

AN AROUND-THE-WORLD REVIEW OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 10, 2005

Serial No. 109-128

Printed for the use of the Committee on International Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.house.gov/international_relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

24-516PDF

WASHINGTON : 2006

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa	TOM LANTOS, California
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
DAN BURTON, Indiana	GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
ELTON GALLEGLY, California	ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
DANA ROHRBACHER, California	ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California	SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
PETER T. KING, New York	BRAD SHERMAN, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado	ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
RON PAUL, Texas	WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
DARRELL ISSA, California	GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona	BARBARA LEE, California
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia	JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York
MARK GREEN, Wisconsin	EARL BLUMENAUER, Oregon
JERRY WELLER, Illinois	SHELLEY BERKLEY, Nevada
MIKE PENCE, Indiana	GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, California
THADDEUS G. McCOTTER, Michigan	ADAM B. SCHIFF, California
KATHERINE HARRIS, Florida	DIANE E. WATSON, California
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	ADAM SMITH, Washington
JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas	BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota
J. GRESHAM BARRETT, South Carolina	BEN CHANDLER, Kentucky
CONNIE MACK, Florida	DENNIS A. CARDOZA, California
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska	
MICHAEL McCAUL, Texas	
TED POE, Texas	

THOMAS E. MOONEY, SR., *Staff Director/General Counsel*

ROBERT R. KING, *Democratic Staff Director*

KRISTEN GILLEY, *Senior Professional Staff Member*

JEAN CARROLL, *Full Committee Hearing Coordinator*

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESS	
The Honorable Karen P. Hughes, Under Secretary of State, Office of the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, U.S. Department of State	15
LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING	
The Honorable Karen P. Hughes: Prepared statement	20
APPENDIX	
Responses from the Honorable Karen P. Hughes to questions submitted for the record by the Honorable Christopher H. Smith, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey and Vice Chairman, Committee on International Relations	61
Mr. Allen Rosenshine, BDA Board Member & Chairman, BBDO Worldwide: Statement submitted for the record	61

AN AROUND-THE-WORLD REVIEW OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2005

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:32 a.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Henry J. Hyde (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.

Chairman HYDE. The Committee will come to order.

Ms. Hughes, we are very pleased to have you with us today. As is the case with many who appear before this Committee, you are bringing very impressive credentials to your task, but not too often do I have the pleasure of saying to an Administration official of either Party that he or she appears to be ideally suited for her position.

The subject of this hearing is the state of U.S. public diplomacy, specifically what can be done to arrest and hopefully reverse the sharp rise in anti-American sentiment around the world. Allow me to offer some brief comments that may differ from prevailing opinions on the subject.

The idea that the widespread and growing hostility to the United States emerges from an unfamiliarity with our country defies logic. For most of the last century, American popular culture has saturated the world to such an extent that we are routinely accused of cultural imperialism, with foreign governments able to erect only feeble barriers against the onslaught. Decades of American television, from *I Love Lucy* to *American Idol*, and thousands of movies, from the *Wizard of Oz* to *Rocky*, to say nothing of virtually every other aspect of life in the U.S., have insured that even in the most remote corners of the world the full array of American life is on display—the good, the bad, the embarrassing and the most noble.

There is more than a touch of arrogance to this common explanation. To believe that to know us is to love us is a surprisingly immature attitude for anyone to profess. It is in fact quite possible for people to know us and still dislike us. That is certainly true on an individual level, and to dismiss our detractors as merely being ignorant is a crippling self-delusion.

Often, the governments of countries have very significant disagreements with one another, disagreements that resonate with their population. We see it in our own country, and we ask if the widespread dissatisfaction with France is simply the result of igno-

rance on our part, or do the statements and actions of the French Government and others play a role?

Given that most of the world is familiar with so many aspects of our society, any campaign that focuses on increasing knowledge about the U.S. with its noble ideals, wonderful accomplishments, and welcoming tolerance is unlikely to dispel much hostility. Most of the world in fact has been repeatedly exposed to many of our best attributes. The problem is many also believe that we are their enemy. And we are, in plain truth, the enemies of many.

Osama bin Laden rightly views us as enemies of his plan to overthrow governments throughout the Middle East and replace them with fanatically anti-Western regimes, and he has a large following in the Muslim world who see our opposition to that vision as that of an enemy. Imperial Japan saw us as an enemy not because its leaders were unfamiliar with us and our traditions—Admiral Yamamoto spent many years in the United States and strongly admired what he saw—but because we were an impediment to their plans, to their vision of the world.

I don't understand why we are so reluctant to accept the obvious fact that, in crafting our various policies, we are often choosing one group over another, one country's plans over those of its competitors and, therefore, those opposed to our policies are likely to resent and even hate us. How could it be any different?

But not everyone who is opposed to us is unalterably so. Many people have been persuaded that we are their enemies, and our policies do not target them accidentally but do so deliberately. This audience is one on which we must focus much attention and much effort.

Around the world there are many relentless campaigns that depict the U.S. and its policies in the blackest and most threatening terms. Our great failure is that we either do not respond or we respond in so feeble and misdirected a way as to be entirely ineffective.

To use an analogy familiar to you, imagine a political campaign in which an opponent relentlessly paints your candidate in the most outrageous distortions and lies, with endless accusations stretching from criminal activity to moral depravity. If the response is limited to handing out talking points regarding your candidate's accomplishment as an Eagle Scout, or his or her love of liberty and worth as a person, election day is unlikely to be a pleasant one.

Thus, to have any hope of reversing our downward slide, we must begin by abandoning the comforting belief and easy solution that our problems stem from the world not knowing us, that if everyone only knew us then they would love us. Unless we do, we can't hope to understand the rapid growth of hostility over the past few years other than by attributing it to mass amnesia. Instead, we must accept the large numbers who dislike us, do so because they believe we have chosen to be their enemy and that our policies have that as their intent.

Many have been persuaded of our hostility or had their suspicions and biases sharpened by others in the media and elsewhere who, motivated by an intent to slander, are clouded by simple misinformation, peddle an image of conscious malice on our part. Given this reality, the most important task facing us is to accept

that we have done far too little to counter this daily blackening, that the fault is ours, not theirs. Central to our plans must be a determination to engage our audiences, not just the elites, with a persuasive case for our policies.

Let me emphasize the critical distinction again. We must make a persuasive argument for our policies and not just for us as a people and a country. We can't hope to win over our audience by trying to persuade them to change, by preaching to them, by outlining our vision for them, however hopeful. We can only do so by explaining and defending our own position, our own policies, what it is that we are in fact trying to accomplish.

No magic bullet has yet been found. Those whose recommendations focus on reorganizations of the bureaucracy often greatly overestimate the possible beneficial results. We can certainly do better, but when is that ever not the case? Regardless of however imaginatively done, this can only be a small part of what must be a much broader effort.

Our Foreign Service, however superbly trained and motivated, can never be expected to counter a deluge of televised images of fiery commentary. How would the Foreign Service have fared in the campaign between President Bush and Senator Kerry? Why then should we expect them to perform miracles in Egypt or Indonesia?

Nor is more money the answer. Doing more of what we have been doing for decades will not produce useful results. Shortwave radio has a glorious past but a bleak future. Satellite television and other means of communications represent a way forward, but most of these remain largely terra incognita.

Similarly, stories on life in America may be heartwarming for expatriots, but these can do little to change the minds of those set against us. Instead, what we need is a permanent campaign aimed at the minds of our estranged audiences, a combative, aggressive, fully-engaged political campaign, one that directly counters assertions and distortions by presenting a convincing case for what we are doing, for countering our enemies' assertions and lies and proving our case.

Preaching to our foreign audiences, trying to get them to change, to live up to our ideals, is fatally misconceived and directs our attention and energies toward ends of limited effect. We are very unlikely to win them over by outlining our vision of what we want them to become. Our only real hope is to convincingly explain our policies and how these either help or do not hurt them. That effort must embrace not merely all the standards and worthy elements of public diplomacy such as student exchanges and citizen ambassadors, but the sustained attention of those at the top levels of our Government, from the President on down. He, most of all, must be directly engaged in addressing our target audiences, convincing them that our policies have been crafted to achieve certain goals, that we do have reasonable purposes and plans and that the dark visions of us filling the airwaves are lies.

That is why I believe you are ideally suited for this position. You have been doing this very thing for many years and very successfully, and you have the standing to draw in the highest levels of

our Government. I don't think we can ask for better and we can't reasonably expect more.

I now yield to my good friend, the Ranking Democratic Member of the Committee, Representative Tom Lantos, for any opening remarks he would like to make.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; and I want to commend you for a singularly thoughtful and serious statement.

I want to welcome Secretary Hughes; and instead of reading my prepared comments, may I just share a few ideas with you? Your success, Secretary Hughes, is our success, because we have only one Public Diplomacy Program. You are heading it, and we all wish you the very best.

Let me say at the outset that, since we all know this, you have a gigantic task, an incredibly difficult task. I am reminded of a day I spent with my late friend, Edward R. Murrow, in Geneva, probably before you entered high school; and Ed Murrow, although he had a somewhat narrower scope of responsibilities, basically dealt with the same issue, telling the American story abroad. But he had an enormous advantage over you, and his advantage was that he spoke on behalf of a pretty united country.

So while we will all give you suggestions, which you really don't need because, having had the pleasure of a long conversation with you, I know you are fully aware of all of these ideas, but I would like to deal with the issue that perhaps is at the core of our dilemma. That is the profound division in the country, which is reflected in the profound division in Congress. You are one of the few people to whom I can say that this is not above your pay grade. This is at your pay grade because of your close relationship with the President.

It seems to me that we will not succeed in our public diplomacy as long as the country is as profoundly divided as it is today; and while I know I will not be viewed as a partisan observer, let me just make a couple of observations in this regard.

Today, this House will vote on cutting back on a variety of desperately needed programs for our most needy; and within a few days we will be voting on an incredible new tax cut for those who need it the least. This brings with it an internal division of unreachable proportions. My feeling is that your success is likely to be very limited as long as we don't deal with fundamental divisions in the body politic of our Nation, and only the President can do so.

It seems to me that all of the suggestions that we are making—and you really don't need us to make them—allowing more foreign students to come to this country; improving the linguistics of our diplomatic staff; another item you and I had the pleasure of talking about, namely, establishing American presence in countries, because in many countries just having one Embassy in the capital doesn't do it because parts of the country are really culturally and linguistically isolated from the capital. All these are good suggestions, but they do not deal with your fundamental dilemma that all our opponents—and I will come to Aljazeera in a minute—all of our opponents only need to quote public figures in the United States and their message is already prepared.

So my only request to you is to sit down with the President and remind him that, if we are to succeed abroad, he does have to be a uniter and not a divider. I don't need to tell someone of your sophistication that a number of the issues, beginning with the now-forgotten Social Security Program which has now been shifted to 2009, only divided the country and it made your job and your colleagues' job all the more difficult.

Now as one who comes from a generation where people still read newspapers, I know that again this week, again, newspaper readership is down, which should remind you and me and all of us that your principal challenge will be to deal with Aljazeera, which is now moving into the English language on a full-scale basis and is likely to be your single most important adversary during your tenure.

I very much hope that you will study—I know you have already—the legislation that Senators McCain and Lieberman and my colleague, Frank Wolf, and I introduced making our Embassies active advocacy posts for democracy overseas. Some of the best American Ambassadors in the last couple of generations were Ambassadors who did this. Ambassador Mark Palmer in my native city of Budapest, speaking fluent Hungarian, made the Embassy an outpost of freedom at a time that Soviet troops were still occupying the country. So my feeling is that, apart from all the obvious suggestions we are making to you, your principal task to tell America's story is to see to it that unnecessary divisions are not allowed to persist in the public arena. We will have different views, but the degree of divisiveness which is present in the country and in the Congress today makes your job almost impossible. And I suspect that is even more important than making getting visas easier for students from abroad, because they are now going to Canada, England and Australia rather than here, beefing up the language program for our diplomats, and providing a public/private partnership because you need additional resources from the private sector.

And I was appalled by the testimony yesterday of the oil company executives who displayed a degree of unwillingness to live up to their public responsibility. They simply feel that providing subsidies for low-income Americans to get through the winter with assistance with their fuel bills is something that needs to be handled someplace on the moon. They have no responsibility. With Exxon making a \$10 billion profit in one quarter, they think they are in a hermetically sealed container that has nothing to do with the plight of poor Americans in New Hampshire and Vermont and in other cold areas.

My hope is that you will deal with the underlying issue as probably only you can in this Government of underscoring, as the California election results 2 days ago so clearly demonstrated, that an ideological approach to public issues simply does not fly and an ideological approach to public diplomacy surely will not fly. So as one who wishes you the best of success, I am asking you to deal not just with the mechanics and the programs but with the underlying issues.

I welcome you, and I look forward to your testimony.
Chairman HYDE. Thank you, Mr. Lantos.

The Chair will entertain brief 2-minute statements from each of the Members who choose to make them before we go to our witness in chief, and so Mr. Berman for 2 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no comments at this time. I would rather have my time on the questions.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you. You certainly shall.

Mr. Chris Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; and I want to welcome Karen Hughes and thank her for the work she is doing. I think this is a very important and vital role that she has undertaken, and she is certainly well suited for it.

As we know, the 9/11 report spent a great deal of time and focus on the issue of public diplomacy and the fact that our message is not getting out. We all know, as politicians, what a 30-second commercial can do to tear somebody down in a campaign. When every day Aljazeera and other vehicles are out there—as a matter of fact, I have held hearings myself as Chairman of the Helsinki Commission where we have heard and seen some of the ugliness that is broadcast each and every day in the Middle East.

We had a hearing not so long ago where we talked about the fact that as the emigrating communities from the Muslim world move out into Europe and the United States, many with satellite television and the like, many of the poisonous broadcasts, the anti-Semitic broadcasts make their way into that community, and they carry with them this vitriol, this hatred, and it just gets passed on from one generation to the next.

We need to tell our story, it is a good story, and I think the more honest we are, the better. I think this is one of those times when America does have—we are that shining city on a hill. We are not perfect, we make mistakes, but we have in place the ways and means to correct those mistakes. Dictatorships and authoritarian regimes do not have that.

So I want to commend the Under Secretary for taking up this very, very vital post. Again, she has all of the talent and the wherewithal and the ability to do an exemplary job and already is, so I want to thank you for your work.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Paul of Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just take a moment to welcome Ambassador Hughes today, a fellow Texan. It is nice to have you here. I can't imagine anybody not wishing you success because it deals with the image of America. Everybody wants a favorable impression, and for that reason I think we would all agree that your efforts should be worthwhile.

I think the dilemma, though, that you may be already facing and that we as a country face is separating image from policy, and you can't really separate the two. If you have a policy that is difficult, then your job becomes more difficult.

I do have a question that I will ask later on dealing with the finances and how much financing you get and where that comes from, but, once again, welcome to the Committee.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Schiff of California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At the outset, I just want to compliment you, Mr. Chairman, on your very thoughtful opening remarks. I also wanted to mention, with respect to Mr. Lantos' comments, how remarkably on point I think they are, not only in the context of this hearing but with so many challenges facing the country. With the need to rebuild the Gulf, with the budget deficit problems, the War on Terror, and potential avian flu pandemic. All these challenges, I believe, are surmountable by the United States, but I am not sure they are if we continue to be divided between the red and the blue.

I think there is a real hunger in the country to be one country again. It will not only, I think, help you in your mission, as Mr. Lantos points out, but help us with innumerable other seemingly insurmountable challenges. So I really appreciate, Mr. Lantos, what you had to say.

In February of '04, Edward Djerejian, the Chairman of the State Department Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy, told the House Appropriations Committee that:

“A process of unilateral disarmament in the weapons of advocacy over the last decade has contributed to widespread negative attitudes and even hostility toward the United States, left us vulnerable to lethal threats to our interests and safety.”

Referencing a report by the Pew Center, Djerejian said:

“The bottom has indeed fallen out for support for the United States.”

I am reluctantly in agreement with Ambassador Djerejian. I have been deeply concerned about the lack of focus and leadership in our public diplomacy in the past. Unfortunately, our image has not improved since the Ambassador's comments.

I really look forward to your testimony. I appreciate your being here and the magnitude of the job you have undertaken, and I am particularly interested in your thoughts on, first, what you see as the drivers of America's image problem around the globe and especially in the Muslim world.

Chairman HYDE. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. May I have 10 more seconds Mr. Chairman?

Chairman HYDE. Okay, without objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. I am interested in your vision of public diplomacy, whether it is to use American foreign policy to create a new image for the U.S. or to push back on the rest of foreign policy bureaucracy and consider the effect of some of our policies on the image of the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you.

Mr. Poe of Texas.

Mr. POE. As a fellow Texan, I want to take the opportunity to welcome you. I am way over here on the end. It is a pleasure to be here at your first International Relations Committee hearing.

You know, your new line of work, in my opinion, is much like your old line of work. You are sort of sent out there to deal with wolves, some of these wolves in sheep's clothing, but you are certainly prepared because of your experience and the lines of communication in a journalism background, television reporter and work-

ing for the President, especially during September 11th, those troubling times.

Now you are asked to communicate, to sometimes a hostile environment, the goodwill mission of the United States and foreign diplomacy. I admire anybody that can deal in diplomacy. It is not one of my strong suits. But I commend you for your work, and I followed your entire career. We need more people like you in Government. You certainly give credibility to the phrase "public servant." so I look forward to your testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. You are welcome.

Mr. Blumenauer of Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My only concern is dealing less with image than fact. The facts are a little uncomfortable at times. We need to be able to communicate with our friends, with our adversaries, with one another. We had a brief run at it yesterday on this Committee, which I appreciate the Chair's courage in at least allowing it to go for a while.

I am hopeful that—and I have noted that when we deal with facts and sort of get the basics, that we have more success; and I am hopeful that there will be more emphasis on ways to be able to deal candidly with the facts on the ground, some that may be unpopular, that we have to have the courage to have unpleasant realities that we contend with and that we can deal with our public as well as people around the world.

You have a difficult task. I wish you well and look forward to your comments.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Burton of Indiana.

Mr. BURTON. First of all, congratulations.

I have some questions on foreign policy in just a minute, but my colleagues have been attacking the Administration again in this forum. I don't know why. Maybe it is because they don't have any ideas of their own.

But I just read an article in the *Washington Times*. We have had 4 years of economic expansion under this Administration, the longest in about the last 20, 25 years. Interest rates are down. Home building is up. Inflation is down. There is more people working today than any time in history. Unemployment is down.

So all these things they are talking about, a divided country, eludes me, it just eludes me. And they talk about this deficit reduction package, we are talking about hurting the poor. They talked about Medicaid here, and soon the Floor of the House—today we are going to increase Medicaid over the next few years by 7 percent. What we are doing is cutting the growth rate, but Medicaid is increasing. Student loans. We are going to continue with all those.

All this stuff being put out about a divided country is baloney. It is politics. This country is doing very well economically, and the President has done a good job in leading this country. Unfortunately, the PR hasn't been that great, but we are going to do something about that, and I am glad you are here.

Chairman HYDE. Ms. Berkley of California.

Ms. BERKLEY. Of Nevada, but thank you.

Chairman HYDE. I knew that. I just wanted to see if you were awake.

Ms. BERKLEY. I am indeed awake, Mr. Chairman; and I would like to welcome you, Ms. Hughes, and thank you for being here. In the interest of time and the fact that I am most anxious to hear what you have to say, I will reserve my comments and questions for after your testimony. Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Bless you, Ms. Berkley.

Mr. Flake. Not here. Mr. Tancredo.

Mr. TANCREDO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Although I am usually quite impressed and certainly I agree often with what the Ranking Member says in his opening statements—I find them to be almost always quite profound—this time I must admit that I am perplexed by his statement and that of other Members in that, how in the world we can assume that Ms. Hughes' job would be easier if we were to simply increase taxes in this country or ignore a looming catastrophe in our Social Security system or simply all turn blue in terms of the way the States are represented. Then everything would be better. Then everything would be great. You could portray us as a happy-go-lucky country, I suppose.

The fact is, it is possible, Ms. Hughes, it seems to me, that one of the great strengths of America and one of the great things we can tout to the world and one of the things we can be most proud of is our ability to debate these issues in a free society and our ability to wrestle with big issues and big questions and to do so without guns blazing in the streets, to do so in a way that most of the world, I think, would find admirable. Seems to me that that would also be a nice way to portray us.

Thanks for being here.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you.

Mr. Delahunt of Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You really do, Madam Ambassador, have a Herculean task before you. There was a report that was done by the Government Accountability Office back in April 2004, and they unequivocally stated that anti-Americanism is spreading and deepening around the world. It isn't just restricted to the Middle East. It is all over the world. And that is the reality and that is the fact, according to that independent arm of Congress.

I believe you are going to be an excellent Secretary. I think you can sense that there is a division of opinion as to the basis for this anti-Americanism. Some of us believe it is because of the Administration's policies, but let us put that aside for a moment. I think that you can make a difference, I really do, and I think you should know—and I think I speak for other Members on this side of the dais—we desperately want you to succeed. It is important. Please feel free to call on Democrats as well as Republicans to assist you in that goal, because this really is important to our country.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you.

Mr. Leach of Iowa.

Mr. LEACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome, Madam Under Secretary. I think you will find there is virtually unanimity in this Committee in support of a stronger public policy approach and unanimity and respect for your personage,

and that is important. I would just throw out one cautionary sign, and that is that I have sensed in my political Party an almost escapist view, that all would be okay if we just projected our public diplomacy better. The fact is there is no substitute for good policy, and there is no public diplomacy that can disguise policy that doesn't work and that a fundamental element of public diplomacy has to be a feedback that goes into the decision-making mechanism of what policy itself is.

I urge you to give that considerable thought because most people that think of your job think of it as exclusively one of projecting an image that is defined to be good about a policy that may be imperfect, and I just throw that out as strongly as I can. Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you, Mr. Leach.

Ms. Watson of California.

Ms. WATSON. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman; and I want to welcome you, Deputy Secretary. I watched you in 2000 from thousands of miles away, and you had a special charisma. You made the bad look good for me.

I often recall my training in the Department of State. I went through it twice. And what I want to stress, it is so important how we speak to people who come from different cultures, customs and traditions; and saying one thing and doing something different does not help our image.

I can testify to the anti-Americanism. I was shocked and appalled. As I travel with this distinguished Committee, it is told to us constantly. So you have an awesome job to show our image a little differently. If we are trying to spread American values and principles, we must practice them ourselves.

The rule of law, and that is what I stressed when I was sitting as an Ambassador, the rule of law, because we were using American dollars to support their Government in Micronesia. So what I am hoping that we can do here is give you what you need as you go through various parts of the world trying to improve our image. And you can say what you want, the facts are the facts are the facts, and our enemies watch our television on a daily basis, and they watch what we do here.

So, to put a good face on it, you have a challenge, but if anyone can do it, you can. Good luck, you have our support and go out there and get it done. Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Royce of California.

Mr. ROYCE. Thank you.

Welcome, Ambassador Hughes.

If we do adopt good policy, if we do promote democracy or the rights of women to education or religious tolerance in the world, organizations like al-Qaeda, radicals in various creeds and ideologies are going to hate you, they are going to hate us. So I think since September 11th, our country has faced a difficult task of changing our image abroad because, frankly, a lot of what we stand for is resented. And unless we are prepared to shift off of the position of the rights of women to an education or religious tolerance or certainly advocacy of democracy, they are going to continue to organize and spread their message.

I got a good lesson in this in the early 1990s, when we shut down our broadcasts into Afghanistan and all the people of Pakistan and

Afghanistan had to listen to was Radio Shari'a run by the Taliban and orchestrated by bin Laden's cohorts, and it took us 4 years. I had legislation that I finally got through this Committee. We could not, in the '90s, get Radio Shari'a jammed. So that view is all people heard.

Four years after 9/11, I think we all agree that we are struggling. Radical ideologies are proliferating because they are using the airwaves, and if we are going to succeed we need a complete reevaluation of our efforts. We need to determine what measures have proven successful and which have not, and we need to do that with urgency. That is what we are looking to you to do, Ambassador Hughes, to define ourselves. Because the 9-11 Commission said if the United States does not act aggressively to define itself to the Islamic world, the extremists will gladly do the job for that. I am looking forward to hearing about our efforts.

Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Adam Smith of the State of Washington.

Mr. SMITH OF WASHINGTON. I will be brief.

I want to echo Mr. Leach's comments and say as we go forward on this I hope we don't look at it and say, gosh, if we just come up with a better marketing campaign everything will be fine. In some cases, it is unbelievable what you can accomplish with a good marketing campaign, but in this case we do need to look at the policies as well, and for each Member of this Committee, you would have a different view of what policies are right and what are wrong.

I want to express the view that really matters in trying to get confidence back. As we witnessed in Latin America, we have issues out there. We need to look at our policies, and I think one of the best things we can do is really listen to the rest of the world instead of going there and say here is why you should like us. As someone told me a long time ago, selling is listening, and I think that would go a long way toward helping us.

I thank the Chairman for the time.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Rohrabacher of California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Good luck. Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Wexler of Florida.

Mr. WEXLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I would like to thank the Under Secretary for giving me the opportunity to speak with you before you traveled to Indonesia. I think, as you well understand, that we should avoid making generalizations with respect to how America can present itself to the Muslim world. There are extraordinary opportunities, I think, for positive engagement, opportunities in Turkey and in Indonesia where we have democratic governments that are committed to furthering democracy in their own countries and, I think, value American friendship at a very significant level.

I would concur with what Mr. Leach and Mr. Smith said in terms of listening, but I often wonder, in the context of explaining American policy in the position that you have, if at times we almost apologize to a certain degree a bit too much. I found it quite ironic when there was controversy regarding the actions of or alleged actions of American service personnel with respect to debasing the Koran—I think there would be a unanimous view that de-

basing the Koran is unacceptable, it is incorrect, it doesn't conform with American values, but isn't it ironic that while we were talking about the debasing of the Koran that we don't point out that when the extremists bomb a mosque, that in addition to the 20 or 30 human beings that are destroyed there are probably tens of thousands Korans that are destroyed, and where is the outrage in that regard?

It would seem to me, I wonder, in this context, yesterday's bombing in Jordan, if maybe we wouldn't be wiser to focus less on America and the impact on America and more the impacts on Jordan. It is mostly Jordanians that were destroyed in that bombing yesterday. In Egypt, it was mostly Egyptians whose lives were destroyed. I wonder whether or not we would almost be more effective if one of the roles that you would play would be to help persuade some of our allies and some who are lesser allies in the Muslim world that this is as much if not more an attack and a war on the Muslim way of life, the peaceful Muslim way of life, as it is on America.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you, Mr. Wexler.

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen of Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Ambassador Hughes, for your service to our country and for your dedication to promoting the wonderful interests that we have, the values that we share as Americans. You have a tough mission, but you are doing it very well. Thank you for appearing before our Committee.

The vicious anti-American, anti-Semitic, anti-Western propaganda that permeates much of the Middle East and beyond helps to set the stage for the terrorist attacks upon our country, and we find ourselves facing a powerful ideological enemy. The fanatical incitement that is among the extremist factions of the Muslim world and beyond, that incitement is a real threat to long-term U.S. interest in the region; and I hope that in your remarks you will talk about your discussions with leaders in the region on your recent trip, about what improvements you are considering to enhance the broadcasting to offset the venom that is spewed by the government-controlled media and the like of Hezbollah, Al-Manar.

With respect to Al-Manar, what actions has the State Department taken to designate Al-Manar and its parent company, the Lebanese communication group SLA, as global terrorists and the foreign terrorist organizations; and what are we doing to get tough? Because there is a correlation between governments that are gross violators of human rights and religious freedom and an environment that breeds incitement and anti-American sentiment.

For example, Saudi Arabia has been designated by our Department of State as a country of particular concern under the International Religious Freedom Act. It is at the center of terrorist financing, its education curriculum fosters intolerance at home and exports it, and that needs to be addressed, even though we consider Saudi Arabia our ally in some fronts.

So we have got to integrate human rights, religious freedom, and trafficking reports into our public diplomacy and have a good strategy, a positive strategy to reach civil society in the region. I know it is a tough job, but you can do it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 Chairman HYDE. Thank you.
 Mr. Issa of California.
 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, good to see you back. You look well rested. I do remember one of the last times I saw you, you were talking with such excitement about going back home to Texas. I hope your time outside the bubble, however short, gave you the exact insight that somebody who is in the loop and has been outside the bubble will have. I think that is critical in the job you are going to do.

I am just sorry that you had to be dragged back in like the godfather in—I think it was *Godfather II*—that you just can't get away from it, can you? I just—you are going to say that one was bad. You should see some ones I have to go still.

I am looking forward to your service for a very specific reason and something different than perhaps what others said. I believe you are the best person to know what is in the heart of the President, to take that around the world, to listen as an independent. I was very thrilled to see your four E's, but I also think your independence, access, influence will be critical.

When you go to meet with foreign leaders, they know that you have the knowledge of the President in a virtually unheard of way, your access and your experience with him. They know when you go back you will meet with him, and I know that you will be able to bring back perspectives outside the bubble that he is in.

I look forward to your testimony, and I look forward to your being able to do that. Because nothing can be more important to foreign policy than somebody as good and honorable and dedicated as our President having somebody like you to be the eyes and ears and an independent mind.

Thank you. I look forward to your testimony and yield back.

Chairman HYDE. Ms. Lee of California.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and the Ranking Member and, of course, Secretary Hughes for being here.

I can just imagine how challenging your job would be during a time of more positive engagement with the rest of the world, but putting a positive spin on our military engagements and our international scandals, that has got to be a true challenge. I would be very interested to hear from you, how you are able to put really a positive face on the Administration's foreign policy in light of the unnecessary war in Iraq, the horrific incidents at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay, and the recent revelations that the United States is using former Soviet jails in eastern Europe as torture centers, just to name a few.

The truth is, quite frankly, I believe that this Administration's foreign policies have greatly, greatly diminished our standing as a world leader and has had direct impacts on our safety. In fact, according to the results of a program on international policy attitudes, the international poll said only 37 percent of the respondents felt that the United States was having a positive influence in the world.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe—and I know we disagree here—but I believe that the Bush Administration's policies itself, these poli-

cies have created our image problem with our own foreign policies as it relates to the rest of the world.

So I am pleased that you are here today, Madam Secretary; and I look forward to hearing your thoughts on these important issues. Thank you very much.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Chabot of Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. I will be brief.

I would like to associate myself with the comments from the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Wexler, whom I often disagree with on the Judiciary Committee on most issues, but in here tend to agree with him on many issues; and I think his remarks were right on point.

I am often reminded, Madam Secretary, about a cartoon I saw some years ago. It showed a man, a Middle Eastern man, opening up a flag on this bag of food. He is opening it up and said something along the lines of, how thoughtful of the Americans, food and a flag to burn.

Unfortunately, I think our country, we have a tough time around the world public relations-wise. We are obviously the superpower able to do the most good around the world, and I think in general we do do the most good. But when you are up against the radical Islamic fundamentalist movement that has been growing worldwide and people willing to kill innocent women, children, anybody, in order to make their point, as we saw in Jordan just yesterday, we face a very difficult challenge. You are right in the middle of it, and we all on both sides of the aisle wish you the best. So you will be in our prayers.

Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Joseph Pitts of Pennsylvania is a Member of this Committee. However, he is on leave of absence. But because of the significance of the subject matter he has returned to the fold temporarily; and, Mr. Pitts, if you want to make a 2-minute statement, you are recognized.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege to attend and to sit although I am on leave.

I believe the issue of public diplomacy is extremely important in the world we live in for winning hearts and minds around the world, for American ideals and values; and I just want to thank Ambassador Hughes for your marvelous job that you have done so far.

But I don't think our country has been doing everything we could do. I think we need to think outside the box. I believe in Government programs and Government relationships, but I also believe there is a place for people-to-people diplomacy and people-to-people efforts, if they are properly promoted.

I concur with the gentleman, Mr. Wexler's, comments when he said there are extraordinary opportunities for positive engagement around the world. For instance, I would just love to see every Member of Congress just adopt one country to partner with, to become educated about, to get to know their officials, to open the door for their constituents, to engage in various ways, business, humanitarian, sister relationships.

Many countries are very small. They don't have big budgets, and there is not a lot of awareness about their culture. If just half of

our Members would do this, we could cover the globe and put forward a face of Americans who are interested, that are aware, who care about ordinary people in other countries. I would be interested in your thoughts about this kind of engagement, if you have any, as we go forward today; and I look forward to hearing your testimony.

Thank you very much. Yield back.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you, Mr. Pitts.

Well, we have finally reached—

Mr. ACKERMAN. Almost.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Ackerman just came in. Well, Mr. Ackerman is recognized, from New York.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I thank the Chairman very much.

I would like to welcome Secretary Hughes. Congratulations on your assignment. We have a lot of confidence in your ability. You are going to have to work very hard.

I also am one of those that believe that we have squandered our reputation because of many of the policies of the Administration. Your job is big. It is not going to be easy to clean up after the elephants.

I do wish that, using the access that you have to the White House, that you would also spend some time with the background of an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, that you try to bring some sanity to some of the policies that we have so that we don't have to appear to be as arrogant as we have been to the rest of the world during the rest of the term of this Administration. And I want to congratulate you and welcome you again to the Committee.

Yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you.

I am very pleased to welcome to our Committee Karen Hughes, Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs. She has been an advisor to President Bush for many years, and now in her role in the State Department she leads efforts to improve America's dialog with the world.

Thanks for being with us today, Ms. Hughes, and please proceed with your prepared testimony. Your full statement will be made a part of the record, but I am told the totality of your statement is about 10 minutes, and because you have had to endure the slings and arrows of outrageous Members of Congress, please proceed with a 10-minute summary.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE KAREN P. HUGHES, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ms. HUGHES. Thank you, Chairman Hyde, Ranking Member Lantos, and Members of this distinguished Committee.

We have already heard here this morning the healthy spirit of debate and disagreement that I think is a model for the rest of the world.

First of all, I hope I can speak for all of us in expressing the deepest sympathies of America to the people of Jordan and our horror and outrage at the terrible terror attacks there yesterday. We

have been once again reminded of the stakes and what we are up against, people who are willing to even kill innocent Jordanians attending a wedding. We will work together with countries and people throughout this world to defeat this threat.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to talk about a subject we all care deeply about, and that is America's dialogue with the world. When I accepted this challenging new role, I promised to reinvigorate America's public diplomacy efforts. I have been on the job now for 87 days. I am known as a high-energy person, and I suspect on many of those days my staff thinks I have reinvigorated a little too vigorously, given our growing list of new and expanded projects.

We have a lot under way. We have much more to do. We are just beginning, and our work is critically important. In today's world of instant communications across much of the globe, America's dialogue with foreign publics is essential to a successful foreign policy and to our national security.

President Bush recognized its vital importance when he said public diplomacy is a job for all of us—for Ambassadors, for Foreign Service officers, for Cabinet officials, for Members of Congress, as well as for our public diplomacy professionals.

Public diplomacy is neither Democratic nor Republican but American, and I am very conscious of that. Along with every Member of this Committee, the President recognizes that the global and generational challenge we face is, at its core, a contest of ideas and values. As the President said recently, by standing for the hope and freedom of others, we make our own freedom more secure.

All our efforts are guided by three strategic imperatives that I talk about in every speech and remind my staff of every day. First, that America must continue to offer a positive vision of hope and opportunity to people throughout the world, a vision that is rooted in our enduring commitment to freedom. We promote the fundamental rights of free speech and assembly, the freedom to worship, limits on the power of the state, the rule of law, rights for women and minorities, not because we seek copies of America's democracy but because we believe these are universal human rights of men and women everywhere.

Our second strategic imperative is to isolate and marginalize violent extremists and undermine their efforts to exploit religion to rationalize their acts of terror. We must work to amplify a clear message from people of every nationality and faith that no injustice, no wrong, no matter how legitimate, can ever justify the murder of innocent people.

We must stress that the victims of terrorist violence today, as the victims yesterday in Jordan, are people of every nationality, ethnic group and religious faith, and that most of the people being targeted and murdered by terrorists and insurgents in Iraq today are innocent Muslims.

We must contrast the society that people of goodwill around the world are working toward—an expanding circle of freedom and opportunity, where diversity is respected and celebrated—with the kind of society the terrorists seek—a restrictive, repressive conformity that we witnessed in Afghanistan under the Taliban when women were virtual prisoners in their homes and little girls

weren't allowed to go to school or learn to read. I don't believe that is the type of life most people throughout the world want for themselves and their families, and I think it is very important that we always draw that contrast.

Our third strategic imperative is to foster a sense of common interests and common values between Americans and people across our world. We share so much. People the world over want education and better lives for our children. People everywhere want to live in security. We all want jobs and opportunity and the chance to advance in life.

As we foster these common interests and values, our approach must be humble. I am mindful that public diplomacy, as several of you mentioned, is a dialogue, as much about listening as it is about speaking. That is why my early trips abroad have been styled as listening tours. I tell our Embassies I want to reach out to people who may have never met an American Government official before. I am listening, and then I am reporting back to the President, to Secretary Rice, to other senior officials, so that what I hear is taken into account as we develop and communicate our Government policy.

President Bush is asking Cabinet secretaries and other high-level officials to reach out to foreign publics during their travels, and I want to encourage and urge all the Members of this Committee and all the Members of Congress to do the same, and I know many of you do as you travel around the world, and to participate in interviews with local television stations and local media as you travel. Our Embassies want to work with you and help to arrange that to help us reach broader foreign audiences.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight several of the other specific initiatives we are pursuing through tactics that I call the four E's: Engage, Exchange, Educate and Empower.

As the Chairman noted in his opening statement, we must engage more vigorously, explaining and advocating our policies in ways that are fast, accurate and authoritative. We have set up already a new rapid response center at the State Department. It monitors global news and issues a one-page report each morning with alerts as needed so that busy policymakers focus not only on the news environment in Washington or America but also on what is affecting people's lives throughout our world. This has already proven to be an effective early warning system that helps us respond quickly to misinformation or emerging stories.

We are asking our Ambassadors and public affairs officers to speak out much more aggressively on major issues, to do more speeches and television interviews and to attend more conferences. My office is providing tools and guidance to help them do so in ways that are clear, concise and coordinated.

We are proceeding with plans to set up regional public diplomacy platforms to expand our television presence. In today's world, our setup tends to be country specific. Yet much of the news media now is regional, so we need to have that regional presence throughout the world. It will also help us to make programs such as our speaker's bureau more strategic and effective.

We are at work on a technology initiative to make greater use of Web chats, graphics, streaming video, perhaps even text mes-

saging—which they used recently in Indonesia to communicate government policy—to help amplify our message and make it relevant to younger audiences.

Our second E is exchanges, which many foreign policy professionals regard as the single most effective public diplomacy tool of our country over the last 50 years. We are increasing exchanges, making them more strategic and working to amplify the exchange experience through creative uses of media such as a program we have underway now, a radio program in Indonesia that has an audience of more than 1 million and is currently chronicling the American experience of two Indonesian students who are on an exchange program in Colorado.

We are focusing on key groups that are influential within their own societies and vital to our interests, among them teachers, journalists, religious leaders, women and young people.

We are creating new public-private partnerships. Dina Powell, who serves as my deputy and is also the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, is a leader in all of these efforts. Earlier this week, in California, she announced a new program, the Fortune/State Department Women Entrepreneurship Internship. This will give emerging women business leaders from across the world the opportunity to participate in 3-week internship programs during which they will work with and learn from senior executives in America's Fortune 500 companies.

On the third E, education, we have already redirected money to expand one of our most effective and eagerly sought programs, English language teaching. Learning English gives young people a skill they want, a skill that directly improves their own opportunities and potential in life, while also opening an important window on our values, and we plan to make teaching English a priority.

Americans must also educate ourselves to be better citizens of the world. I am working with Secretary Rice on a strategic languages initiative to encourage more American students to study languages of the future, languages such as Chinese and Arabic.

In January, we will convene a University Presidents Summit. America now faces competition for foreign students. We have to be more effective in encouraging them to come here, and we have to work to dispel lingering misperceptions from the months and years after September 11 when there were delays in receiving student visas. We have made great improvements in overcoming those, and we want young people to know we welcome them and want them to come to America.

Our fourth pillar, empowerment, recognizes that the voices of government officials are not always the most powerful nor the most credible voices to deliver the anti-terrorist message. This is one reason I have spent a great deal of time reaching out to the Muslim-American community, traveling to Muslim majority countries and meeting with both political and religious leaders who advocate respect for people of different faiths and greater interfaith dialogue and understanding. A Muslim has far more credibility to say that Islam does not allow the murder of innocents than I do as a government official or Christian woman.

I am also working to empower our best natural resource, our fellow Americans. My very first trip, I traveled with two citizen am-

bassadors, one a teacher from Wisconsin. I had never met him before, but during my confirmation hearings, Senator Russ Feingold talked to me about his belief in citizen ambassadors, and he recommended a citizen from Wisconsin, a teacher named Bill O'Brien, and a graduate student here in Washington, Kareema Dauod. I wish you could have witnessed the powerful connections those two American citizens were able to make. We are building on that start, and we plan to create a robust program to help our citizens share their skills and their stories with people across the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close with three initiatives that are helping us to accomplish all these goals.

First, we are integrating policy and public diplomacy at the State Department. Several of you made the point that public diplomacy is about policy, and I agree. Because with policy, what we are talking about is affecting people's lives, and that is what our policies do, and that is what public diplomacy is all about. I say it is people driven.

Either I or a member of my staff participate in Secretary Rice's key policymaking meetings, from partnering with the Palestinian Authority as they develop institutions to planning for avian flu. From the day of the devastating earthquake in Pakistan and the flooding in Guatemala, America's response has been formulated with public diplomacy at the planning table.

Next week, I will travel to Pakistan with key business leaders who President Bush recruited to lead a significant private sector fund-raising effort because it is the right thing to do and because it also demonstrates the compassion and generosity that are at the heart of who we are as a great country.

Second, we have relaunched the interagency strategic communications process. I lead a high-level group of policy and communications professionals who come together, and we are at work on specific plans to further the freedom agenda and win the war of ideas. I am also working with Andrew Natsios and visiting USAID projects as I travel abroad to highlight the many ways that the American people are helping people throughout the world to improve their lives, from immediate help in times of disaster and crisis, to long-term development of stronger economies and civil society institutions.

Third, we are reinvigorating public diplomacy as a strong, rewarding career path within the State Department. We are working to restore management links that were severed during the USIA merger. We have elevated public diplomacy in the regional bureaus, adding a deputy assistant secretary who dual reports to the head of the bureau and to me, which gives me a senior management team and also direct management links into the regional bureaus, and through them, the field.

We are making public diplomacy a part of every officer's job description and developing ways to evaluate and reward success. In fact, we are instituting a culture of results throughout the broader public diplomacy community, and we have already acted to restructure our evaluation unit to base it on the successful model that is used currently in our educational and cultural affairs division.

If some of these ideas sound a little familiar, they are. We took the best thinking from the more than 30 different reports that have

been written over the last several years about America's public diplomacy. Many foreign policy and public diplomacy experts gave very generously of their time to develop these recommendations, and we are now working to implement them.

I want to highlight one that I have not yet mentioned that I discussed recently with Congressman Lantos. He mentioned it briefly.

Many of these reports recommended creating some sort of private foundation for public diplomacy to strengthen our partnership with the private sector and to bring in and encourage some of those who might not want to work directly with the Government. This foundation could do a number of things, from making grants available to produce quality television programs and making them available to the multiplying number of satellite television stations across the world, to funding translations of great works of literature, to working to increase interfaith dialogue and understanding. I have a working team that is looking at this proposal, and I believe it has the potential to make a long-term difference for America's public diplomacy.

All of this work is just a beginning, but I am very proud of what a great team of people has been able to set in motion in a very short period of time. I welcome the ideas and expertise from Members of this Committee. I look forward to working with you and all of our partners in the United States Congress.

Thank you for your time and attention, and I look forward to your questions.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Hughes follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE KAREN P. HUGHES, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thank you, Chairman Hyde, Ranking Member Lantos, distinguished members of this committee.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss a subject we all care deeply about: America's dialogue with the world. When I accepted this challenging new role, I promised to reinvigorate America's public diplomacy efforts. I've been on the job now for 87 days—and I suspect that on many of them, our staff thinks I've reinvigorated a little too vigorously given our growing list of new or expanded projects.

We have a lot underway, we're just beginning and our work is critically important. In today's world of instant communications across much of the globe, America's dialogue with foreign publics is essential to a successful foreign policy and to our national security.

President Bush recognized its vital importance when he said public diplomacy is a job for all of us—ambassadors, foreign service officers, Cabinet officials, members of Congress as well as our public diplomacy professionals. Along with every member of this committee, the President recognizes that the global and generational challenge we face is at its core a contest of ideas and values. As the President said recently, "By standing for the hope and freedom of others, we make our own freedom more secure."

All my efforts are guided by three strategic imperatives. First, that America must offer a positive vision of hope and opportunity to people throughout the world, a vision rooted in our enduring commitment to freedom. We promote the fundamental rights of free speech and assembly, freedom to worship as one chooses, rights for women and minorities, the rule of law, limits on the power of the state not because we seek copies of American democracy—but because these are the universal human rights of all people, men and women, everywhere.

Our second strategic imperative is to isolate and marginalize violent extremists, and undermine their efforts to exploit religion to rationalize their acts of terror. We must work to amplify a clear message from people of every nationality and faith:

That no injustice, no wrong—no matter how legitimate—can ever justify the murder of innocents. We must stress that the victims of terrorist violence today are people of every nationality, ethnic group and religious faith, and that most of the people being targeted and killed by terrorists and insurgents in Iraq are innocent Muslims. We must contrast the society that people of good will around the world are working toward—an expanding circle of freedom and opportunity where diversity is respected and celebrated—with the kind of society the terrorists seek—a restrictive, repressive conformity. We witnessed that society in Afghanistan under Taliban rule when women were virtual prisoners in their homes and little girls couldn't go to school or even learn to read. I don't believe that's the type of life most people throughout our world want for themselves and their families and it's important that we make that contrast.

Our third strategic imperative is to foster a sense of common interests and common values between Americans and people of different countries, cultures and faiths across our world. We share so much. People the world over want education and better lives for our children, people everywhere want to live in security, we all want jobs and economic opportunity.

As we foster these common interests and values, our approach must be humble. Public diplomacy is a dialogue, as much about listening as it is about speaking. That's why my early trips have been styled as listening tours. I tell our embassies that I want to reach out to people who may have never met an American government official before, I'm listening and reporting back to the President, Secretary Rice and other senior officials so that what I hear is taken into account as we develop and communicate public policies. President Bush is asking Cabinet Secretaries and other high level officials to reach out to foreign publics during their travels and I hope members of Congress will do so as well—and participate in local television and newspaper interviews to help us reach broader foreign audiences.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight several of the other specific initiatives we are pursuing through tactics that I call the four "E's:" Engage, Exchange, Educate and Empower.

We must engage more aggressively, explaining and advocating our policies in ways that are fast, accurate and authoritative. We have set up a new rapid response office at the state department. It monitors global news and issues a one page report each morning with alerts as needed so that busy policy makers focus not only on the news environment in Washington or America, but also around the world. This has already proven to be an effective early warning system that helps us respond quickly to misinformation or emerging stories. We are asking ambassadors and public affairs officers to speak out on major issues, to do more speeches and television interviews, and my office is providing tools and guidance to help them do so in ways that are clear, concise and coordinated. We're proceeding with plans to set up regional public diplomacy platforms to expand our television presence, and make programs such as our speaker's bureau more targeted and strategic. We are at work on a technology initiative to make greater use of web chats, graphics, streaming video perhaps even text messaging to help amplify our message and make it relevant to younger audiences.

Our second "E" is exchanges, which many foreign policy professionals regard as the single most successful public diplomacy initiative of the past 50 years. We are increasing exchanges, making them more strategic and working to amplify the exchange experience through creative use of media such as a radio program in Indonesia—with an audience of more than a million—that is currently chronicling the American experience of two Indonesian students studying in Colorado.

We are focusing on key groups that are influential within their own societies and vital to our interests—among them, religious leaders, teachers, journalists, women.

We are creating new public private partnerships. Dina Powell, who serves as assistant secretary for educational and cultural affairs, also serves as my deputy and is a leader in all our efforts. Earlier this week, she announced a new program we have created: the Fortune/State Department Women Entrepreneurship Internship. This program will give emerging women business leaders from around the world the opportunity to participate in three-week internships during which they will work with and learn from senior executives in Fortune 500 companies.

On the third "E," education, we have redirected money to expand one of our most effective and eagerly sought programs, English language teaching. Learning English gives young people a skill they want, a skill that improve their opportunities in life, while also opening an important window on our values—and we plan to make English teaching a priority.

Americans must also educate themselves to be better citizens of the world—and so I am working with Secretary Rice on a strategic languages initiative to encourage more American students to study languages such as Chinese and Arabic.

In January, we will convene a University President's Summit. America now faces competition from many other countries to attract foreign students. We must be more effective in encouraging them to come here, and we have to work to dispel lingering perceptions from the year after September 11th about students visas. We've made great improvement in overcoming delays and we want young people across the world to know we welcome them and want them to come to America.

Our fourth pillar, empowerment, recognizes that the voices of government officials are not always the most powerful nor the most credible voices to deliver the anti-terrorist message. This is one reason I have spent a great deal of time reaching out to Muslim Americans, traveling to Muslim-majority countries and meeting with both political and religious leaders who advocate respect for people of different faiths and greater inter-faith dialogue and understanding. A Muslim has far more credibility to say that Islam does not allow the murder of innocents than I do.

I'm also working to empower our best natural resource: our fellow Americans. My very first trip, I traveled with two citizen ambassadors, a teacher from Wisconsin named Bill O'Brien and a graduate student here in Washington, Kareema Dauod and I wish you could have witnessed the powerful connections they were able to make. We are building on that start and plan to create a robust program to help our citizens share their skills and stories with people across the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close with three initiatives that are helping us accomplish all these goals.

First, we are integrating policy and public diplomacy at the State Department. Either I or a member of my staff participate in Secretary Rice's key policymaking meetings, from partnering with the Palestinian Authority as they develop institutions to planning for avian flu. From the day of the devastating earthquake in Pakistan and the flooding in Guatemala, America's response has been formulated with public diplomacy at the planning table. Next week, I will travel to Pakistan with key business leaders that President Bush recruited to lead a significant private fundraising effort because it is the right thing to do—and it also demonstrates the generosity and compassion that are at the heart of our great country.

Second, we have relaunched the interagency strategic communications process. I lead a high level group of policy and communications professionals. We have already had several productive meetings and are at work on specific plans to further the freedom agenda and win the war of ideas. I'm also working with Andrew Natsios and visiting USAID projects as I travel to highlight the many ways the American people are helping people throughout the world to improve their lives—from immediate help in times of disaster and crisis, to long-term development of stronger economies and civil society institutions.

Third, we are reinvigorating public diplomacy as a strong, rewarding career path within the state department. We are working to restore the management links that were severed during the USIA merger. We have elevated public diplomacy in the regional bureaus, adding a deputy assistant secretary who dual reports to the head of the bureau and to me, giving me direct links with the bureaus and field operation. We are making public diplomacy a part of every officer's job description and developing ways to evaluate and reward success. We are instituting a culture of results—we are restructuring the evaluation of all of our programs, based on the successful model used in our educational and cultural affairs division.

If some of these ideas seem familiar, they are. We took the best thinking from more than 30 groups over the last several years that reviewed America's public diplomacy and made recommendations to improve it. Many foreign policy and public diplomacy experts gave generously of their time to develop these proposals and we are acting to implement them. I want to highlight one that I have not yet mentioned that I discussed recently with Congressman Lantos. Many of the reports recommended creating some sort of private foundation for public diplomacy to strengthen our partnership with the private sector and to encourage those who might not want to work directly with government to get involved. This foundation could do a number of things: make grants to produce quality television programming and make it available to the multiplying number of local and regional television stations across the world; fund translations of great works of literature; work to increase interfaith knowledge and understanding. I have a working team looking at this idea and believe it has the potential to make a long-term difference for America's public diplomacy.

All of this work is just a beginning, but I am very proud of what a great team of people has set in motion in a very short time. I welcome ideas and expertise from members of this committee and all our partners in the United States Congress. Thank you and I look forward to your questions.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you very much, Ms. Hughes.

I very seldom take time myself to ask questions, but I am going to this time, but I, too, will be brief.

I just want to comment that everything about America in the world is not bleak. We have many friends.

On a recent codel, we talked to the Foreign Minister of Greece, the President of Ukraine and the Prime Minister of Estonia, and they launched into lengthy, heartfelt and unsolicited praise for the United States and its indispensable role in rebuilding Europe and defending freedom in the post-World War II world. We stopped at Gdańsk, where they were celebrating the 25th anniversary of the founding of Solidarity, and Lech Walesa talked to us in Polish, but I could understand two words he uttered: Ronald Reagan. So I think we have a great story to tell.

The emphasis on unity also must take into account the nature of democracy, which is a robust debate. So we are going to always have robust debate, as long as we have a healthy two-Party system. I have an intuition that if President Bush were to have nominated a resurrected Abraham Lincoln to the Supreme Court, the senior Senator from New York would be unimpressed.

In any event, I want to thank you, and I repeat what I said with more emphasis and fervor, you are the ideal person for this job.

Ms. HUGHES. Thank you so much.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and let me commend our distinguished witness for an excellent statement.

When Senator McCain and Senator Lieberman joined Frank Wolf and myself in introducing the Advanced Democracy Act, in a very fundamental sense, we were attempting to implement the key aspects of the President's second inaugural speech. This is his hoped-for legacy. It is a legacy that all Americans share, and we thought that our legislation would be a way of moving it forward.

Thanks to the Chairman's support, the House incorporated our legislation in the State Department Authorization Act. The Senate has not yet acted. I would very much like to encourage you, Madam Secretary, to talk to Senator Lugar, because this legislation would make our Embassies abroad active participants in your very complex and very difficult task.

In the quarter century I have been in Congress, I have visited Embassies which are doing exactly what our legislation is calling for. Every single member of the Embassy staff is out speaking about the United States. But there are Embassies, beginning with the Ambassador, which really are just doing very second-rate jobs along these lines. Unless there is legislative support behind your effort to energize our Embassies, I don't think we will have them reach their potential.

I would like to raise a couple of questions with respect to dramatically enhanced educational exchange programs. As you know, during the last year-and-a-half, I visited Libya five times. We now have over a generation of total lack of contact with Libya. We haven't had a Libyan student at our universities for about a quarter century.

When I talked repeatedly to one of Qaddafi's most trusted people, the head of his Secret Service, he displayed a remarkable knowledge of the United States, and it became obvious he was a grad-

uate of the University of Michigan. The Prime Minister of Libya, who also understands us quite well, has his Ph.D. from Tufts. We now have a whole generation of Libyan leadership with zero experience in the United States.

I simply can't urge you strongly enough to work on both the visa issues and on the general question of educational exchange, because while some of these people who spent years here turn out to be hostile to us, most do not. Most understand the fundamental values of this society.

I also would like to ask you to expand a bit on a program that I know you strongly support and implement, mainly multiplying the American outposts abroad. It seems to me that one-person operations, as we established in Cluj, Romania—that the State Department fought tooth and nail under Warren Christopher, and finally they were forced into implementing—and it has been an enormously successful undertaking. And the establishment of a mini-office in the Kosovo capital of Pristina, are all doing an enormous amount of good work for us. I would be grateful if you would comment on what your plans are on these outposts.

Ms. HUGHES. Thank you very much, Congressman. I couldn't agree more about making our Embassies active participants, out speaking, and that is a change in the culture of the State Department.

Traditional diplomacy is viewed as government-to-government. One of our diplomats would carry a message to a comparably-ranked diplomat from another country, and that exchange would be very quiet and not very public, traditionally.

But as part of Secretary Rice's vision of transformational diplomacy—and in this age of instant communication, of satellite television, today's age of information is far different than the public diplomacy challenge we faced during the Cold War. At that time, we were trying to get information into societies that were largely closed, and most of the people were hungry for that information. Today, in many parts of the world, we are in an information explosion. You have so many satellite televisions from which to choose, and you can get on the Internet in an instant and find all kinds of sources of news and information, some credible and some not.

So I think in this age of information, it is extremely important that all of our people, all of our Embassies, not just the Ambassadors and not just the public diplomacy professionals, but everyone who works within an Embassy, that they communicate on our behalf to foreign publics and with foreign publics.

So that makes it my job then to help provide them the training and tools necessary to do so, and we are going to be looking at the training programs at the State Department to make sure that, in the future, we are able to give people the skills that they need to be able to accomplish and achieve that.

We are also going to begin making public diplomacy a factor in evaluations. When you measure things, they tend to improve, and if people know they are going to be measured and rewarded when they reach out to foreign publics, that can help change what in the past has been a risk-averse culture in terms of that outreach.

Second, on exchanges, you are absolutely right. It is striking as you travel around the world and meet leaders how many of them

were educated in the United States of America and, therefore, how many of them have an understanding of our country and of our people and of our values. I think that is very important for the future, and that is why I am a big believer—as I first took this job and reached out to people with a great deal of experience in public diplomacy, I met with a number of foreign Ambassadors and a number of different groups, many of whom had done extensive analysis of public diplomacy, and almost universally they told me that they thought the most effective program that we had done over the course of the last 50 years was in fact our exchange programs.

That is another reason it is so important that we compete for students, because 30 years from now, I want the person who sits here as she travels or he travels around the world on behalf of our country to be able to meet with people who have been educated in America and who therefore understand our country very well.

Third, in terms of expanding our presence beyond capital cities, I agree with you, that is very important. Of course, we do have some resource issues, but I think that we can certainly look at how we deploy people. You and I talked about, for example, Indonesia, which is spread across such a large geographical area. It is very hard for a public diplomacy person in the capital to reach out to someone on one of the further islands.

Ed Morrow, whom you quoted earlier, once famously said that public diplomacy is about the last 3 feet, and that is the last 3 feet between you and another person as you make that personal connection. So that is something we will work very hard to foster and also encourage our people in Embassies to get out more across countries.

We do face security challenges in today's world. As you know, it has become harder and harder as we work to secure our Embassies for our people to reach out, and we have had to work on some creative ways to do that. I am proud to report that the State Department has developed some innovative ways to do that by placing an American presence. For example, when I was in Malaysia, I toured a very successful program called the American Corner—it is the Lincoln Corner, they call it in Malaysia actually—but it places an American presence, a small American library, in the case of Malaysia, in Kuala Lumpur. It was in the Malaysia city library, and so someone who walks into the Malaysia library has a chance to walk by the America section and take a look at some of our history and some of our literature and some of our magazines. And it was a very impressive little corner. So we have had to work on creative ways to establish that presence, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Paul of Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Earlier, many Members mentioned the connection between the policy, and, of course, our image overseas, and you even referred to in your remarks about integrating policy and public diplomacy. But the mere integration, I don't know whether it would be quite enough because it is the policy itself that might make the difference.

But I share that concern and I share a concern that our image has changed so much, because, in the year 2000, we as a Party, you know, talked about a foreign policy that was opposed to nation-building. We didn't want to be the world policeman. We criticized that, and we wanted a more humble foreign policy.

I don't think today we are going to solve the problem of policy. I don't want to dwell on the issue of policy as much as the perception of our policy, which is really what counts. Even if we are above reproach on our intentions about what we want to do around the world, it probably doesn't matter if the interpretation is that we are crusaders, the images that we have already seen about torture, and there could be secret prisons. All of these things, I cannot see how we can overcome that because the perceptions have been portrayed. So I don't think it is just policy, although obviously they are connected.

I wouldn't mind if you commented on that, but I have one specific question that has to do with funding. There was a recent article in the *Boston Globe* that said that the Bush Administration has devoted \$670 million this year to the public relations efforts by Ambassador Hughes.

Ms. HUGHES. What was that figure?

Mr. PAUL. \$670 million. I tried to check this out, and I haven't been able to. If you can tell me today, fine. If not, maybe you can follow up. I would like to know how much we spend and what budget it comes from, because today we are dealing with budgets on the House Floor, and we are trying to pick away a dollar here and a dollar there, and I would like to know about that.

Also, do you know whether or not whatever amounts we are spending, how much of it goes to any private public relations firms? Do we use public relations firms in the work you are doing?

Ms. HUGHES. Let me comment, first of all, on our funding. Our 2005 funding was a total of \$670 million. That is divided into two accounts. One is for the general public diplomacy area; and the second, that amount was for public diplomacy specifically, \$315 million; and for education and cultural affairs, which is in a separate part of the budget but is also in the public diplomacy purview, that amount is \$355 million, for a total of \$670 million.

The current conference report for 2006 is recommending an increase in that amount. I will note that all of the 30 reports, I believe, that were done on public diplomacy recommended increases in our expenditures, specifically in a lot of different areas, specifically in the area I mentioned as a priority area, and that is of exchanges. The 2006 conference report as it stands today does have an increase for exchange program funding of about 20 percent. The overall budget increase recommended is about 14 percent. So that is the status of the specific funding issues.

Let me talk just generally about the issue you raise about anti-Americanism, about—

Mr. PAUL. May I interrupt you? Does any of the money go to the private PR firms?

Ms. HUGHES. I am not aware of any private public relations firms that we use. We do use contractors in several areas. We use contractors to prepare publications that help publicize our policies. For example, we have a very nice publication that has just come

out, an electronic journal called, *See You in the USA*, which seeks to encourage people to come to our country, which we think is an important thing to do, because once they come here, it helps to open their minds about America. They see what we are really like. They see that Americans are hardworking people, who are people that value family and faith and very much have values very similar to theirs. We use contract employees for things such as language translation to translate our statements and policies into a number of different languages.

But I would be glad to check for you and find out whether any of that work is done with a firm or not, because we do have a number of contract employees that we contract out, which we think is an efficient way to handle some of those preparations of publications and reports.

[The information referred to follows:]

WRITTEN RESPONSE RECEIVED FROM THE HONORABLE KAREN P. HUGHES, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTION ASKED DURING THE HEARING BY THE HONORABLE RON PAUL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

The bureaus that report to the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy have infrequently contracted with private firms for a few special projects. For example, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) had a contract in FY05 to develop a marketing strategy to make the ECA alumni Web site more useful and appealing for ECA alumni. There are, at present, two open contracts. One, in the Bureau of International Information Programs (IIP), is a contract signed in 2003 to design and complete a marketing campaign to promote the HI magazine brand and secure advertising pages for the magazine. The other, in the Bureau of Public Affairs (PA), is a contract signed in 2002 for print, radio and television advertising in targeted markets for the Shared Futures program. The remaining funds in this contract, which concludes in February 2006, are currently being used to pay for sewing machines for micro enterprises and backpacks containing information for use in schools; these materials are distributed in association with cultural exchange programs.

Ms. HUGHES. We also work through our exchange programs with a large number of NGOs, nongovernmental organizations, who help to administer our exchange programs. But I will be glad to check on that, Congressman, and get back to you with specifics.

On the second part of your question, let me talk about a couple of broad things. First of all, obviously during the campaign of 2000, none of us—it is very interesting, I traveled the country with the President. I watched as he answered thousands, literally, of questions in debates and from journalists, and I recall him being asked about the Taliban only once and never being asked about al-Qaeda. Yet less than 9 months later, we found ourselves involved in a war with them after a horrific attack on our homeland on September 11th.

I know many of you were here in Washington, as I was, and we remember the horror of that day. And we had to look at our country's national security in the new light of September 11 and recognize that we were, as well-reminded again so tragically yesterday in Jordan, that civilized people and nations throughout the world are engaged in a very difficult war against extremist terrorists who want to inflict violence against people who disagree with them. And their stated intention they have said: They want to kill Americans; they want to kill Jews; they want to kill Muslims who don't agree

with them. So we are engaged in a very, very different time in the aftermath of September 11.

You mentioned the detainee issue. Let me make it very clear what our policy is regarding detainees. We treat detainees humanely, in compliance with our laws, in compliance with our values, and we treat them consistent with the principles of the Geneva Convention.

Now, we have seen some horrible crimes, and all of us Americans were sickened by those pictures from Abu Ghraib, just as people around the world were sickened by those pictures from Abu Ghraib, and they don't represent the actions of the vast majority of our men and women in America, any more than the horrific beheadings being carried out by terrorists represent the thinking of the vast majority of people around the world.

Those were criminal acts that were committed at Abu Ghraib, and as often is the case, the crimes got a lot more attention than the punishment. But I think it is important for the American people and the world to know that more than 20, I believe 25, people have been reprimanded, sentenced, tried or held responsible in one way or another for what occurred at Abu Ghraib, including the individual that we saw in most of the pictures, many of the pictures, who has been sentenced to 10 years in the penitentiary for those crimes. Another was sentenced to 8 years. Another was sentenced to 3 years. A number were reprimanded. The commanding general was removed from command and later demoted in rank.

So democracies are not perfect, but we hold people accountable. I do think it is important to note it was a United States soldier who saw what was going on and thought it was wrong. And he was right that it was wrong, and he brought it to light. And it was investigated, and those responsible have been punished.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Berman.

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, I would like to get your response to three points: There are a number—I am told by people who know that we have a number of American schools, particularly in major cities in the Arab world, the students are primarily children of American diplomats, children of American Government contractors, children of American businessmen and children of elites in Arab societies and Arab countries, children of wealthy, successful business and government officials in those countries.

Those schools have room for additional students. Joe Knollenberg and I, based on this information, introduced legislation and secured an earmark in this year's Foreign Operations Bill to create a scholarship program for the promising children of middle- and working-class Arab students in other countries as well to attend those schools. It is very little cost. The schools are there. There is room in the schools and the facilities. It is an investment in the long-term exposure of people coming from a broader class than now use these schools, schools that feature a Western-style educational environment, a premium on development of critical thinking and analytical skills, an exposure to American values.

We have had some problems inside the State Department and with the MEPI Administration in getting a commitment to use these funds. I think they are one small part of a long-term invest-

ment in a successful program, and I would like to encourage your support for that.

Secondly, Alhurra, our Middle East satellite TV station, often has a difficult time to get United States officials to go on the air and comment on the important issues of the day. With that in mind, I am interested in your views of the place of Alhurra in advancing U.S. public diplomacy objectives. Is Alhurra the preferred satellite TV vehicle for U.S. Government engagement with Arab viewers? Is it just one among equals with Aljazeera, al Arabia and the others? I would be interested in your views on that.

Finally, I am told that one or more times you have expressed support for certain fatwas that condemn religious edicts by Muslim scholars that condemn terrorism. Obviously, those fatwas are useful. But critics short of endorsing fatwas say this is a dangerous game to get into. For instance, in Egypt, Sheikh Tantawi, who I had a chance to meet with at Al-Azhar—I believe you met with him as well—he gave a very strong edict against terrorism, but he exempts from that attacks and killings of soldiers in occupation situations like we are in in Iraq.

You made some wonderful statements regarding freedom and promotion of democracy in your testimony. Rules that are developed through democratically-elected institutions and become laws are, I think, something that we want to promote. That ocean of edicts, getting in to starting to judge certain fatwas and whether they are good or not, gets to be troublesome. I just throw that out to you to hear your thoughts and any reaction if you have it.

Thank you.

Ms. HUGHES. Congressman, let me start with that last point. It is a point well taken. One of the things I am working to do, though, is to amplify the voices of those, particularly in the Muslim community, who are willing to speak out and condemn acts of terror.

As I mentioned, I was at the White House after September 11, and at that time, frankly, it was very difficult to get voices within the Muslim world to speak out, to condemn the use of terror as a tactic, even terror against innocents.

After the London bombings, we saw a number of voices that began to speak up and say that the use of terror against innocents was not permissible in Islam. Again, I think the fact that those are voices of Muslim clerics, that those are voices issued through fatwas, which are viewed as important rulings within the world of Islam, that we think that is important to amplify those voices, so that this is not just America saying that acts of terror against innocents are bad, these are voices within Islam that are saying that acts of terror are bad.

We had, I think what you are referring to, what I highlighted, was a fatwa that had been issued by a group of Muslim-Americans and was unveiled at an Islamic Society of North America meeting. That doesn't mean we always agree with all of the views represented by those who are speaking up, but I think it is important that we speak up together as a world community with people of different faiths and different countries who are willing to join us and say the murder of innocents is not acceptable. So I think that is an important thing to highlight.

Your first point on American schools, I believe, and I have asked about this program once before, I believe you are referring to a program that would basically fund scholarships for students to attend those schools. I think in theory that is a very good idea.

I did ask MEPI about that and was told that the tuition costs were very high compared to comparable costs at other schools and that that was one of the problems. But I will be glad to look into that further. Because during my work in Afghanistan—I will relate a story—I had a group of visitors from Afghanistan who came to Washington on an exchange program, and I invited them to come to Texas because I wanted them to see a part of the country in addition to Washington.

They came to my home in Texas, and I was talking with a couple of the women, and I asked where their children went to school. One of them said, “Oh, my child goes to the French school.” Another one of them said, “My child goes to the German school.” I thought, well, those children are being exposed to positive experiences about those countries. Why aren’t they going to an American school?

So I checked into it and found that actually our Ambassador at the time, Zal Khalilzad, who is now our Ambassador in Iraq, had attended an American school in Afghanistan. It had been shut down some time ago, and I believe it is now reopened. And I do agree with the point in principle that reaching out to lower-income people who might not otherwise have an opportunity to be exposed to America and having them attend American schools would be a good idea, and maybe there is a way for us to work more closely with those schools. And I will look again into those costs. I believe someone wrote a column about this at some point, and I inquired about it and was told actually the tuition costs were high. But I will be glad to check and get back to you on that.

[The information referred to follows:]

WRITTEN RESPONSE RECEIVED FROM THE HONORABLE KAREN P. HUGHES, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, TO QUESTION ASKED DURING THE HEARING BY THE HONORABLE HOWARD L. BERMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I have looked into this, and I understand that MEPI is developing a plan to implement a scholarship program for students in the Middle East and North Africa with American institutions of basic and higher education in the region. Congressional committees of jurisdiction will receive notification of this plan after it is approved by the Deputy Secretary.

Ms. HUGHES. Third, about Alhurra, as a communicator, I believe it is important to reach out to a lot of different mediums and a lot of different stations. For example, there has been some debate about whether Administration spokesmen should appear on Alhurra, given the fact that frequently the reporting is inflammatory and not always very objective. I am a communicator. Alhurra reaches a huge audience. Therefore, I feel if we are not present on that station, if we are not making our case on that station, we are missing an opportunity to communicate with a whole lot of people. So I think it is important. I did an interview——

Mr. BERMAN. That inflammatory station——

Ms. HUGHES. I am sorry, Aljazeera. Did I say Alhurra? I meant to say Aljazeera. I apologize. I misspoke.

I believe it is important to Aljazeera, which frequently the Administration, and I know Members of this Congress, I am sure, object to because the reporting on Aljazeera is frequently wrong and based on rumor and innuendo and not based on fact, based on misinformation, and we continue to complain when that takes place.

But I think it is important for our spokesmen, and we have aggressively tried to step up the presence of our spokesmen on that station, because I think it is important that the vast audience that Aljazeera reaches hear from us.

I have met with Ambassador after Ambassador and talked with them about public diplomacy in their country, and I will say, what are you doing about public diplomacy? Well, we have worked this newspaper or that newspaper. And I will say oh, do people in your country get most of the news from the newspaper? They say, no, they get it from Aljazeera. So I say, what are you doing about Aljazeera? Well, it is located in another country.

Well, that is why I think it is very important, and that is the reason I am looking at the idea of a regional platform to put Arabic speakers on to Aljazeera.

With that said, on Alhurra, yes, I think it is important that we make our spokespeople available for Alhurra. As you know, the Broadcasting Board of Governors is a separate Federal agency. I sit on that board as a representative of the State Department to ensure strategic coordination, to give them input into our policy and our strategic priorities, the three strategic priorities, for example, that I shared with you this morning.

There is a firewall that prevents me as a State Department employee from interfering or recommending or making any judgments about the news operation of Alhurra and many other, all other U.S. broadcasting initiatives, other than the editorials that are done by Voice of America, which are specifically required to be editorials that reflect U.S. Government policy.

I do think, however, given that firewall, despite that firewall, there are opportunities for some synergy, and I have been trying, as I have attended the first couple of meetings that I have been to of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, to make some recommendations.

For example, we do all these exchange programs. We bring 10 clerics from Jordan to the United States, a program that we did not do too long ago, and they have an opportunity to see what our country is like and to visit and go see synagogues and mosques and churches in America.

Why should that experience be limited to those 10 people? Why wouldn't it make sense for our American-Arabic language television station, Alhurra, to cover that exchange, to do a documentary about that exchange program and therefore share it with a much wider audience?

I think we can do things like that in a way that does not breach the firewall, and I would hope it makes both programs, both public diplomacy and our broadcasting efforts, more effective. I am looking for ways that we can do things like that.

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Burton of Indiana.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have to say, Madam Secretary, you are a very impressive lady, and your knowledge and scope of knowledge is very impressive. You have talked about a lot of public diplomacy involving countries across the seas.

I am Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, and I am very concerned about what is going on in Central and South America. I believe if we don't have the right diplomatic attitude and take the right steps, in the next few years, we could have a conflict or conflicts down there that would be very, very destabilizing for the entire hemisphere. I think it is extremely important. I met with President Chavez a couple of times, once in Caracas and once in New York, and I listened to his speech the other day to the big gathering down there at the Conference of the Americas, and one of the things that he said in the closing remarks was something about that they should continue to further the goals of Che Guevara. He also said on a number of occasions that he is an enemy of the United States.

I talked with leaders throughout Central and part of Latin America, and I intend to see as many as I can. And they are all very concerned about the oil money that he is getting and how it is being used to potentially undermine their governments. They will all tell you the same thing; it is happening, and they are very concerned about it.

So I would just like to divert your attention from the Middle East and overseas and Africa and so forth to South and Central America and ask, what steps you and the Administration intend to take to deal with that from a diplomatic standpoint? Because a lot of the rhetoric going on, emanating primarily from Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela, is very anti-American and very, very caustic. I think that is an area that really needs attention, and you can be a great help in that regard.

Ms. HUGHES. Congressman, as a Texan, our friends in Latin America are very, very important. As a Texan, I know that. I also spent some of my early years growing up living in Panama, which is where I learned just a little bit of Spanish. I understand it a lot better than I speak, so I hope I don't destroy the beautiful language. But I think it is important that Americans try to show respect and appreciation for the wonderful languages of different countries.

I agree with you that public diplomacy—although some of the media reports frequently focus on the Muslim world, and it is a very important part of public diplomacy—public diplomacy, though, involves the entire world. And our friends in this hemisphere are very important. In fact, the President, when I talked with him about this job, underscored for me the importance of reaching out to Latin America, and I plan to travel there. I was initially hoping to do so this month, but I think it is going to now be right after the first of the year. But I look forward to traveling there.

There are some loud voices in Latin America that are trying to stir up anti-Americanism. I think there also is a very broad consensus that has emerged over a period of numerous summits and a series of meetings between leaders of America and Latin American and Central American and Caribbean countries, a consensus that favors free trade and free markets and economic integration.

And we believe that those are the paths to a better life, a more hopeful life for the people of Latin America. That is what we are all working toward.

We recognize we want to nurture the democracies of Latin America, and I think our public diplomacy can be very, very important to that effort. Our Ambassador in Venezuela works very hard to reach out to the people of Venezuela. We did an innovative baseball exchange program where we brought an American baseball player, who I believe is from Venezuela, and brought some young baseball players from Venezuela to America. We are trying to foster citizen exchanges.

In Latin America, we have a very successful program called Bilingual Centers, where we teach English language classes within institutions that are hosted by the host country. So it is a unique partnership between America and the host country and also gives young people a skill that is very highly desired. And I understand that we have waiting lists in many of those programs, and we would like to be able to expand those programs, because they have been very, very successful in building bridges of cooperation. We also have a number of American Corners in Latin America.

So I think your point is very well taken that we need to work to foster the democracies there, to foster our partnerships with our neighbors in this hemisphere, and that is very important to our work.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Schiff of California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Hughes, I, like my colleagues on the Committee, feel that you have one of the most important jobs in the U.S. Government right now and certainly one of the most difficult. I wanted to ask you about the work prior to your appointment by your predecessors, Margaret Tutwiler and Charlotte Beers. Those efforts had little success in improving our image overseas.

I am not asking you—I don't want you to comment on them personally. I know they did their very best. But nonetheless, we didn't advance the ball much under your predecessors, and I wonder if you can share some thoughts about why you feel those prior efforts were unsuccessful and what lessons we can draw from that experience. What will you be doing that is different in kind than your predecessors did that is more likely to have a successful outcome in changing our image and the perception of America abroad?

Ms. HUGHES. Well, let me make a couple points to that. One is that, by its nature, a lot of what we are doing is very long term. So I want to disagree a little that those efforts were unsuccessful. I feel that there were a number of programs actually that were started that have the potential over the long run to be very successful for our country.

Both Charlotte Beers and Margaret Tutwiler, in the aftermath of September 11, moved to try to make our exchanges directed more to young people, particularly the young people who might not otherwise have the opportunity to come to America.

There was a very successful program started called YES, which brings high school students, low-income, underprivileged high school students from different Muslim world countries to America,

people who would otherwise probably never have the opportunity to see our country for themselves.

I am a big believer that one of the most important things we can do is bring people here. We want open minds. We want people to have open minds, to come here and see for themselves, because we believe when they do, their opinions of our country will be forever changed. So, who knows? One of those young high school students, I happened to meet with a group of them last summer, one of those young high school students might one day be a leader of a country that is instrumental to America and to our foreign policy and to our standing in the world. So I think some of these programs take years.

I am under no illusions of what I will be able to do in the little more than 3 years remaining in this Administration. So I am very mindful. One of the things I am trying to do, and I can't speak to whether my predecessors did or not, but I am trying to look at, how can we put in place institutions that will make a difference over the long-term?

For example, how can we better train our Ambassadors and our Foreign Service officers? How can we attract the best and the brightest and make it clear that public diplomacy, communicating American policies and ideals and values is the job of all of us, and give them the tools over the long run to do a better job at that?

Mr. SCHIFF. Can I interrupt for one question? These initiatives I think are all very important, but they probably raise an issue that has come up in the Committee in the form of comments from our colleagues. How much of the problem that we face is the result of our policies, and how much is a result of our communication? Some of our policies aren't going to change and shouldn't change, and they may be unpopular, and we are just going to have to deal with that.

Some of our policies may be giving rise to legitimate antipathy. Our close relationship with authoritarian regimes in parts of the world has caused a criticism that we support dictators who are friendly to us; we only oppose dictators that are unfriendly to us.

How much of those issues do you think are poisoning the environment you have to work in? How much do you get pushed back when you travel around, particularly the Middle East, about our support for less than democratic governments or those that abuse the rights of their own people?

Ms. HUGHES. Let me make a couple of points on that, Congressman. When I traveled to the Middle East, I think the two areas that I heard the most about were Iraq and the Israeli-Palestinian issue.

In the case of Iraq, I recognize that many countries and many people, many people in our own country, disagreed with our decision to go into Iraq. But when I talk with people, I think there is general agreement that, given where we are today in Iraq, what should happen next—there is general agreement that it is important for our country to continue to help Iraq emerge as a united and a stable democracy. So I think there is broad agreement about what we are doing to try to stay in Iraq and work to help that country become united and stable and democratic.

On the Israeli-Palestinian issue, there is a feeling in the Middle East that I heard over and over again that we favor Israel over the Palestinians, and yet our policy is that the United States of America supports the creation of a Palestinian State that could live side-by-side in peace and security with Israel.

So one of the recommendations that I made when I came back from our trip is, to the extent we can be seen working in partnership with the Palestinian Authority to develop the institutions that will allow that state that we do support to emerge, that I think that could be a very effective way for us in the Middle East region. People there are somewhat suspicious of words. They want to see actions. I think those actions are both in keeping with our policy and will be good for our public diplomacy.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Leach of Iowa.

Mr. LEACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just say, at the end of your opening statement, you made a reference to citizen diplomacy, and several times more recently in your statement, you talked about exchanges. I think that is very thoughtful.

Often in this town there is an assumption that relations between States are government-to-government, but actually a lot of the tone is set by American citizens, whether they are business people or artists or students or scholars. At the government level, there is obviously no substitute for good policy. At the non-government level, I don't think there is a substitute for using our greatest asset, which is our citizens.

To put a focus on this is something that I think is a great challenge. I would like to note, in my State, in the City of Des Moines, there is a real effort to establish a citizen diplomacy center. I hope you look at that.

In Iowa City, a town I represent, a group of scholars have developed a rather extraordinary way to use very small local servers to put millions of books on, and they have approached the city American Corner aspect of USAID, and it has gotten a very sympathetic review. I hope you pay attention to this. It is a way to expand geometrically the types of things that can be offered in these American Corners.

I would caution a little bit on the policy of your last comment that everything you hear is that people want us to stay for a prolonged period of time. I don't hear that from anyone anywhere. The notion of overstaying is something that you should be thinking seriously about. Once these elections are held this December—not to use that as a basis for—a drawdown of troops and an upgrade of assistance of a nonmilitary variety is something that I think should be the goal of the United States of America. Overstaying militarily in an occupation is the one thing that could produce catastrophic consequences. I know that there is a feeling in this Administration that they want to stay for a long period of time, and I really think that is going to have to be reviewed.

Ms. HUGHES. Congressman, if I said stay, I think I misspoke. Succeed was what I intended to say. It is important that we succeed, because obviously all of us want our men and women in uniform to come home as quickly as possible. And I agree with you that people throughout the region, people in Iraq do. But they don't

want us to come home before Iraq is capable of defending itself against this terrorist and insurgent threat. As the President has said, we want to stay as long as necessary and not 1 day longer.

Mr. LEACH. I appreciate that clarification, although we all should understand that the occupation itself becomes an incentive for terrorism and we can get involved in a Catch-22. But let me just turn to the—very quickly, I think there is a diplomacy aspect dealing with the Congress. We are responsible, as you are responsible, for visa policy. It has become irrationally tough and I think that this is something that you ought to take a personal responsibility to deal with us and within the Department about. If we don't have the right kind of people that come into our country that want to come for student exchanges, we are really doing counterproductive things.

Secondly, I would like to discuss minorly, because we had an aspect on the House Floor, if we are going to support public diplomacy we have got to support diplomacy. Supporting diplomacy means supporting the United States Department of State and that means in a budgetary sense as well as in a philosophical sense, and we have got to be very careful about not having enough resources in your department as we move in a world where diplomacy is going to matter a lot, public and nonpublic, and I am very concerned on our budget at this moment in time, and I wonder if you would like to comment on that.

Ms. HUGHES. Well, thank you. On the area of visa policy I agree it is very important. I just recently returned from a Chiefs of Mission conference with our Chiefs of Mission in Asia and they identified the whole visa issue and treatment of visitors to our country as one of their biggest challenges that they face on a daily basis. I will be glad to get involved in that personally. Secretary Rice is also very involved in that personally. She is working with Secretary Chertoff on that issue and, as I said, we have made significant improvements.

I know in 2002 and into 2003 we were still experiencing very long delays as we instituted special screening programs. In many cases, particularly in the cases of student visas, we have managed to improve that substantially. In fact, in a lot of countries, I believe probably the majority of countries, most students are now able to get an appointment within a day or 2 and get the visa very shortly thereafter. We have improved, but we need to improve more and we also face a big challenge as we work to protect this country, and no one wants to be the one who makes a mistake and lets in someone who is going to attack our citizens, and so I am very mindful of that.

On the other hand, it is very important that we remain a welcoming country. I was overseas in a low-income neighborhood in Turkey and a young man looked at me and said, "Does the Statue of Liberty still face out?" I said of course. We still are a welcoming country, we want people to come to our country, we welcome people to America and I think it is important that all of us as government officials, as airport screeners, as customs officials, that all of us respect that you don't get a second chance to make a first impression, and we need to say welcome to people that we greet at our airports,

even if we do need to screen them or look a second time at their visa.

Chairman HYDE. Ambassador Watson of California.

Ms. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to throw some thoughts together and because of lack of time, you can answer them all as a group. Number one, in my travels around the globe we are seen, and I have heard this, as starting a war against Islam, and so you can comment on that when I finish.

What do you make of the debate between the President and the Vice President relative to torture?

And as I understand, in the eighties, Congressman Stokes put a provision in the foreign policy bill that we identify at the HUCUs (historically black colleges), students who are the best and brightest, and you did mention that term, bring them to the State Department, train them so they could go into diplomacy, and I think it is a good idea because there are people of color talking to people of color. So I just want to make that point.

And then I raised this issue last year with someone from the Department of Defense, and I said there sounds to me like we are doing nation-building and we are planning on occupation. I would like you to comment on what is the message in Iraq and who should talk about when we plan we will get out of there as soon as we have accomplished the mission. Well, 2 years ago the President said, "Mission accomplished." So how do you feel about the thought that we are doing nation-building in Iraq and it looks like we are going to have a long-term occupation there?

These are my questions. You can throw them all into one response. I thank you so very much for listening and for your patience. Thank you.

Ms. HUGHES. Thank you so much. I am glad you brought up that first point because I do think it is something that we struggle with, making it very clear that the war against terror is a war against violent extremists who are trying to hijack a religion, not against the vast majority of people of faith and peace who are Muslims, and that is one of the reasons I was at the White House in the days after September 11th when the President visited a mosque to try to make that point very clearly that we—this was not in any way a war that involved people of the Muslim faith but this was a war against terrorists and violent extremists. And that goes back to the point I made earlier about why it is so important that we encourage Muslims themselves to speak up and to speak out and that we help to amplify and empower their voices. And that is why I tried to reach out to the Muslim-American community, because I think they can be a very important bridge in that effort as we make that case across the world.

It is also the reason it was great to have a young Muslim-American with us as a citizen ambassador in the Middle East. You should have seen the young people flock to her and ask her what is it like to be a Muslim in America and her talk about how freely she was able to practice her faith and how welcoming Americans were and how people reached out to her in the aftermath of September 11th.

So I think that is a very important message that we have to repeat again and again and again, and one of the points that I hear

frequently is that as Americans we need to work to foster greater understanding and interfaith dialogue among people of different faiths within our own country. That is something I am working on here at home as well. We had maybe 2 weeks ago at the State Department a fascinating panel discussion on traditions in Islamic culture, and we did that as an education experience for our own employees and also to set an example for other workplaces and other cities and other communities, that we hope they will foster similar programs to encourage greater dialogue and understanding between people who practice different faiths.

Second, you mentioned the debate regarding detainee policy. All the members of our Administration are working very hard to protect this country and to fulfill our responsibility to live up to its laws and uphold our values in our treatment of detainees, and we had before I left the Administration back in 2002 and we continue to have discussions, debates, thoughtful deliberations as to how we can best do that. It is a very important issue—it is a very challenging issue because we are facing something we have never faced before. We are facing stateless terrorists who do not wear the uniform of a state. All our international law was developed under the premise that two armies would confront each other and yet we face these stateless terrorists who don't wear a uniform, who don't conform to any rules, and we are trying to treat them under rules when they are not parties to any international treaties and they don't respect any boundaries or rules of international law.

Again, the policy is that all detainees will be treated humanely, in compliance with our laws, with our Constitution, with our values, and consistent with the principles of our international treaty obligations and the standards of Geneva. I recently saw an interview by General Peter Pace, who is the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, the senior ranking person in uniform, and I want to quote him because I think it is important that the world hear clearly, and unequivocally know, what the policy of the United States is. And this is General Peter Pace:

“I can tell you categorically that any maltreatment of any detainees by U.S. forces or coalition forces is totally unacceptable, that our orders have and will continue to be that we will treat everyone in our charge humanely and with respect. And that is the policy of our country and of the United States of America.”

Ms. WATSON. Would you speak specifically about torture? Because the discussions about torture, and the President said, do not eliminate options. So it is like a double message going. I hear that message but it is torture that the debate is about and you have the Vice President saying one thing and the President saying another and the President is saying he is going to veto legislation if it comes to him.

Ms. HUGHES. I believe you are referring to a specific piece of legislation, and the Administration has issued a statement of Administration policy on that legislation. I can only repeat to you what our Commander-in-Chief and President of the United States has said—we do not and will not condone torture. I don't know how to say it any more unequivocally than that.

You asked about our message in Iraq, and I want to challenge the word that I have heard several times here this morning—occupation. Our forces are in Iraq today supporting the democratically-elected Government of Iraq. I hear that word used around the world. It is interesting to me, one of the things I heard on my travels. I believe there is a disconnect between what the rest of the world looks at when they look at Iraq and what the people of Iraq are saying, at least the ones I have talked with and according to public opinion surveys about what they are saying. The rest of the world, and I understand that no one likes war, no one likes—we all hate to see the bombings and the violence and the security situation in Iraq—and it is important to know what is happening in Iraq today. Terrorists and insurgents are engaged in the indiscriminate murder of fellow Iraqis, fellow Muslims. That is what is happening in Iraq today. United States forces are there trying to help the elected Government of Iraq to emerge as a stable and united and democratic country.

I think what I hear when I travel is people look at Iraq and see the chaos there, the violence there, and I think they somehow get a conclusion that somehow the people of Iraq are not better off today than they were under the rule of Saddam Hussein. Yet when I sit down and ask Iraqis, “Are you better off, do you think your life is better today than it was under Saddam Hussein?” I have never once had any one of them tell me anything other than, “Yes, we are better off, we are glad that Saddam Hussein is no longer in power.”

I sat at the White House last week and watched a group of Iraqi women meet with the President, and this is the thing television cameras don’t see because it was a private meeting and these women wanted to tell the President—each one of them—thank you, thank you for my family. One of them said my mother wanted me to please tell you thank you, Mr. President, she never thought in her lifetime we would be free from Saddam Hussein.

I think it is important that we work hard to make sure that the American people and people throughout the world hear more from the people of Iraq about how they feel about the future of their own country. We saw it when they turned out in those huge numbers to vote in the face of threats of terror and even death. We saw it when they turned out again to vote for their Constitution. And I think it is important that we help them do a better job of making their feelings known to the rest of the world and to the American people.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Royce of California.

Mr. ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. Would you yield to me?

Mr. ROYCE. I certainly will.

Chairman HYDE. My good friend, Ms. Watson, the Ambassador, used the phrase “nation-building” and I know that is a pejorative phrase in these discussions, but when 60 percent of the eligible voters come out under threat of being shot by snipers or bombed by terrorists to vote, that is an enormous victory for democracy and it shows they have hope, that they would risk their lives to cast a vote to pass, adopt a Constitution. If that is nation-building, we need more of it. Thank you, Mr. Royce.

Mr. ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I found some of the opening statements, especially critiques of United States tax and social policy of interest as we got underway with our hearing, and these statements actually come at the same time that France, with a system that is the polar opposite of ours in terms of the role of the state and the economy, is suffering from domestic violence and is specifically suffering from riots that are unprecedented in recent French history in terms of the scope, and this goes to the issue of perception among certain young Muslims in France. But as you know, this week over 6,000 cars were burned, over 200 towns and villages were attacked, many churches and many shops, and many public schools were burned in France. And what is interesting to me about the argument is that France has created a system where it does have a high level of social spending, it does have very high taxes. It spends a fortune on its social cohesion plan that is specifically addressed at trying to find jobs in the inner city, a part of the problem in France is the unemployment is over 20 percent for youth throughout France. So it is higher than that in these immigrant communities, but France tries to deal with this. The population in North Africa is going to double in the next years and a huge percent of that population comes to Paris and other major French cities and so they have a plan to try with their social cohesion plan to face the unemployment problems that come about as a result of the unemployment and also with public expenditures. They have a cradle to the grave program, with welfare payments and public housing and everything else, and yet at the end of the day, with a social policy that is far to the left of ours in terms of the magnitude of public expenditure, they still have this perception problem.

So I go back to those initial opening statements. It is true that we are divided here on the question of policies which are going to come up this week where we are going to try to hold the spending to 6 percent growth increase per year, and we are going to try to keep from raising the capital gains rates from 15 percent to 25 percent. That is a debate that is going on. But I don't—it seems to me that those policies have helped create a situation where we created 37 million jobs, where Europe created 4 million in the same time frame, and I am not altogether certain that the level of spending on social policy in the United States is a source of resentment overseas as put forward in that thesis. And I would like to give you the opportunity to respond to some of these criticisms that it is our domestic policies that are problematic overseas.

Ms. HUGHES. Well, Congressman, I think I certainly have a big challenge to talk about in our foreign policy so I am not sure I want to add domestic policies as well, although I think your points are very interesting ones and I certainly feel that our economy is strong and growing, that our policies have been a big factor in that success.

The situation in France is a very difficult one and we have seen, obviously, difficult situations, similar situations in our own country. We stand with the people and the Government of France as they work to restore order and to try to put an end to the violence, which is, I know what we all want, and as they seek to address some of the concerns that have apparently prompted it.

Mr. ROYCE. Let me also say that I would like to point out that Tom Dine, who served at Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, very capably for many, many years, just stepped down and I know that this Committee, Under Secretary Hughes, wishes him well and I certainly hope to see a capable and professional successor for him. The radios are a key tool and he understood that well.

I would like to raise a point because we had a hearing before the Subcommittee on Terrorism, which I chaired, and one of the witnesses spoke of what he called the emergence of a virtual Caliphate on the Internet. And this has been the basis of concern given that this broadens the reach of al-Qaeda and similar terrorist organizations, but it also broadens the reach of just propaganda in general, a relentless source of propaganda that gives only one viewpoint, and I wanted to ask how we can combat this battle on the Internet. I am very interested in your views on that.

Ms. HUGHES. Well, it is a huge battle and you are right, it is a relentless barrage of propaganda, of information, it is an important source of information but it also can be—we are faced with a situation where not only can terrorists communicate under the radar screen and very quickly and easily, but also they can spread lies and misinformation the same way, and it is difficult. I told someone it reminds me of the little childhood pop-up game where you knock one thing down and another one pops up.

So it is a big challenge. We do have an interagency working group that is looking at issues of the terrorists' use of the Internet and seeking to challenge that use. I believe one of the things we need to look at is providing good content, good information. One of the good things about the Internet is people who are able to get on the Internet and look can decide for themselves. They do have access.

One of the battles we are fighting in this war of ideas is against closed minds. We want to open minds. And I think the Internet can be a tool in helping open minds as well. It does allow a lot of access to information and education. We have been very successful in our International Information Programs Bureau at hosting Web sites and getting information into societies that have been closed in other ways. For example, we have a very successful Chinese-language Web site and although China sometimes attempts to block the information, we are finding that it gets out because people pick it up and post it on Chinese-language Web sites within China, so it can also be a source of fostering our democratic values, and I think we just need to be aggressive and creative and that is one of the reasons I have convened a technology group to work together. In fact, we are trying to make that one of the core missions of the IIP Bureau—to look at technology to become a mecca for technology for the government so that we can use it in positive ways to foster our values and principles and to confront some of the hate and the propaganda that it also allows to spread across the world.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Wexler of Florida.

Mr. WEXLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I could ask that we just focus on Indonesia for a moment, knowing that you visited there recently, and ask you as a result of your trip, what specific opportunities do you think that we may have? My impression, and

I am by no means an expert, but my impression is, in the context of Indonesia, we are faced with an opportunity of historic proportions, the largest Muslim country in the world, a democratically-elected President for the first time. I believe more people voted in the Indonesian elections for President than did our own. My impression of President Yudhoyono is that—and I don't want to exaggerate, but when I had the opportunity to sit with him and listen to him, I thought I was listening to an Indonesian Thomas Jefferson in terms of his vision for democracy in his country and undoubtedly he has all of the domestic problems that many leaders of countries have. But this is a leader that to me appeared to be somebody totally committed to democracy, a patriot of his country in the greatest sense, a democrat in the most important of ways, and somebody who has great respect for the United States of America and was a beneficiary or recipient of interaction in his younger years in American programs and yet—and this is not a criticism of the Administration in any way because I think the Congress is far behind the Administration in terms of an enlightened policy with Indonesia—and I am just curious as a result of your visit there and visiting Aceh, which when I visited there I think it was my proudest moment as an American to learn of the extraordinarily positive role the American military played after the tsunami. Knowing the goodwill that exists as a result of what America did after the tsunami, I respectfully ask you what plans you have to recommend to the President and to the State Department in the short term what we do with Indonesia.

And if I could just make a respectful observation in listening to how you respond on the issue of Iraq, and I say this as somebody who has a respectful but different view of current affairs there, my fear is, and I have no desire to engage in a debate at this point, but my fear is that so much of your good work will be undermined if so much of your focus is either by choice or by necessity having to continually argue the merits of American policy in Iraq to people who, whether we agree or disagree, largely the die has been cast, fundamentally disagree with our policy.

And what I have found, obviously not in your position of importance, but sometimes the best way to respond to people who fundamentally disagree with what we are doing in Iraq is to at least point out the fairness of the totality of American policy toward what they perceive as uniquely Muslim interests or people of the Muslim faith and how they have been harmed in historical events. What I have found is, if people are going to criticize us in Iraq, at least give us credit, us meaning the United States of America, for along with France helping to support the sovereignty of the people in Lebanon versus the Syrian occupation. If they are going to criticize the Iraq War II, at least give us credit for the Gulf War I. If they are going to criticize us for anti-Muslim policies in Iraq, if that is how they perceive it, then at least give us credit for being the only country to stand up against Milosevic essentially and lead the effort to hopefully benefit at that time and pursue the justice of Milosevic now. And we don't get credit for being really the singular voice for, outside of Europe, promoting Turkey's entry into the European Union.

And when they ask you or criticize you with respect to the Israeli/Palestinian conflict and America's too close association with Israel, I think it is fair to point out whether they agree or disagree, what has their country done to support the Palestinian people? And too often the most affluent of Muslim nations have done little or nothing to support the Palestinian people and you rightfully point out the President, to his credit, from the Rose Garden announced that it was the policy of the United States to support a state for the Palestinian people. I have mixed my messages and that is probably the worst thing people can do from this point, and I apologize for that.

Ms. HUGHES. Well, I think those are great points and I will—I think that is a very important point that we frequently fail—we tend to get the finger of blame when someone disagrees, but fail—good news does not ever travel as fast as bad news and we fail to get credit for a lot of the very good things we have done on behalf of Muslims and Arabs and on behalf of the Palestinians and others, and so I think that is a very good point and I will be mindful of that and try to make that case.

On Indonesia I agree with you, we discussed it before I traveled and my trip only reinforced my belief that Indonesia is at a time of incredible opportunity for our partnership with them. We have a very good Ambassador there who is committed to making a difference. You are right about their election. I joked when I was there that it is not often a Texan goes someplace—and being from Texas we are used to things being big—and realizes Indonesia is three times as big as my home State of Texas. And they had the largest single election day in the history of the world when they had that huge turnout for the Presidential election.

It is a very important country, and I do agree that—I want to tell you about a couple of interesting things that I did there. I went to an event, I think the Embassy was, frankly, a little worried about it, but I had read an article about a young rock band there that one of their songs—the lead singer is a young man named Donnie—and one of his songs talks about Islam being a religion of peace, not a religion of terror, and it seemed to me that that directly reinforced the message that we want people around the world to hear and to concur with. And so through a member of my staff we reached out to the Embassy, and they said Karen wants to meet with this rock star. They were a little surprised, I think, but we had this wonderful neighborhood event in this neighborhood community, where the volunteers have come together and reclaimed this low-income neighborhood from gangs. These young boys who played in a neighborhood band, probably 10 or 12 years old—when Donnie showed up it was interesting—the moderator asked if they knew who the President was—some of them did—but they all knew who this Donnie was. And he sang with them as they played their instruments, and it was just a wonderful event and a reminder that we need to be innovative as we look at America's public diplomacy. If there are voices that appeal to young people like this rock band that share our basic message, that we need to reach out to those voices, and so that was a wonderful event.

And in Aceh I was, as you said, very, very proud of our country. I am also very encouraged that the effects will be long-term, not

just short-term, because I met with some young people, a group of about 12 young students who are going to be coming to the United States on Fulbright Scholarships that were made possible by President Bush's and President Clinton's private sector fundraising efforts, and this one young man told me that he is going to come to America to a school because the two Presidents arranged it for their home States, and he is going to come to Texas and study English, and he is doing that as a tribute to the university professor who taught him English who was killed in the tsunami. And he is going to come here, get his Master's in English, go back to Indonesia and teach English in that same school.

I think that is a wonderful investment in human capital that will pay off over the long term that we are making in Indonesia. So I agree with you that it is a moment of great opportunity and that is the message that I brought back to our Administration.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me associate myself with remarks of Mr. Wexler and congratulate him for his activism on this Committee. He is playing a very significant and positive role and I know that is not going to make him popular with the other Members of this Committee on that side of the aisle, but I find him to be a very positive force and he has chosen to be active about Indonesia, which is what we should do as Members, find where we can play a positive role and be active in that area, and I have certainly listened to his recommendations myself and congratulate him for the points he made today and associate myself with them.

I would like to be—actually, one of my strongest campaign slogans when I ran the very first time was, vote for Dana, at least he is not a lawyer, and what I am is actually a wordsmith. I was a writer by profession before I became involved in this congressional situation. I would just like to mention one word being bandied around here, and that is there is a mistaken impression that insurgency and terrorism are the same thing, and attacks on non-combatants is terrorism or people who achieve those goals, no matter who is committing that act, and that terrorism is always wrong and we should condemn that. Insurgency, however, is not necessarily wrong. When people attack troops, even if it is our troops, insurgency is not terrorism. Insurgency is wrong when people attack our troops in Iraq because the people using insurgency in that regard are trying to install an Islamo-Fascist or some other dictatorship in Iraq. That is why it is wrong for those people to attack our people in an insurgency-type operation. It is always wrong for people in Iraq, those people who are attacking civilians in Iraq, to do so because that is terrorism. I think that we need to look at our words when we are talking about that and, being in communication, I thought you would appreciate that observation.

We defeated communism, it was a great threat to our way of life, to the Western world. We relegated it to the ash heap of history, as Ronald Reagan said, through military might. We needed that, but basically what won the Cold War was a battle of ideas. We never had that all-out fight with communism, thank goodness, because we won the war of ideas. The war against radical Islam will be the same and hopefully we will not have an all-out war any-

where with Muslim people. We shouldn't because Muslim people by and large reject radical Islam in the same way that people who lived under communism rejected communism, and it was our ability to reach out to them which saved the world from a conflagration that would have been so destructive it is beyond imagination.

So your job is incredibly pivotal in reaching out to those people who live in Islamic societies. In reaching out to those people, I would agree that positive values, treating people humanely, women being treated equally, and democracy and honest government are good objectives that we can share with them.

I think that in this battle I would like to disagree with one of my colleagues who mentioned you to be cautious about fatwas and using fatwas on our side. Fatwas are a method of—systematic method of—analyzing things for Muslim people that helps them guide and determine what is right and wrong. And to the degree that Muslims are issuing fatwas that are on our side, we should be working with those Muslims that see the moral imperative of having a good relationship with the West and in fact share our values for democracy and treating people decently.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put for the record one of these fatwas, which is a comment by the Free Muslims Against Terrorism, which was issued after the Spanish act of terrorism. I would like to put that into the record at this point.

Chairman HYDE. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

<http://www.freemuslims.org/news/article.php?article=524>

The Islamic commission of Spain issues a fatwa condemning terrorism and the Al Qaida group.

June 4, 2005
Nacional- 10/03/2005 Islamic Commission of Spain

In the name of God, the almighty and merciful.

Fatwa against Osama ben Laden, Al Qaida and many that pretend to justify terrorism based on the sacred Koran or the beliefs of the prophet Muhammad, may God save them.

On the 1st anniversary of the terrorist attacks on the 11-M in Madrid, the Islamic Commission of Spain has approved a fatwa (legal religious opinion) in which it declares its strong condemnation of terrorism and emphasizes the impossibility, from an Islamic point of view, that any type or demonstration of terrorism can be justified. God willing, the fatwa will serve as a foundation for the next antiterrorist conference held, God willing, next autumn in Madrid.

Doctrinal foundation

In the Koran, the Book revealed as a guide to humanity, God orders the Muslims to acquire excellence in ethical and moral behavior. Islamic morals are based on values such as: peace, tolerance, mercy and compassion.

The Koran reminds Muslims that they are accountable to God for all their behavior and the way they treat other people, either Muslims or non-Muslims.

In this sense, the Muslim is obligated to seek good for himself, his family, the people around him, and society in general.

"Do good to others as God has done good to you; and do not seek to sow corruption in the land, for certain, God does not love those who sow corruption'. (28:77).

The term 'corruption' includes any form of anarchy and terrorism that undermines peace and security.

The Muslim, therefore, not only cannot commit crimes against innocent people but is also responsible before God to stop those people that have the intention to do it, since they 'sow corruption in the land.'

As one speaks about the treatment toward non-Muslims, so says in the aleya (passage?) 60:8:

"As for those that do not combat you because of their religion and do not expel you from your homes, you are not prohibited to treat the greater deference (birr) or justice, for certainly God loves the just."

The concept of "birr" in this aleya (passage?) refers to the manner in which someone should treat parents and relatives. Likewise, it comes enclosed in the two principle collections of hadices (Bujari and Muslim) that the Prophet said:

"By God, one is not a true believer whose neighbors fear him for his malice."

The prophet encouraged the believers to be kind even with the animals, and prohibited doing them harm or overworking them. A hadiz indicates that the Prophet said about a man who gave water to a thirsty dog, that all his sins were forgiven just for that action.

It was asked then:

"Oh Messenger of God, shall we be rewarded for our kindness toward animals?" The prophet responded: "There is a reward for the kindness toward any animal or any human being." (Sahih Muslim, 2244, y Sahih Al-Bujari, 2466).

The Koran does not urge Muslims to return evil with evil; on the contrary, it calls the believers to respond to evil with good deeds.

"But, as good and evil cannot go together, repel evil with something better. Therefore if enmity exists between you and somebody else, he shall become a true friend." (41:34).

In the Koran, God also indicates that the Garden (Paradise) has been prepared for those that spend time in His Cause, in times of prosperity and times of famine, restraining their anger and forgiving others, because God loves those who do good (3:135).

"To those that persevere in doing good, the supreme good awaits them. Their faces will not be darkened by the darkness or humiliation (in judgment day). They are the ones destined for paradise, where they will live for eternity." (10:26).

"Remember that in an attempt to be compensated for something bad, it can become bad at the same time. Therefore, whoever forgives his enemy and makes peace with him, will receive a reward from God, as certainly he does not love the wicked." (42:40).

The loathing of God towards murder is manifest in the aleyas (passages?) that speak of Abel in the Surah de La Mesa Servida (statement unclear- de La Mesa Servida means from the served table).

"And Cain said: Be sure that I'll kill you!" (5:27). Abel responded: "Even if you raise your hand to kill me, I won't raise my hand to kill you: in truth, I fear God, the sustainer of the entire world."

After the murder of Abel, God says:

"We decree to the sons of Israel that whoever kills a human being, not being for punishment of murder or for sowing corruption in the land, will be as if to kill all humanity; and whoever saves a life will be as if to save all humanity."

One might point out that the reference to the children of Israel does not affect the universal validity of the message.

The Prophet also remembered that the murder was the second of the great sins than can be committed (Sahih Al-Bujari: 6871, and Sahih Muslim: 88), and said that on Judgment Day the first cases that have to be heard will be those that have to do with bloodshed (Sahih Muslim: 1678, and Sahih Al-Bujari: 6533).

The proper concept of war that is established in the Koran has an exclusively defensive nuance:

"And fight for the cause of God against those that fight you, but do not commit aggressions, for certainly God does not love aggressors." (2:190).

As Muhammad Asad says in his tafsir (interpretation of the Koran): 'the majority of commentators are in agreement that the expression 'the taatadu' means, in this context, "do not commit aggressions." The defensive character in combat 'for God's cause' - that is to say, because of the ethical principles ordered by God- is evident by the reference to 'those that combat you'.... and it is clarified still in aleya (passage?) 22:39: "For them it is permitted (to fight) that have been unjustly attacked" is, according to all the traditions of which we have the first (and therefore the fundamental one) Koranical reference to the question jihad."

Within the context of defensive warfare, the Prophet imposed strict limits destined to safeguard lives and property. Thus, the Prophet Muhammad prohibited killing, in case of warlike conflict, women and children and civilians in general (Sahih Muslim: 1744, and Sahih Al-Bujari: 3015).

Also he said that a person who killed a person whom had a contract or an agreement with the Muslims would not smell the fragrance of the Paradise (Sahih Al-Bujari: 3166, and Ibn Mayah: 2686).

In light of these and other Islamic texts, the terrorist acts of Osama ben Laden and his organization, Al Qaeda, that look to fill the hearts of defenseless people with fear, that entail the destruction of buildings or properties, that entail the death of civilians, like women and children, or other similar things, they are prohibited and they are the subject of a full sentence within Islam.

Therefore, the accomplishment of terrorist acts under the pretext of 'defending the oppressed nations of the world or the rights of Muslims' has no justification in Islam.

There is no doubt that the Muslims have a legitimate right to react to an aggression or a situation of oppression. Nevertheless, such reaction does not have to give rise to a blind or irrational hatred:

"Do not let your hatred towards those which prevent access to the Inviolable House of Adoration (that is to say, the accomplishment of the religious obligations) lead you to transgress (the limits), but on the contrary, you collaborate in fomenting the virtue and the conscience of God, and you do not collaborate in the foment of badness and animosity" (5:2).

Also, the Koran indicates, in reference to which they hypocritically say to follow the Bible, that whenever they ignite the fire of war, God extinguishes it (5:64). God also condemns those nations that violate international treaties and initiate the wars (8:56) and requests that they are reunited by all means possible to defeat them (8:60), but if they incline to peace, the Muslims will have to also do it (8:61).

By it all, it is necessary to show that terrorism and the extremism contradict proper human nature and the lessons of Islam.

Muslims must know that terrorism is a threat against Islam and damages our religion and the Muslims. Correct Islamic training in the madrasas and Islamic universities will allow all to understand that Islam is a peaceful religion, and renounces all acts of terrorism and indiscriminate death.

The presence of signs like arrogance, fanaticism, extremism or religious intolerance in a person or group shows that these have broken away with Islam and the tradition of Muhammad the Prophet.

The commission of terrorist acts supposes a rupture of such magnitude with Islamic lessons

that allows affirming that the people or groups who have made them have stopped being Muslim and have located themselves outside the sphere of Islam. Such groups distort and manipulate basic Islamic concepts, such as the one of jihad, putting under them their particular interpretation and criterion.

These groups that use names and languages relative to Islam, discredit, in fact, with their performance, the image of Islam and serve the interests of their enemies. Their performance urges Islamophobia in the countries in which Muslims are a minority, and destroy the relations of cooperation between non-Muslims and Muslims. Their actions provide a false image of Islam that is indeed the one that the enemies of Islam try to offer to the world.

These extremist groups cause death indiscriminately, including the death of other Muslims. We have to remember here that the Prophet expressed that a Muslim that kills another Muslim becomes a kafir (unbeliever). In this same thought, if one Muslim or a group of Muslims commit an act of terrorism, this group is violating the laws of Islam, and is abandoning God's guidance and the path of Din.

"God does not give his guidance to those that deliberately do wrong" (9:109).

For this, it's necessary to declare:

1. That Islam rejects terrorism in all its forms, whether it's the death of innocents or damage to their property.
2. That Islam is the main victim of terrorist acts performed by some groups that falsely call themselves "Islamic", as such attempts not only cost the lives of many Muslims, but also damage the image of Islam, cause growth in anti-Islamic sentiment, and serve the interests of their enemies.
3. That these groups try to cover their acts by false interpretations of the holy writings, in the effort to gain support of Muslims or gain new converts. This fraud needs to be strongly denounced by the educated and Islamic leaders worldwide.
4. That those that commit terrorist acts violate the basic teachings of the Koran, and become apostate, abandoning Islam.
5. That it is the duty of every Muslim to fight against terrorism, in unison, with the mandate by the Koran that establishes that corruption should not spread in the world.

That according to the Sharia, all that declare that it is permissible to do the things that God has declared should not be done, such as the slaying of innocent people in terrorist acts, becomes Kafir Murtadd Mustahlil, or an apostate, for having declared that the killing of innocents is permitted under Islam, crimes which the prophet and the Koran expressly prohibit.

In that Osama Bin Laden and his organization defend the legality of terrorism, saying that it is based on the teachings of the Koran, they are committing a crime and have become apostate, which should not be considered Muslims, or treated as such.

We also declare that Osama Bin Laden and his organization, Al Qaida, who are responsible for horrific crimes against the innocent people that were murdered during the terrorist acts of Mar 11 in Madrid, are outside the parameters of Islam, as are all who proclaim the Koran and the teachings of the Prophet as basis for such terrorist acts.

In addition, we declare that the political vindication attempts of Osama bin Laden and his

organization over the recovery of Al Andalus public actions, and therefore notorious and known by all, totally contradict the divine will that has been clearly expressed throughout history, in that God is the Master of History and everything that happens, has happened or will happen, it is design and divine favor and must always be considered in any event by those Muslims for whom God is the giver of goods and the greatest of the conspirators, not having the creature capacity to judge nor question that which divine will has decreed.

The tragedy of Al Andalus, the genocide of Muslims and their expulsion from Spain, their homeland, is an act that God will himself judge, and it is the duty of the created to accept His divine will and be thankful. In reference to the breach of the Santa Fe Capitulations signed by Catholic Kings and the King of the Islamic Kingdom of Granada, we declare that with the signing of the Cooperation Agreements of 1992 between the Spanish State and the legal representatives of the Spanish Muslims, known as the Islamic Commission of Spain, can be given final vindication, legal or political, in so much as the Agreement recognizes in its introduction that "Islam is part the identity of Spain." This recognition, together with the stipulated Agreements, definitively settles the question from the legal or political point of view.

The Cooperation Agreement of 1992 is the new framework that we have given the Spanish State and the Spanish Muslims to reunite us. The Agreement represents the explicit will of the Spanish Muslims and no unknown person in this community, calling himself Bin Laden or calling themselves Al Qaida, or anyone else, has the right to interfere in the internal issues of our Islamic community.

In line with this fatwa, we requested to the national government and the Spanish media, to stop using the word Islam or Islamic to identify these wrongdoers, as they are not Muslim nor have any relation to our Umma or Islamic Community, they must be called Al Qaida terrorists or something similar, but without using adjective Islamic, which, as has been stated above, is not appropriate.

Also, we asked the people in charge of the media to lend credence to what is stated here and that from now on, with the criterion expressed above, not to tie Islam or Muslims with any type of terrorist act and especially if it comes disguised with Islamic claims or language.

Mansur Escudero Bedate
Secretary General of the Islamic Commission of Spain
Cordova, 11 March 2005

This is a free service of webislam.com

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And with that said, I would like to end this with—and also when we work on trying to influence those people in the Muslim world, my admonition to you is that we go to their language and we start using words in their perspective that reflect to them. We shouldn't be calling the radical Islam's war on the West their holy war, we should be calling it an unholy war, and there are words in their language that would suggest that, and instead of calling people martyrs, we should be calling them people who are misguided and people who are being manipulated by radicals, et cetera, and challenging the idea in their language whether or not someone who murders innocent people is going to go to Paradise.

This is the type of intellectual argument that we need to conduct, and I would just suggest to you, as I mentioned in my opening statement, I wish you good luck in those efforts. Thank you.

Chairman HYDE. The gentlelady from California, Ms. Lee.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for your forthrightness; it is good to see you here and you do have quite a challenging job. A couple of things I would like to say, again with all due respect, first of all, I was always taught, like you were and all of us were, that honesty is really the best policy. When we say that we are not occupying Iraq and when we go through an effort to revise history, and quite frankly it almost sounds like this is what is taking place now, that the rest of the world is not going to listen or embrace our public diplomacy effort because they know that we are not being honest. We went to war and we misled this country and the world, saying there were weapons of mass destruction. We knew then, like the world knows now, and our country, that that was not the case, that we invaded, we occupied and, yes, I am very delighted that the elections came out the way that they came out and applaud the Iraqi people. But over 2,000 of our young men and women have died, countless Iraqi civilians, and we need to talk about how in the world in a very honest way we can communicate many of the facts of this without being seen as being disingenuous because when we are seen that way we lose.

Secondly, the 9–11 Commission, like many investigative bodies, proved, demonstrated, documented that there was no connection between al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. Now Iraq is a hotbed for terrorists and the world knows that and our country is less safe as a result. How do we—in your job it has got to be very difficult. How do you deny that or confirm that? We know that Iraq was not the War on Terror and the world knows that.

Finally, let me just say with regard to the Sudan, this country declared genocide as being the stated policy and we all are very committed to ending the genocide, the countless deaths of those civilians. On the other hand we are beginning to cozy up to the Sudanese Government, allowing them to have a lobbyist, engaging in discussions with them. On one hand genocide is taking place as our policy, but on the other hand we are doing just the opposite to undercut what could be the beginning of the end of the genocide taking place. And so I don't see how in the world you can do your job when on one hand we say we disagree with torture, yet on the

other hand we have Administration officials saying, well, we don't support efforts to say as our policy torture is wrong.

So how do you deal with those contradictions and the appearances of our country being very disingenuous in many of the efforts that we are undertaking?

Ms. HUGHES. Well, with all due respect, I do agree that honesty is our best policy and I just have to respectfully disagree. I think it is very important that all of us guard our words, and I object strongly to your use of the word "misled" because based on everything I know, and I was involved in some of this—I had left the White House but I was still actively engaged—based on everything I know, and based on all the bipartisan commissions which have looked at the evidence and the intelligence, the President and his Administration based their decisions on the facts and the best intelligence that they had available to them at the time, just as Members of this Body, both Democrats and Republicans, based their decisions on the best evidence and information they had available to them at the time in authorizing the use of force in Iraq. And I think it is very important that the world not hear words like "misled" when in fact the bipartisan Robb-Silverman investigation found there was no misuse of intelligence, that some of the intelligence was in fact wrong, but that the Administration used the facts and the intelligence that it had available to them at the time.

I will also point out that September 11th occurred before the United States of America went into Iraq, and so the threat of terror in this world, the growing threat of al-Qaeda and terror and operatives around the world, the camps in Afghanistan that have trained thousands of terrorists, all existed before the United States made a decision in our own national security interest to go into Iraq.

Chairman HYDE. Mr. Weller. Not here.

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you. Just to follow up on what Ambassador Hughes was talking about, the precooked intelligence and whether we manufactured the evidence, we just had a very interesting and a very helpful discussion in this very Committee just a few hours ago on this very issue, and I think that the evidence is very strong and the Chairman was so eloquent in quoting all of the reports and all of the investigations that had gone into this theory about precooked conditions, and he read off not only the number of investigations but the number of statements made by Democrats alike and previous Administrations about Saddam Hussein's capabilities. And so there was no misinformation, there was no distortion of the truth, and the investigations speak very loudly for themselves.

But I wanted to ask you, Madam Ambassador, about the failure of states such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt and Lebanon to take terrorist broadcast stations such as Hezbollah, Al-Manar, off the air, and are they not in violation of UN Security Council Resolution 1624, which just recently passed, and it calls on all states to cooperate in addressing terrorism and specifically called for countries to prohibit by law incitement to violence and terrorist acts, and are we as part of our public diplomacy strategy highlighting this re-

cently passed Security Council resolution and requiring its full compliance?

And also, my last question is about public diplomacy and if there are different objectives that we are pursuing in the Muslim world versus the non-Muslim world, and if so, do you in your capacity intend to develop strategies that are directly tied to those areas and to those parts of the world, different strategies, different tactics, different programs tailored to the Muslim world so that—I agree with you—we have a good story to tell? What is shameful about helping the Iraqi people get to free elections, an incredible achievement, write a Constitution, incredible steps that they have undertaken in just a little bit of time and what has happened in Afghanistan, we have nothing to apologize for.

My stepson serves as a Marine officer in Iraq. He flies F-18's. He understands his mission, he wants the support of the U.S. community, but also of the international community to understand what the mission of our brave men and women in uniform is throughout the world. And I wanted to know about the regional and counter specific strategies for the Muslim world.

Thank you, Madam Ambassador.

Ms. HUGHES. Thank you so much. You inquired about Al-Manar. It was placed on the terrorism exclusion list in December 2004 and it is a very high priority for us and we have been working it very aggressively. In fact, through our work in diplomatic channels we have managed to have it removed from seven satellite providers in Europe, Asia and Latin America. Now it continues to be broadcast on ArabSat and NileSat, and that is something that I brought up at the most senior levels with leaders in Egypt and Saudi Arabia during my visit there. All of us will continue to work on this issue because we believe it is very important, and as I said, it has been designated and we are looking for additional things that we can do, and it remains a top priority.

In terms of strategies for the Muslim world and the broader world, a few points. First of all, as you well know, the Muslim world is not monolithic—it is very different in very different places. One of the benefits of the State Department's structure is that we are able to take a menu of best practices and things that work well, share ideas, and then the Embassy and the public diplomacy and public affairs staff within each Embassy are able to tailor those for specific countries, and often it is very different.

For example, I was recently at a Chiefs of Mission conference and we were talking about whether working with the diasporas would be effective. One country said that would be terrific, another said no, they would resent it. So it is very different, as you well know, in different places.

What I am trying to do is come up with broad strategies on big issues that affect everyone. Obviously there are big issues of policy that everyone in the world is going to look at. There are incidents that happen that we need to rapidly respond to and they affect the entire world. Then there are some that are country specific or region specific and so we are trying to work on those at all levels.

This is one of the things we really want to foster. We had a discussion at our last Chiefs of Mission conference among the people in different countries that have large Muslim populations, about

what is effective in reaching out to clerics and teachers, what kind of exchange programs might be best, what is successful in terms of identifying and empowering mainstream voices of Islam—in order to share those ideas while having the flexibility to let each country team work on the programs that make most sense for that country, and that is exactly what we will try to do.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you again for your service. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. You are welcome. Mr. Ackerman.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you very much. The Chairman was indeed very eloquent at our meeting yesterday and I am sure there would have been many Democrats who would have also possibly been not as eloquent, but eloquent, had they had the opportunity to speak and had the debate not been surreptitiously ended by a Party-line vote by the majority.

I want to talk to the—first, I want to thank you for bringing up NileSat and ArabSat, and thank you for responding to the letter that we wrote to you, but the fact remains that they are still on the exclusion list and not yet on the terrorist list, and I just want to ask you to encourage the Secretary in her consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury to put them on that list. They are a poisonous organization.

My question: People in countries such as within the Middle East are very smart; people in the street, they are smart. They have lived under some pretty difficult dictatorships in many instances and they know the difference between policy and policy. They know the difference when their government tells them and tells the world what the policy is and then actually what they actually do and what they actually carry out. The question really is one of marketing and how we sell the United States, as is your responsibility to help out with, how we sell that responsibility to different places within the world. We can have the President and we can have General Pace stating that the policy of torture is unacceptable, so that is the policy. The policy is unacceptable. But what is the policy, what is the policy that the people in the street see, people who are not necessarily wordsmiths but people who live under those policies and see what is actually going on? Stating that it is unacceptable and stopping it are two different policies. One is just words and one is actual deeds.

Where do we go when there are reports about the United States engaging in torture that are rampant throughout the world and here in our own press, when there are reports just this week of secret detention facilities run by the U.S. all over the globe, where the Vice President of this great Nation is lobbying the Senate to get a special exemption to allow the CIA to officially torture detainees. Don't these things all contribute to the hobbling of the effort and the mission upon which you have embarked?

Ms. HUGHES. A couple of things, Congressman. First of all, you refer to a newspaper report about a matter that, under the law, I am not allowed as a government official to discuss, whether or not it exists or, if not, I am just not allowed to discuss that issue as a matter of our law and my responsibilities—

Mr. ACKERMAN. Understood.

Ms. HUGHES. The detainee issue more broadly is a challenge. It is a public diplomacy challenge and a policy challenge, and it is a challenge that we have wrestled with because, as I discussed earlier, it is very difficult. We have never been faced before with dealing with a group of people who have been on the battlefield trying to kill our soldiers or who are terrorists committed to trying to kill as many innocent Americans as they possibly can, and yet don't wear the uniform of any country, don't honor any international treaty, don't respect any rule of law. And so this is a difficult challenge, and I think one of the things that has not been given much attention in this debate is, what about our men and women in uniform who are over there in Iraq?

I read every morning the list of the names of those who have given their lives and say a prayer for their families, and as I read those names I think about the fact that they have captured these detainees once and should they ever have to face them twice, which is possible once we have captured these detainees on the battlefield, our military has worked very hard to treat them fairly.

Congressman Wexler, I thought, made a great point earlier when he talked about, let's look at the other side of things, let's look at the ways that others treat us, let's contrast that to the way we treat our detainees humanely. Those in Guantanamo are given culturally appropriate meals, they are allowed the opportunity to worship, they are given the Koran, they are given medical care and treatment. Let us contrast that with the way our enemies treat their prisoners. They have beheaded them, and I am sorry if that sounds blunt, but those are the facts. There is no justice, no rule of law, no compliance with any international standards. Our policy again, I can't state it—

Mr. ACKERMAN. We are not arguing that and you are absolutely right and Mr. Wexler was certainly well acclaimed here by both sides of the aisle in making those points and he was absolutely right and Mr. Rohrabacher was right and others. There is no disagreement there. But the image of the United States is based on not just myth but when a myth and the facts that aren't true are underscored by abnormalities such as Abu Ghraib and other things that happen, that magnifies it and gives credence to the belief out on the street, and these things, without going into any security areas, which I appreciate that you can't comment on, there are people within the Administration who are asking that torture be allowed. I mean this lends credence to all of that, whether it is true or not. We don't have to get into that. But it certainly lends credence and gives that a tremendous amount of gravitas so people have something to hold on to and say, you see that, the United States is indeed the bad country that we say. That hurts the effort that we are all engaged in and which you are spearheading.

Ms. HUGHES. This is, as I said, a challenging issue for both public diplomacy and for policy. I will point out that again, in the case of Abu Ghraib and the case of other horrific instances, that it was an American soldier who reported that, and that people have been held accountable.

We are not perfect, but our democracy is accountable and officials have to come before Members of Congress and answer questions about our policies. We debate them, the public finds out about

them, they are covered extensively in the news media, and, I think, the world. Again in the case of some of the horrible abuses such as those at Abu Ghraib, we saw a lot more about the crime than we did about the punishment and it is important for people to know that those engaged in those crimes were punished and brought to justice.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you. Mr. McCaul.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Madam Secretary, thank you for being here; it is nice to see a fellow Texan. Congratulations on your new position. I can't think of anybody better suited, better qualified for what you are doing right now. I know you have many challenges.

Personally, I think we have made great progress in this War on Terror, and I think it is important we stay the course. The challenges are broad. This War on Terror, in my view, is going to be a long-term struggle. I think your position is perhaps the most important position in the Administration because to ultimately win this War on Terror we need to win the war of ideology.

We saw in 1979 an extremist movement take place in Iran and in Afghanistan that haunts us today. The Wahhabism in Saudi Arabia, this idea that jihad is an acceptable practice. I was recently in Jordan on a homeland security congressional delegation and we actually stayed in the Four Seasons Hotel which was bombed, as you know, yesterday. We met with the King, he said there are good Muslims and there are bad Muslims, and our approach is to get the bad Muslims. But he had another idea that I wanted to share and get your comments on. I think it goes to winning this sort of public relations challenge, if you will.

He said that he met with the top 12 Imams in the region. As you know, bin Laden is not a true cleric, but he issues fatwas. They have the force and effect of law to his followers. But a lot disagree with what he is saying. In my view, to get the religious community, the clerics who don't believe that violence is an acceptable practice on board issuing their fatwas, denouncing the violence would be a really effective way to challenge that. He, I think, offered a little bit of hope. He said he got the top 12 Imams and issued fatwas denouncing the violence in the region.

He even talked about the idea of sort of a summit comparable to a G-8 type conference to get the religious clerics together and to show the region that this is not the true religion of Mohammed, that this is a perversion, and this is not acceptable.

So, having said that, I am sure this is not new to you, but I wanted to get your comments on that.

Ms. HUGHES. Congressman, I agree it is very important, and King Abdullah has been a leader in this effort. I see one of my most important jobs as helping to amplify those voices of mainstream Muslims and Muslim clerics who speak out and say that the murder of innocents is not condoned by Islam.

We are beginning to see progress on this. I concur. I shared earlier with the Committee that in the immediate aftermath of September 11, it was very difficult to find voices to state that. After the London bombings, more and more people began to speak up. I noted recently that the Ulama in Morocco—I saw a news report—

that it had issued a statement in response to the kidnapping of two Moroccans in Iraq that was a very strong statement that quoted the Koran, condemned this action, said that al-Qaeda had claimed to have tried and sentenced these Moroccans, and issued a very strong statement calling them “apostates” and saying that Islam did not allow anything like this type of activity.

So we are beginning to see voices speak up. I think it is very important. One of the things that I can do is to help foster those and communicate those and amplify those when voices speak up in the Muslim community.

Mr. MCCAUL. We also visited Egypt and Morocco and Israel. But I think, in my view, this is a vocal minority. I think the mainstream Muslim community denounced this. So I think we have them on our side. If we can channel that in the right direction, I think we will be successful.

Thank you so much for being here.

Chairman HYDE. Last, but not least, Mr. Payne of New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know we were supposed to be out of here at 1:30. I really commend you for not cutting me off because you know my normal trend of thought, and it would have been just if you had cut me off. So I appreciate your allowing me to say what I have to say. You are a real gentleman.

First of all, I would just like to mention, as you disagreed with the gentlewoman from California where you said that the Administration did not mislead the American people, I know that you had a very strong group, the WHIG (White House Iraq Group), made up of the best minds in the Administration, and they came up with the fact that it was time to have a preemptive strike.

Now, we knew that Saddam Hussein—we had the no-fly zone. We had done away with all of their surface-to-air defense. He could not go in. He could not go out. Iraqis could not go in or out, but we had the inspectors there, Hans Blix and the inspectors, and at that time, as we know, Saddam Hussein had violated the resolution from the UN that said the inspectors should be able to go anywhere. He finally, knowing that he had no weapons of mass destruction and had no biological and chemical weapons, then said, okay, Hans Blix, the inspectors, you can go wherever you want to go.

However, the Administration ordered the inspectors out. Time was up. And you also said in your comment, in your testimony, that no one likes war. There is no question about that.

However, I wonder why there was the rush to war when we had options. Because once you get into war, it is hard to get out of war. We are seeing that. We hear estimates, if we are really going to stay until the job is done, a decade at minimum. Over 2,000 United States troops gone; 50,000 Iraqis dead. They say they are better off without Saddam. Of course, 30,000 to 50,000 of them are dead. They are not better off.

But the whole question of the preemptive strike, the rush to war, when we had an option. I was one who said we should go into Afghanistan, take all of the forces that we have. Al-Qaeda, Osama bin Laden went on television and said, I went into the World Trade Center. A third of the victims were from New Jersey, many from

my District, they go through from Newark to New York on that path, and they were people I knew, friends of mine. I said, we should go and get the al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, and if we have to take 500,000 United States troops to go through every mountain in Afghanistan, let's go and get Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, who attacked our country.

Did we do that? No. We went into Iraq. Well, he is a bad leader. There is no question about that. But I think if we would have eliminated Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, there would not have been the new, even probably more dangerous, al-Qaeda wing that is in Iraq now, and there was absolutely no al-Qaeda or extremists in Iraq other than Saddam, because he didn't want competition, and now it is the place where everybody goes to get trained. Are we better off? I don't think so.

The question about rushing to war and going into the other place when we could have and should have gotten the perpetrators who rained death and destruction—one of my constituents was a flight attendant. I still visit her children. She switched with a friend. The plane left Newark. She is dead. Her family is disrupted. So it is very personal to a lot of us.

For us to have pulled out the UN inspectors to say that time is up really bothered me tremendously, because of the situation we are currently in.

I just want to say briefly, too, that I think your job—and I do commend you for your ability. I have looked at your resume, and you come highly qualified, so they really have, I guess, the best person the Administration could have at this time, and that is a real compliment to your ability. But how do we have Article 98 where we take friends like Barbados, who loves America, and say, unless you sign this bilateral Article 98 that says that the International Criminal Court may never—you will have a bilateral agreement that you will not cooperate with the International Criminal Court, people like Barbados and Bolivia, Costa Rica, where our retirees go, they have been cut off from assistance from the United States because we are twisting their arm, and they are saying, I don't want to sign Article 98.

How are we influencing people and making friends when we are telling them, if you don't sign this, we are cutting off military cooperation, and then we are going to really cut off other assistance?

Kenya is the only country in the world where the United States military can fly in without even informing, just a call we are coming in. It was very important in the Somali situation. As a matter of fact, even then they didn't have to ask.

Chairman HYDE. Would the gentleman permit the witness to answer?

Mr. PAYNE. Let me just say that Kenya, the only country in the world that has this agreement with the United States that any of our aircraft can fly there, has now been cut off from military assistance or cooperation or friendship because they say that we don't believe Article 98 is wrong, so I guess my question is that behavior like this, how are we going to—these are our friends. How are we going to keep our friends and try to influence our enemies that we are all right when we have policies that are just so counter-productive? I don't even want to get into the—because my time is

up—into the camps and all those other things, the Geneva Convention.

I just wonder, it seems to me to be an oxymoron.

Ms. HUGHES. Well, thank you very much, Congressman. We do work on a multilateral and bilateral and strong basis with our friends and allies across the world. That does not always mean that we agree on proposals of international treaties, that those are always in our best interests, and the President has to look at them and make a determination as to whether a proposed treaty is or is not in our best interests, for example, of our servicemen and women who are serving across the world.

I will make every effort to reach out and work with you, and I look forward to working with you and Congresswoman Lee. I think we just have a basic disagreement about the situation in Iraq. I was in the White House after September 11. We had to look at the threats in the world, in the new light of September 11. When we did, the biggest threat was that terrorists who had obviously been arming and training and disbursing around the world for years would somehow be able to access weapons of mass destruction that we, at that time, thought that Saddam Hussein had, that all the intelligence at that time told us that he had, that we knew that he had used in the past.

I have to dispute the use of the word “rush.” We had been at this for more than a decade. Saddam had consistently refused to comply with his international obligations. Iraq was the only place in the world that was regularly shooting at our airplanes, trying to enforce the no-fly zones. We had tried the carrot of Oil-for-Food, the stick of sanctions, and so the feeling was very strong—and I remember sitting on the floor of the United Nations General Assembly. I remember also the time when the world said the President won’t go to the United Nations General Assembly. He is just going to go off on his own. He didn’t. He came to the Congress. He went to the United Nations General Assembly and got a unanimous resolution telling Saddam to comply or else. You know all that history. So we just have a disagreement.

I do believe that when we succeed in Iraq the people of Iraq will be better off, that the security of America will be better off and that we will have made progress toward greater peace in our world.

Chairman HYDE. Thank you very much.

I would just add parenthetically, I hope we never agree to the International Criminal Court. How can we send our soldiers overseas on a mission and tell them they are not protected by our Constitution; they are not entitled to due process or equal protection? That is an American thing. If they are subject to this international court, you deprive them of those protections. So I am not ready to do that.

In any event, you have persisted in yeoman-like fashion. You came in here with a great reputation, and you leave with it twice followed enhanced. Thank you very much.

The Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:45 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

RESPONSES FROM THE HONORABLE KAREN P. HUGHES, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AND VICE CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Question:

Have you considered visiting Muslim community leaders in Europe?

Response:

I have made it a priority to engage Muslim community leaders, both in the United States and around the world. During my first few weeks at the State Department, I met with a number of American Muslim community leaders. I also attended the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA) conference in Chicago in September, where I met with several prominent British Muslims. They echoed your views on the energy and diversity of European Muslim communities, and the role responsible Muslim leaders can play in fostering a sense of common values between the West and predominantly Muslim countries. We seek to empower those who speak out against terror and champion the cause of religious freedom and toleration. I have made it a priority during my travels to reach out to such diverse voices. For example, I met with Muslim leaders in Turkey on my first overseas trip, and most recently met with Muslim leaders in Germany during my visit in Berlin.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY MR. ALLEN ROSENSHINE, BDA BOARD MEMBER & CHAIRMAN, BBDO WORLDWIDE

“BUILDING NEW BRIDGES TO THE WORLD”

As an advertising executive who has led a global network of agencies and helped forge the strategies and communications of many iconic American brands for almost two decades, I find our nation greatly in need of new leadership in managing our reputation among the people of the world. America has so much good to offer but we make too little of it and too often pursue policies that make us difficult if not impossible to appreciate.

And this is not the fault of a particular political party or administration. It is a collective failure that has gone on too long and puts our future in jeopardy. Public diplomacy is not just about the policy. It is about how we engage each and every day with the world. The deterioration of America’s standing in the world is a threat not only to our national security but to our broader economic security and competitive edge.

The appointment of Karen Hughes to a high-ranking public diplomacy post is a positive step. However, along with my fellow board members of Business for Diplomatic Action, I believe that the private sector must harness its resources and creativity in order to take the lead and mount a credible public diplomacy offensive to help restore the respect and even admiration that we have enjoyed in the past. From all that we know and have learned in our global listening efforts, the federal government is not a credible messenger to the world. Efforts such as ours should be leveraged by the US Government to encourage and engage the private sector in a broad-based way towards public diplomacy goals that work in parallel with government efforts.

This summer, BDA assembled an internal team to develop a comprehensive vision statement for our effort. The enclosed statement embodies our collective passion and hope for the future.

Building New Bridges to the World

Since the birth of our nation, America has been devoted to the principles that (1) people should be allowed the greatest possible individual liberty consistent with the need to live in a communal society, (2) we are governed by laws administered with equal and consistent justice for every citizen, and (3) our government acts through the will of the people who decide through the democracy of free elections who will lead us.

America is that simple. And that complex.

We have learned that it is not easy to always adhere to these concepts, balancing their idealistic hope with the reality of the vagaries and often conflicting demands of human nature. We know our record has not been perfect. But when we have strayed from our beliefs, we have always worked our way back.

Liberty, justice, and the democracy of representative government are what we stand for, what we want the world to see in us, and what we wish for all mankind.

But it cannot happen because we say so. It cannot happen because we have the power to impose our will. It cannot happen unless the world wants it to. It cannot happen unless we build the bridges that bring America closer to the world, and the world closer to America. Our vision of an America understood, respected, and believed can only be achieved by an America willing to understand, respect, and convince.

As difficult as it is to govern just ourselves and find solutions to our own socio-economic problems, it is that much more complicated for America to be both a citizen and a leader in today's world. We must work not only with those who believe in and admire us but also with people who view us with mistrust or even hatred. We must accept as reality even what we know is irrational in order to cope with it. We must consider compromise when our instincts are to remain unyielding. We must enhance our well established and still appreciated tradition of sharing our wealth, our power, and our success for the benefit of others. We must build more such bridges to more of the world, crossing them ourselves so that we might better listen and hear while inviting the world to cross over to us so that they might better experience the fundamental truths of America.

It is to this end that Business for Diplomatic Action enlists leaders in business and communications, as two of the most powerful and potentially effective forces in guiding how America is and will be seen around the world. Our goal is to work on issues that we believe affect people's beliefs about us, subjects such as (1) the social and economic consequences of globalization, (2) the impact on other countries of the entertainment and popular culture we export, and (3) the personality of our nation as seen in the American people working and visiting abroad. And while we are not associated with or supported by the U.S. government, we will encourage and endorse any administration's effort that can lead to building new bridges to the world—bridges that will be good for business, good for America, and good for the world.

This is the America that Business for Diplomatic Action would have the world perceive—a nation striving to perfect its own commitments to liberty, justice, and democracy while working in partnership with the rest of the world to provide both the hope and the realities of a better life for people everywhere.

Is this just our dream alone or does the world share it? Do we have both the will and the resources to make it happen? In a world as diverse, as difficult, and in fact as fragile as ours has become, is it even possible?

What America has accomplished in its relatively short history should leave no doubt about our answer. As a people, we have shown our resolve, our commitment, and our determination to meet such challenges at home and abroad, time and again. In this new time, we will do so again. And we believe it must be the business community supported by the communications industry that leads the way.

