

**NOMINATIONS OF THE 110TH
CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION**

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 30 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 24, 2008

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



NOMINATIONS OF THE 110TH CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION

S. HRG. 110-777

NOMINATIONS OF THE 110TH CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 30 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 24, 2008

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

48-281 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2009

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) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
110TH CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts	CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin	NORM COLEMAN, Minnesota
BARBARA BOXER, California	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
BILL NELSON, Florida	JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire*
BARACK OBAMA, Illinois	GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
ROBERT P. CASEY, Pennsylvania	JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
JIM WEBB, Virginia	DAVID VITTER, Louisiana

ANTONY J. BLINKEN, *Staff Director*

KENNETH A. MYERS, Jr., *Republican Staff Director*

*Note: Reassigned to Committee on Finance January 24, 2008.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
110TH CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts	CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin	NORM COLEMAN, Minnesota
BARBARA BOXER, California	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
BILL NELSON, Florida	GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio
BARACK OBAMA, Illinois	LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
ROBERT P. CASEY, Pennsylvania	DAVID VITTER, Louisiana
JIM WEBB, Virginia	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming*

ANTONY J. BLINKEN, *Staff Director*

KENNETH A. MYERS, Jr., *Republican Staff Director*

*Note: Appointed February 12, 2008.

NOMINATIONS

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2008

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

Ameri, Goli, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs

Glassman, James, to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy

Kramer, David, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:15 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Bill Nelson, presiding.

Present: Senators Bill Nelson, Feingold, Menendez, Cardin, and Lugar.

Also present: Senators Lieberman and Smith.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BILL NELSON, U.S. SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

Senator Bill NELSON. We're here to consider the nominations of the Honorable Goli Ameri to be Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, and the Honorable James Glassman to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy, and Mr. David Kramer to be Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

We've been joined by our colleague, Senator Smith, and I want to extend the courtesies of the chair to you for your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. GORDON H. SMITH, U.S. SENATOR FROM OREGON

Senator SMITH. Thank you, Senator Nelson. I'm honored to be back in the Foreign Relations Committee. I miss this committee very much and I thank you and Ben for your service on this committee. I hope you enjoy it as much as I did in my first term.

It is for me both a privilege and a pleasure to be here to speak on behalf of Goli Ameri. She is one of the most remarkable Oregonians that it is my privilege to know. She's a long-time friend, she's been a supporter, she has been a public servant, she has been a distinguished businesswoman. She has a lovely family and a great husband in Jim.

But her story really is much richer than that. Goli was born in Iran and came to the United States under very difficult cir-

cumstances, made her way through Stanford University, and distinguished herself academically. Moreover, she took that knowledge and built a very successful business. She's the founder and president of eTinium, which is an international consulting and marketing research company specializing in telecommunications. Her opinions are regularly sought by business magazines, journals, and newspapers.

Before starting eTinium, she served as a director of U.S. Leasing, a former division of the Ford Motor Credit, and Fleet Bank. She has recently completed service, played a valuable role in representing the United States internationally as a public delegate to the 61st session of the United States Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland.

In addition to that, she is a supporter of the Iran Democracy Project at the Hoover Institution, which seeks to study democracy and how to aid it, its development, in Iran.

I believe she truly embodies all the best in the American spirit and I'm very excited at this nomination and I urge your support. She certainly has mine, because she has earned it over many, many years with a distinguished career in public service and mostly just as a great human being.

So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Bill NELSON. Thank you, Senator Smith.

Senator Lugar.

**STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD G. LUGAR,
U.S. SENATOR FROM INDIANA**

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just make a short statement of greeting, if I may, this morning. I'm very pleased to welcome three very distinguished nominees. I have often spoken of the need to draw talented individuals from the private sector into public service. Given the potential loss of privacy, the reduction in pay, financial restrictions, other complications, government service sometimes holds little attraction for men and women who have built careers in the private sector. Many nominees make personal and financial sacrifices to pursue difficult assignments in the service of our country.

I am grateful that Mr. Glassman, Mr. Murray, and Mr. Kramer have stepped forward to serve their country at this critical time. Understandably, during an election year the country begins to look ahead to the possibilities of a new administration. But irrespective of the upcoming election, the important business of our Government continues on, and this is especially true in the State Department, which is contending with numerous diplomatic challenges.

With less than a year remaining in this administration, it's essential that the Foreign Relations Committee move with dispatch to confirm qualified nominees so they can provide leadership as soon as possible. Similarly, I would urge the Bush administration to make decisions about vacant posts at an early date so the State Department does not experience gaps in its diplomatic or managerial leadership.

I congratulate the nominees before us today. I look forward to your discussion with them and support of them as we try to expedite this procedure.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for chairing this meeting.
 Senator Bill NELSON. Thank you, Senator Lugar.

Would each of you introduce your families that might happen to be joining you today?

STATEMENT OF HON. GOLI AMERI, NOMINATED TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Ms. AMERI. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce my husband, Jim Ameri, who is sitting over there, and my oldest son, Darius Ameri, who is here today.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Ameri follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. GOLI AMERI, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. I would also like to thank Senator Smith of the great State of Oregon for being here today and for his kind words of introduction.

I would like to begin by recognizing the members of my family who are sitting behind me for their love and support. Joining me here today are my husband, Jim, and my son, Darius. My second son, Sherwin, could not be here and I am proud to say that he is in New Orleans building homes for the victims of Hurricane Katrina. My parents are both elderly and unfortunately could not be here either, but I want to thank them for their ever-present love and support and their foresight in sending me to the United States for my higher education.

It is also a great pleasure to be seated before the committee today with David Kramer to be Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, as well as a gentleman who I've gotten to know well in the last few weeks and who I will have the pleasure to work with in the coming year, Jim Glassman, nominated to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.

I am honored by the trust and confidence shown to me by President Bush and Secretary Rice in putting my name forward to be Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

I believe that my background and experience will enable me to carry on the proud tradition of excellence at the Bureau.

First and foremost, there is who I am—an American by choice. I was born and raised in Tehran, Iran, and came to the United States to attend Stanford University—one of the 100,000 international students who embarked for the United States in 1974. When the revolution in Iran happened in 1979, there were thousands of us studying in America whose futures were put in doubt. But even in our gloomiest moments, we knew there was a light at the end of the tunnel because we were armed with a first-class education we had gained right here in the United States. Our education not only propelled us to success, but it also taught us many valuable life lessons. Among the myriad of things I learned and they are too numerous to list, was the value of freedom and democracy, the fundamentals of critical thinking, the questioning of ideas, and a profound sense of empowerment. I learned that in America there are no constraints to one's desire to achieve. That it's ok to be a woman, it's ok to be an immigrant, and most importantly it's ok to be a dreamer.

Where else in the world would an immigrant, a woman of Iranian heritage, be nominated as an Assistant Secretary and have the privilege to sit in front of this distinguished panel?

The idea of America is alive and well and as strong as ever. Education and culture are among America's greatest soft power assets—assets recognized around the world. These programs allow us to demonstrate American values, not just assert them. I am delighted that President Bush and Secretary Rice have emphasized that public diplomacy and exchanges are top priorities for the State Department and for foreign affairs, in general.

I understand both personally and professionally what Secretary Rice means when she speaks of the transformational power of education and exchange. I have experienced it firsthand and, if confirmed, it would be not only be a tremendous privilege to lead the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs but to have firsthand responsibility to promote these values overseas.

If confirmed, I am committed to strengthening the many achievements of the Department's educational and cultural exchanges. I intend to expand our people to

people exchanges and introduce (1) more opportunities for engagement with key countries like Iran and North Korea where we seek better relations between our citizens, and (2) reach out to the more disadvantaged segments of the population around the world. I will encourage more women and girls to participate in our exchange programs and I would like to make sure that we institutionalize successful and powerful programs like the Middle East Breast Cancer Initiative and the Fortune Women's Mentorship program.

Coming from the private sector, I know that the challenges of the 21st century cannot be addressed by the government alone. I have been delighted to see that public-private collaboration is a significant part of the organizational culture at ECA with hundreds of partners among NGOs, businesses, and academic institutions. ECA has made significant progress in creatively expanding these public-private partnerships with impressive new undertakings, such as with the Edward R. Murrow Program for Journalists, the Global Cultural Initiative, American Public Diplomacy Envoys, and engagement with America's higher education community. My goal is to engage and enlist the private sector and private foundations more fully to expand our No. 1 public diplomacy tool—exchanges and teaching English abroad.

I would also like to expand our outreach to ethnic communities in the United States to listen to their ideas about expanding our exchanges and finding creative ways to have them represent us overseas. If confirmed, I will also be looking for effective ways to engage the 800,000-plus strong alumni of ECA programs who are often America's best friends.

Having two young sons and coming from a technology background, I have come to understand the incredible power of this industry in attracting youth around the world and one of my goals is to further harness this power in achieving the goals of the ECA. Our challenge is to build mass in reaching out to the world and today the Internet is our most significant ally.

And, of course, last but not least, I am committed to investing in and recognizing the hard work and expertise of all PD professionals who are responsible for much of the success of our programs, and coming from the private sector, my commitment to you will be to ensure that the resources allocated to ECA are spent wisely, effectively, and with maximum impact.

Ladies and gentlemen, we all know that these are challenging times for public diplomacy. But I am hopeful about our activities, because after all what we are promoting is the idea of America—our people's commitment to freedom and democracy, to honesty and integrity, to trust, and most of all to tolerance. There is still not a day that goes by that I don't feel a surge of joy, a thankfulness for being a part of this commitment. It is indeed a joy worth sharing with others. I look forward to working with all of you and your staff to spread the powerful message of our values all over the world. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today and look forward to your questions.

Senator Bill NELSON. Welcome.
Mr. Kramer.

STATEMENT OF DAVID J. KRAMER, NOMINATED TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce my oldest brother, Steven Kramer, who has joined us today. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kramer follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID J. KRAMER, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am honored to appear before you today to seek confirmation as Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. I am grateful to Secretary Rice for recommending me and to President Bush for nominating me for this position—a position central to the pursuit of the President's global freedom agenda.

If confirmed, I will devote my utmost energy and effort to serving as our Government's lead representative in the worldwide defense and advancement of human dignity and democracy. Should you afford me the opportunity to serve, I know that my work will be strengthened, as that of my predecessors has been, by the active, bipartisan support of this committee, and indeed, of the entire Congress.

Let me also take this occasion to say, Mr. Chairman, that if confirmed, I will be fortunate to inherit an impressive Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau from my distinguished colleague and good friend, Barry Lowenkron.

The advancement of human rights and democratic freedoms reflects the core values of the American people. As President Bush said during his visit to Prague last summer, "[F]reedom is the nonnegotiable right of every man, woman, and child, and the path to lasting peace in our world is liberty."

In his Prague speech, the President spoke about the great promise that has emerged with the rebirth of freedom in many parts of what used to be the Soviet Union, and Central and Eastern Europe. That region for many years has been the primary focus of my professional efforts, both during my time in government and before that when I worked in the foundation world, helping to establish one of the first independent public policy think tanks in post-Soviet Russia, the Carnegie Moscow Center.

My commitment to promoting human rights and democratic principles is longstanding. Relatives on my father's side were the victims of Soviet totalitarian brutality. Only one family member in Riga, my father's first cousin, survived—after 17 harrowing years of forced labor in Siberia. She died 5 years ago. What happened to her and countless millions like her is seared upon my memory. And so I am personally, as well as professionally, committed to do all I possibly can to help other innocent men and women who are caught in the cruel grip of oppression—from Belarus to Burma, Zimbabwe to Cuba, North Korea to Iran, and Eritrea to Syria. And, if confirmed, I also will use every tool available to me as Assistant Secretary to support those in every region of the world who are working to help their countries make the transition to accountable, democratic government.

President Bush's second inaugural address in January 2005 struck a deep chord with me and reminded me why I wanted to serve in government in the first place. Early in this administration, I had the privilege of serving as senior advisor to Under Secretary for Democracy and Global Affairs, Paula Dobriansky—and I would look forward, if confirmed, to the pleasure of working with her in my new capacity. I worked intensively on democracy and human rights issues. I pressed, for example, for more attention to be focused on the tragic situation in Chechnya. I also played a role in developing the President's unprecedented HIV/AIDS initiative—a vivid demonstration of the good that our compassionate country can do. This experience also impressed upon me the need not just to promote democracy, but also to strengthen the capacities of democracies so that they can deliver a better life to their people. Human rights and democracy assistance is not the same as development aid—both are important and they are mutually reinforcing.

Similarly, advancing democracy cannot be pursued to the exclusion of important security interests, such as combating terrorism and extremism and promoting non-proliferation. At the same time, cooperation with the United States on strategic matters of mutual interest should not win a country a pass on pushing forward with political liberalization and reform. As President Bush said during his recent trip to the Middle East: "... the best way to defeat the extremists in your midst is by opening your societies, and trusting in your people, and giving them a voice in their nation."

In my current position as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova, I have made sure that democracy and human rights issues are at the top of the agenda. The collapse of the oppressive Soviet empire opened the possibility for nearly 400 million people to live in freedom, many for the first time in their lives. This opportunity, I know, has not yet been realized for all in this region. Time and again, Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I have been deeply moved by the courage of human rights defenders, independent journalists, NGOs, religious and minority rights advocates, and labor activists striving—some even sacrificing their lives—to secure the blessings of liberty for their fellow citizens. Indeed, much of my work and that of my colleagues has been focused on the defense of human rights and democratic processes in this part of the world.

I have been told that I am not allowed into Belarus anymore because of my advocacy for freedom in that country and my leadership in imposing sanctions against that dictatorial regime due to its human rights abuses. I guess I have been doing something right.

For the first time in a long time, there may be some reason for hope in Belarus. In the past 2 weeks, the government has released several political prisoners—a cause that my colleagues and I in the U.S. Government have been pressing for years. While the Government of Belarus needs to do much more, we may be seeing our policy of pressuring the regime through sanctions combined with support for the democratic opposition finally paying off. If confirmed, I will continue to press hard for reform in Belarus.

When governments veer from the democratic path, it is our responsibility to speak up for the people who are being denied their rights, to urge the governments to return to the path of democracy, and, when necessary, to take appropriate punitive action. As the President said in his speech last summer in Prague, "Freedom can be resisted, and freedom can be delayed, but freedom cannot be denied."

Mr. Chairman, the goal of the Bush administration's democracy promotion efforts is not to impose America's ways on others, it is to encourage adherence to international principles and help others effect positive change so that they have the freedom to choose. As Secretary Rice has said, we seek "to expand the circle of well-governed states that enshrine liberty under the rule of law, that provide for their people, and that act responsibly in the international system. America cannot do this for other countries. Nor should we. It must be their choice, and their initiative. But we can help and we must help. This is partnership, not paternalism."

If confirmed as Assistant Secretary, I will continue to concentrate DRL's diplomacy and programs on the core components of democracy that must be present in countries around the globe if human rights are to be effectively exercised and protected: (1) Free and fair electoral processes, with a level playing field to ensure genuine competition; (2) good governance, with representative, transparent and accountable institutions operating under the rule of law, including independent legislatures and judiciaries; and (3) robust civil societies, including independent media and labor unions.

These components are central to our efforts to help the people of Afghanistan and Iraq to assume their rightful places in the global democratic community. As the President said in his State of the Union speech on Monday, over the past 7 years, "We've seen Afghans emerge from the tyranny of the Taliban and choose a new president and a new parliament. We've seen jubilant Iraqis holding up ink-stained fingers and celebrating their freedom. These images of liberty have inspired us."

At the regional level, we will continue to deepen work with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the African Union, the Organization of American States, and the Association of South East Asian Nations. These bodies already have established or are in the process of establishing human rights and democracy standards, institutions, and mechanisms. At the global level, we seek to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Community of Democracies. And we will continue to work in partnership with like-minded countries at the United Nations to defend human rights and democratic principles, for example by marshalling international efforts to press for democratic reform in Burma and an end to the Darfur crisis.

Partnerships with NGOs—indigenous and international—are essential to the development and success of free societies and play a vital role in ensuring accountable government and peaceful, democratic change. If confirmed as Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, I will regularly reach out to civil society representatives here and abroad for their valuable ideas and insights. There also is much that we can do in partnership with the private sector, for example, to promote corporate social responsibility and uphold international labor standards.

Mr. Chairman, outstanding, dedicated men and women serve in the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. I see my job, if confirmed by the Senate, as helping them to do their vital work by ensuring that DRL has a strong voice at the policy table and that issues of human rights and democracy are fully integrated into the decision making process here in Washington and at our foreign posts.

Mr. Chairman, if this committee and the Senate see fit to confirm me, I will make the most of each and every day as Assistant Secretary. The brave men and women around the world who are striving against great odds, often at great risk, to advance human rights and democracy deserve nothing less. I am acutely aware that this is a time when NGOs, the independent press, labor activists, and other human rights and democracy defenders are under siege in every region of the world in countries as various as China, Russia, and Zimbabwe. In many countries, those in power wield unjust laws like weapons, or dispense with all pretense of legality and employ brutal extrajudicial measures against people who try to peacefully exercise their rights. As long as men and women around the globe are deprived of their most fundamental freedoms of belief, expression, association, assembly and movement, we, who live in liberty, can never do enough.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, I look to work closely with this committee and with your other congressional colleagues on the full range of human rights and democracy concerns in furtherance of the goals set forth in the Advancing Democratic Values Act. I also am determined to ensure that when my term is ended, I will leave the DRL Bureau in strong shape for my successor in the next administration. Working for freedom's cause transcends politics. It is part of what it means to be an American, and that is why I would be deeply honored to serve the American people as Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

And now, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I will be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

Senator Bill NELSON. Welcome.
Mr. Glassman.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES K. GLASSMAN, NOMINATED TO
BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY**

Mr. GLASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce my uncle, Bernard Glassman, who's seated behind me. Unfortunately, my wonderful wife, Beth, is recovering from emergency surgery on Monday. She's doing well, but she couldn't be with us.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Glassman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES K. GLASSMAN, NOMINEE TO BE UNDER
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on October 1, 2003, the Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy in the Arab and Muslim World, mandated by Congress and chaired by Ambassador Edward Djerejian, produced a powerful report that concluded, "At a critical time in our nation's history, the apparatus of public diplomacy has proven inadequate."¹

The report pointed to our "unilateral disarmament in the weapons of advocacy that has contributed to widespread hostility toward Americans and left us vulnerable to lethal threats to our interests and our safety."²

I was one of the 13 members of the Djerejian Group, and it is not hard to sum up our conclusions: get serious and strategic about public diplomacy, rebuild the institutions, modernize them, provide interagency leadership and coordination, increase resources, get the President and the Congress fully behind the effort.

That was 2003. Times have changed. There is today a broad, bipartisan consensus that soft power, smart power, public diplomacy—that is, the arsenal of persuasion—are absolutely critical to counter and defeat the violent extremists who threaten America and the freedom of people around the world.

The will is there. The President and Congress are more engaged. Many of the recommendations of the Djerejian Group have been adopted over the past 2 years under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Under Secretary Karen Hughes—not only programs but what the report called a "culture of measurement," a rigorous examination of how well public diplomacy is "moving the needle"—that is, enhancing understanding and changing minds.

The rebuilding is well underway. Indeed, I believe that American public diplomacy, after a bipartisan period of neglect in the 1990s, is now poised to move beyond the successes of the cold war, beyond anything envisaged by the Djerejian Group.

This is the background, Mr. Chairman, for today's hearing. I am honored by the nomination of President Bush and the support of Secretary Rice, and I seek your confirmation as Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.

I am proud to introduce my wife, Beth Glassman. Much of the rest of the family is far-flung: My daughter, Zoe Miles, and her two children, Violet and James, live in New Orleans; my daughter, Kate Bennett, and her daughter, Tess, live in Las Vegas; and my stepchildren are in college: Michael Rocks at the University of Virginia and Hilary Rocks at Vanderbilt. My mother is nursing a knee injury. I want also to recognize the support of my stepmother, Betty Glassman; my brother and sister, Peter and Betsy; and my uncle, Bernard. My father, Stanley, who died in 2005, would have loved to have seen this day.

I also want to take this time to thank Senator Lieberman for his kind introduction. I have been an admirer of Joe Lieberman even before he was elected to the United States Senate. He is a man of principle and vision.

Just 8 months ago, this committee and the United States Senate confirmed me as chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, which oversees taxpayer-fund-

¹ Changing Minds, Winning Peace: A New Strategic Direction for U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Arab & Muslim World. Report of the Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World, Oct. 1, 2003, submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, p. 8.

² Ibid, p. 13.

ed international radio, television, and Internet networks. This remarkable electronic platform, built over 65 years, now directly touches the lives of 155 million people each week in 57 languages.³ In Arabic alone, BBC radio and TV broadcasts reach 35 million people—more than 10 times as many as were reached in 2002. In recent months, our broadcasters have provided a lifeline to people seeking the truth in such places as Somalia, Syria, Burma, North Korea, Russia, Cuba, Tibet, and Pakistan.

As just one example, one in every five Iranians watches VOA Persian television at least once a week. U.S. taxpayer-funded broadcasting beams 7 hours of TV a day into Iran, including a popular call-in show that allows Iranians to talk directly with American policymakers and Iranian exile dissidents. Taken as a whole, U.S. international broadcasting—including such venerable institutions as Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty—is our largest single civilian public diplomacy program by far.⁴ If I am confirmed, I will, of course, step down as chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, but I will remain on the board as the Secretary of State's representative.

In addition to my service on the Djerejian Group and on the Broadcasting Board, I have spent nearly 40 years as a professional communicator—a writer, publisher, editor, TV public-affairs show moderator, and Web site host. I have founded two media businesses and rejuvenated two others. My respect and admiration for this institution was nurtured during the time I was editor of Roll Call, the congressional newspaper, in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Additional preparation came from a deep immersion in the world of ideas, which began when I was publisher of *The New Republic* and president of *The Atlantic Monthly* and continued through my 11 years in the think-tank world, at the American Enterprise Institute, where I am now a senior fellow and editor of AEI's magazine of economics, *The American*.

If I am confirmed, it is my intention to focus on three areas: 1) Leading the war of ideas, 2) building on our current public diplomacy strengths in educational and cultural exchanges, and 3) bringing fresh and vital technologies to bear on all of our efforts.

LEAD THE WAR OF IDEAS

The war against al-Qaeda and other extremist threats to peace, freedom, and justice is not only military. It is a war of ideas. Secretary of Defense Gates made just this point when he extolled "soft power" in a lecture at Kansas State University in November.⁵ As the 9/11 Commission put it: Eliminating al-Qaeda requires "prevailing in the longer term over the ideology that gives rise to Islamist terrorism."⁶

In this war of ideas, the White House in April 2006, gave the State Department—and specifically the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy—the lead. The Under Secretary is charged with "leading our strategic communications efforts to promote freedom and democracy and to counter extremism."⁷

If I am confirmed, this will be the main focus of my attention: The war of ideas—perhaps better expressed as global ideological engagement. "Al-Qaeda," as Michael Doran, a scholar of Middle East politics at Princeton and now a Pentagon official, has written, "is the ideological organization par excellence."⁸ The organization disseminates its messages through mass media and the Internet, and our job is not merely to explain and advocate American values and policies but to counter the disturbingly persuasive ideology of the enemy.

Let me give you an idea of what we are up against. A poll last April by WorldPublicOpinion.org, a project of the University of Maryland, found that about four out of five respondents in Muslim nations surveyed agreed with the proposition that the goal of the United States, in its global policies, is to "weaken and divide

³ See http://www.bbg.gov/bbg_aboutus.cfm.

⁴ The budget of the BBG is greater than that of all educational and cultural exchange programs supervised by the State Department, but the total public diplomacy budget of the State Department is greater than that of the BBG by about \$200 million for fiscal 2008.

⁵ Robert Gates, Landon Lecture, Nov. 26, 2007. See <http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1199>.

⁶ The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (W.W. Norton & Co., 2004), p. 363.

⁷ Stephen Hadley, Memorandum, "Establishment of the Public Diplomacy and Strategic Communications Policy Coordination Committee," April 8, 2006.

⁸ Michael Doran, "The Pragmatic Fanaticism of al Qaeda," *Political Science Quarterly* (Summer 2002), p. 187. Quoted by William Rosenau in *The McGraw-Hill Homeland Security Handbook* (2005), p. 1132.

the Islamic world.”⁹ Roughly two-thirds of those polled in Muslim countries said that a U.S. goal was to “spread Christianity to the Middle East.”¹⁰

A Pew survey found that 80 percent of Indonesians were “very” or “somewhat” worried that the United States could be a military threat to their country.¹¹

Where do such notions come from? Straight from the doctrine that is at the foundation of al-Qaeda ideology.

The fact that so many people adhere to these beliefs is testimony to the effectiveness of the radicals, who, as Mary Habeck, a historian at Yale who now is with the National Security Council, writes, comprise a “faction—generally called ‘jihadi’ or ‘jihadist’—[that] has very specific views about how to . . . return Muslims to political power and what needs to be done about its enemies, including the United States. The main difference between the jihadis and other Islamists is the extremists’ commitment to the violent overthrow of the existing international system.”¹²

Certainly, the many millions in the Muslim world who believe that the United States seeks to destroy their religion do not themselves adhere to jihadist ideology. But that they buy into major tenets of the ideology presents an enormous challenge to our national security.

How do we counter such notions? How do we counter the widespread misperception that America does not allow mosques on its soil? Or that we are not a religious or family-oriented people? Part of the answer lies in ideological engagement—directly entering the conversation to confront lies and distortions with truth. At the time of the Djerejian Report, that was barely happening. Now, the efforts is gaining momentum, through institutions that Ambassador Hughes inaugurated, like the State Department’s media hubs in London, Brussels, and Dubai, which rapidly deliver voices that advocate for United States policy on Arabic and other important international media, and the Digital Outreach Team, which began engaging with Arabic Internet sites in November of 2006, and expanded to include Persian and Urdu sites in December of 2007.

What makes the current war of ideas so difficult is that jihadist ideology is built on a religious base—which means that non-Muslim Americans are not the best messengers in countering its appeal. As President Bush has said, “The war on terrorism is not a clash of civilizations. It does, however, reveal a clash inside a civilization, a battle for the future of the Muslim world. This is a struggle of ideas, and this is an area where America must excel.”¹³

Ideological engagement is the job, of course, not only of the State Department. Other agencies of government are hard at work. If confirmed, my intention will be to coordinate closely with these agencies and with our allies—especially in Europe, where the traditions of the Enlightenment and critical thinking were born and where the extremist threat today is intense.

BUILD ON THE FOUNDATION OF EXCHANGES

Another way to counter the ideas of the extremists is personal engagement through educational and cultural exchange programs. Funding for these programs has more than doubled since fiscal 2003¹⁴—and with good reason. Exchanges are the crown jewels of public diplomacy. We are fortunate that a talented Iranian-born American, Goli Ameri, has been nominated by the President to head these programs as Assistant Secretary of State.

We should never forget that, to the rest of the world, education is America’s great brand. In my preparation over the past few weeks, I have learned that the total number of international students in the United States is on track to rise to a record high in the 2007–2008 academic year. This is big news, and welcome.

We will also look for new ways to spread the benefits of educational and cultural exchanges to less advantaged youth to study in the United States. In particular, we will work to fulfill the President’s vision to expand the Partnership for Latin Amer-

⁹WorldPublicOpinion.org, Program on International Policy Attitudes, University of Maryland, “Muslim Opinion on US Policy, Attacks on Civilians and al Qaeda,” April 24, 2007. A press release summarizing the study began, “An in-depth poll of four major Muslim countries has found that in all of them large majorities believe that undermining Islam is a key goal of US foreign policy.” See <http://worldpublicopinion.org>.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹America’s Image in the World: Findings from the Pew Global Attitudes Project, Testimony of Andrew Kohut, Pew Research Center, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, March 14, 2007.

¹²Mary Habeck, *Knowing the Enemy: Jihadist Ideology in the War on Terror* (Yale University Press, 2006), p. 4.

¹³The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, 2002. See <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss9.html>

¹⁴From \$244 million in fiscal 2003 to \$501 million in fiscal 2008.

ican Youth, a program which will increase access to English language teaching and provide thousands of young people in our own hemisphere a greater chance to study here in the United States.

BRING NEW TECHNOLOGIES TO BEAR

The truth is that ordinary Americans are superb citizen ambassadors. They live our values: Generosity, tolerance, compassion. The problem is that the vast majority of people in the world have never met an American. The challenge is how to amplify our exchange programs. Research shows that the Fulbright program is highly effective. Through video technology and the Internet we can magnify the life-changing experiences of nearly 7,000 Fulbrighters and 2,000 Flex and YES high school students who come here each year so that such experiences are shared not simply by the families and friends but by millions.

New technologies also will play a larger and larger role in the war of ideas, through innovations such as the Digital Outreach Team.

After I was nominated, I read a great deal in the press about my job. People speculated on what I would do to burnish America's image, to increase our popularity ratings—as if the United States were a brand of soft drink or an entrant in “American Idol” seeking global votes.

Let me offer a different perspective. Public diplomacy's role is to help achieve the national interest by “informing, engaging, and influencing people around the world.”¹⁵ It is a tool, a means, to achieve specific ends. One of those ends—the first goal as defined by President Bush's National Security Strategy in March 16, 2006, is “promoting freedom, justice and human dignity—working to end tyranny, to promote effective democracies, and to extend prosperity.”¹⁶ And why do we do that? Not just for moral reasons, but because free governments, since they are accountable to their people, tend not to attack other free nations. “Peace and international stability,” says this National Security Strategy, “are most reliably built on a foundation of freedom.”

What does all this have to do with popularity? It matters that people in other parts of the world trust us and respect us. Their leaders are sensitive to public opinion, and when we ask nations to support our aims in the world—to send troops, to impose sanctions, to assist in humanitarian relief—those nations are more apt to respond if their publics are favorably disposed toward the United States.

On the other hand, isn't it better that more and more people in the Arab and Muslim world today reject suicide bombing as a tactic¹⁷—even if their love for America has not necessarily increased?

I have spent a good deal of time since my nomination in an attempt to gain a deeper understanding of the data on attitudes toward the United States. I met for 2 hours with Andy Kohut of the Pew Research Center and have conferred with experts at the State Department and read practically all the surveys. Here are some conclusions:

1. Animosity toward the United States is real, and it must concern us.
2. Different countries have different views of the United States. In Africa, Japan, and India, for example, most people favorably disposed toward the United States.¹⁸ In much of Western Europe and nearly all the Arab and Muslim world, they are not.
3. Much of the animosity is not deep. Even people who say they dislike us want to have strong bilateral relations with us, and attitudes are not set in stone.¹⁹ As Secretary Rice said last year, the United States is “still the place where people like to send their kids to school, where people want to start a new

¹⁵Changing Minds, Winning Peace, op. cit., p. 13.

¹⁶The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, 2006. See <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2006/intro.html>.

¹⁷“Islam and the West: Searching for Common Ground,” Testimony of Andrew Kohut, Pew Research Center, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, July 18, 2006. For example, in Jordan, the proportion saying that suicide bombing against civilian targets is “often” or “sometimes” justified dropped from 57 percent in 2005 to 29 percent in 2006. See <http://pewglobal.org/commentary/print.php?AnalysisID=1009>.

¹⁸For example, proportions of those with favorable views of the United States, according to a June 2007 Pew Global Attitudes Project Survey, were 88 percent in the Ivory Coast, 80 percent in Ghana, 59 percent in India, 61 percent in Japan, 30 percent in Germany, and 21 percent in Egypt. In Nigeria a majority of Muslims views the United States favorably.

¹⁹See, for example, a study conducted between November 30 and December 5 by Terror Free Tomorrow: The Center for Public Opinion and D3 System. It found that 40 percent of respondents in Saudi Arabia had a favorable opinion of the United States, compared with just 11 percent in May 2006. See <http://www.terrorfreetomorrow.org/template.php?section=WN>.

life. Sometimes we overstate the degree to which America is not popular, even if sometimes our policies are not."²⁰

4. The animosity of foreigners has three sources:

a. They understand that we are a powerful nation and will ultimately set policies with our own interests in mind, but they believe we do not listen to them, do not act as a reliable partner, and do not respectfully take their views into account.²¹

b. In the Arab and Muslim world, especially, they have major misconceptions about America, our aims, and our policies. Remember the examples I cited before, such as a belief that we want to supplant Islam with Christianity in the Middle East.

c. They disagree with our policies, especially our presence in Iraq and what they see as our bias in the matter of Israel and the Palestinians.

The first two sources of animosity, I believe, we can address effectively through public diplomacy. We can listen better and more respectfully and through exchanges, information programs, and ideological engagement, we can address and rectify the lies and misconceptions.

As for policy: Edward R. Murrow, when he was USIA director, famously said that public diplomacy should be in on the takeoffs, not just the crash landings.²² In other words, public diplomacy should have a place at the table, to advise policymakers of the potential reaction of foreign publics to policies. But never, in my view, should global public opinion polls determine the foreign policy of the United States.

Can we do a better job explaining our policies? Yes. Will those policies be universally embraced? No.

In the early 1980s, the United States and our allies agreed on the placement of cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe. It was a decision that was aggressively opposed by much of Europe's public opinion, but it was a policy that helped bring down communism.

Consider Muslim Americans. A Pew study in May found that foreign-born American Muslims, by a 70 to 3 percent majority, have an unfavorable view of al-Qaeda.²³ By 78 to 18 percent, they are happy with their lives in America. They are optimistic, by a four-to-one margin, that a way will be found for Israel and the Palestinians to coexist. In all of these measures, Muslim Americans differ not only from Muslims in the Middle East and much of Asia but from Muslim immigrants in Europe.

Yet American Muslims, by a margin of more than six to one, say that the war in Iraq was wrong. That compares to a split of roughly 50-50 at the time among the entire U.S. public.

In other words, Muslims in America embrace U.S. values and participate actively in U.S. society, yet they differ with other Americans and with the U.S. government on policy. That is to say, policy is not the determining factor in their view of America. This is precisely the condition we should strive for in the world. People in other countries will not agree with our policies all the time, but we want them to have an accurate picture of those policies and the motivations behind them, and we want the disagreements to be constructive.

Since I was nominated as Under Secretary on December 11, many friends have congratulated me and perhaps just as many have offered condolences. They were half-joking, I suppose, in their reference to how difficult this job must be.

Public diplomacy requires seriousness, dedication, imagination, and hard work, but no condolences are in order. This is a position for which I have prepared all my life. My focus will be leading the war of ideas, building on the strong foundation provided by Karen Hughes, especially in the area of educational exchanges, and bringing new technologies to bear, in large part to amplify the effects of our programs.

The task ahead is to tell the world the story of a good and compassionate nation and, at the same time, to engage in the most important ideological contest of our time—a contest that we will win.

²⁰"A Resolute Condoleezza Rice," by Maria Bartiromo, *BusinessWeek*, July 23, 2007. See http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/07_30/b4043101.htm.

²¹This is the finding of many surveys. For example, in the June 2007 survey cited in the footnote above, respondents were asked how much the United States "takes into account the interests of countries" like yours in "making international policy decisions." The total proportion answering "not too much" or "not at all" was 79 percent in the Czech Republic, 75 percent in Turkey, 79 percent in South Korea, and 61 percent in Chile.

²²See <http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/murrow/snow.htm>.

²³These results and those that follow are from "Muslim Americans: Middle-Class and Mostly Mainstream," published by the Pew Research Center on May 22, 2007. See <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/483/muslim-americans>.

In closing, I want to thank the men and women working in the area of Public Diplomacy around the world. This includes our Foreign Service officers, Civil Service colleagues, and Foreign Service Nationals. I am honored to have you consider my confirmation and I look forward to working closely with the committee and your staff. Thank you.

Senator Bill NELSON. We wish her a speedy recovery.

Mr. GLASSMAN. Thank you, sir.

Senator Bill NELSON. Senator Lieberman.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,
U.S. SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT**

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning. I am honored to be here with my colleagues Senator Lugar and Senator Nelson. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to introduce James K. Glassman formally—I think you've already met him—to this committee and urge its members to favorably consider his nomination to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

I'm pleased to make this recommendation based on my great admiration for the work that Jim Glassman has done and, beyond that generic interest, I have a more parochial interest because Jim has been a long-time resident of the great State of Connecticut.

The Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy is the closest thing in the United States Government to what might be called a supreme allied commander in the war of ideas, responsible for rallying our Nation's resources so that we can prevail in the most critical and unconventional of battlefields. It is therefore one of the most important posts, I believe, in Washington and in our worldwide struggle against the forces of Islamist extremism and terrorism.

I believe that the members of this committee will find Jim Glassman to be a highly qualified person to lead this fight. He brings considerable knowledge and depth of experience about this particular area of activity, public diplomacy. In 2003, he served as a member of the congressionally mandated Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World, which was chaired by our very respected Ambassador Edward Djerjian. For the last 7 months, Jim has served with great effect and energy as chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors. Unanimously confirmed in that position by Congress last year, Jim has overseen all U.S. non-military international broadcasting, covering 57 languages and producing for more than 150 million viewers and listeners.

I believe that the committee will be especially encouraged as it looks into Jim's record of leadership at the BBG, the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the spirit of nonpartisan, not just bipartisan but nonpartisan, cooperation and consensus that he brought to his decisionmaking. I know that he will bring the same qualities of leadership to his work at the Department of State and to his dealings with this Congress if confirmed in this position.

Because the mission of this position is, of course, in no sense partisan, it is a quintessentially American mission, and for that reason I very much hope that you will favorably report on the nomination of Jim Glassman to lead us in the war of ideas.

Thank you very, very much.

Senator Bill NELSON. Thank you, Senator Lieberman.

I will submit my statement for the record, as we will for each of you. We're going to get right into questions, so I turn to the Senator from Maryland.

[The prepared statement of Senator Bill Nelson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BILL NELSON,
U.S. SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

This hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations will now come to order. Today, the committee meets to consider the nomination of three individuals for key leadership positions in the administration.

The President has nominated James Glassman to be the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, Goli Ameri to be the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, and David Kramer to be the Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

I want to congratulate each of you on your nomination and welcome you and your families here today.

I also welcome our colleagues, Senator Lieberman and Senator Smith, who have joined us to introduce two of the nominees today.

Mr. Glassman has been asked to manage the critical effort of public diplomacy for our Nation. An integral part of state-to-state relations, public diplomacy is a way to engage foreign audiences about the United States on a personal level: It involves people-to-people programs like educational, cultural, and sports exchanges.

America's public diplomacy has been widely criticized since the attacks of September 11, 2001. Within months of those attacks, international opinion of this country changed from one of admiration, respect, and empathy to one of distrust and misunderstanding. Our damaged image abroad, even among our closest friends, has hindered our ability to work with allies toward our shared objectives, and it is imperative that we correct international misperceptions about America.

If confirmed, Mr. Glassman would be responsible for this monumental task.

As Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy, he would be the principal adviser to the Secretary of State for shaping the international community's perception of this country. Mr. Glassman would oversee and manage three important bureaus within the Department of State: The Bureaus of Information Programs, Educational and Cultural Affairs, and Public Affairs.

One of those three bureaus, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs would be directed by Ms. Ameri. Her primary responsibility would be implementation and oversight of international exchange programs.

We are all familiar with the importance of public diplomacy, and specifically cultural exchanges, especially in times of great misperception and misunderstanding. As a young boy during the cold War, I myself had the opportunity to participate in public diplomacy by representing the youth of America and going to the Iron Curtain at the German-Czechoslovakian border.

There in the little village of Tillyschanz in the midst of the cold war, I got to speak over Radio Free Europe to the young people behind the Iron Curtain. At the age of 17, what I saw at that border made a lasting impression on me not until then could I have understood what it means for a people to be enslaved and shut off from the world behind machine gun nests, guard towers, and mine fields.

Although the times have changed, the importance of interacting with people throughout the world has only increased.

We also consider today the nomination of Mr. David Kramer to be Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

In this position, Mr. Kramer would lead U.S. efforts to promote democracy, protect human rights and international religious freedom, and advance labor rights around the world.

He would report to the Secretary of State on countries' human rights records. Because a country's human rights record is considered in the decision to provide U.S. foreign and security assistance, vigilant reporting is enormously important to our foreign policy.

I look forward to a thorough discussion with all of the nominees about their plans for providing leadership to our efforts to shape America's global image and pursue the highest standards of democracy and human rights. Again, I would like to recognize each of them for their distinguished careers and thank them for the continued personal commitment necessary to undertake these challenging assignments.

**STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
U.S. SENATOR FROM MARYLAND**

Senator CARDIN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me thank you for convening this hearing, and I want to thank all three of the nominees for their willingness to serve in the public sector. I agree with Senator Lugar, it's really helpful to our Nation when people with strong backgrounds in the private sector are willing to come forward and help their government in the public sector. It's not easy. It's not easy on you as far as your rights of privacy. It's not easy on your families. And we thank you for being willing to serve your country. Quite frankly, I'm impressed by all three of your backgrounds.

I just want to spend one moment, if I might, with Secretary Kramer, who is no stranger to me because of his close association with the Helsinki Commission. I am honored to be on this committee, but I'm also honored to be the Senate chairman of the Helsinki Commission. It's interesting, the Helsinki Commission predates the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, and it's been an unusual entity in that it's a cooperative effort between the Executive and Legislative Branches.

Your position, once confirmed, will be most likely the designee of your agency to the Helsinki Commission. So, first, I want to thank you for your past help. You testified before our committee on Belarus. You've been very helpful to our staff. And really an invitation to work very closely with us in the Helsinki Commission so that we can advance the portfolio that comes under the position that you're seeking confirmation and we can work closer together, the Members of Congress and the administration, to advance U.S. interests internationally in human rights. I welcome your comments in that regard.

Mr. KRAMER. Senator Cardin, thank you very much for that invitation to continue to work very closely with the Helsinki Commission. I have valued my opportunities to engage with you and certainly the staff members, with whom I worked very closely on a range of issues. In addition to testifying before the commission on Belarus, I also testified on the negotiations and discussions we've had with Russia on the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty, and appreciated very much your comments and thoughts during that session.

I certainly pledge to you, sir, that if confirmed, I look forward very much to a close working relationship with the commission.

Thank you.

Senator CARDIN. Well, I thank you for that, and I do look forward to your confirmation and I look forward to having the full complement within the commission, and I think you can add tremendous strength to our work. I know I speak for all the members.

Mr. Chairman, this is one area where there has been no partisan differences at all. It's a commission that works in very close harmony. It's interesting, it's also one where there is virtually no division between the executive branch and the legislative branch. We work in very close unity, which has made, I think, our effectiveness within an organization which is basically Europe and Central Asia—it includes North America; don't get me wrong—but it's

given us an extraordinary impact in that organization to advance the causes, our interests in Europe and Central Asia.

So I thank you for that answer and I look forward to working with you.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for recognizing me.

Senator Bill NELSON. Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Glassman, during the last few years of this administration, we've had numerous hearings about public diplomacy and in due course people have been sent forth to do that work, the most recent being Karen Hughes. At the same time, those who come into our hearings from the outside world keep pointing to surveys that indicate that the United States is held in less and less regard by more and more countries. Sometimes it's in support of a particular cause or position they have, to indicate that we're on the wrong foot. But on the other hand, the pervasive nature of these adverse surveys is certainly dispiriting to committee members.

You've watched all of this from various vantage points for many years and now have an opportunity to make a substantial difference. What strategies do you intend to employ or what kind of program, or at what point could the committee be apprised of how you will make a difference in this situation?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Thank you for that question, Senator Lugar. I've actually spent the last 6 weeks poring over a lot of the data on exactly this subject. I've met with Andrew Kohut of the Pew Center and I've looked at his surveys as well as internal surveys that have been done by the State Department, and I've come to a number of conclusions.

The first is that the animosity toward the United States is real, it should concern us, but it's not monolithic. For example, in Africa we do quite well in the surveys. In parts of Latin America that's also true; in India, Japan. But there is a great deal of animosity, especially in the Arab and Muslim world and in Europe.

What are the sources of that animosity? I think there really are three. One is that there is a perception that we are not listening and respectfully taking the views of other people into account. People seem to understand in the rest of the world that we're the big dog, that we are ultimately going to make decisions in our national interest, as we should. But they feel that they're not being heard.

The second thing is that there are a lot of misperceptions and, frankly, outright lies that are being told about us. Some of them are based on a particular framework that the ideology on which al Qaeda's doctrine is based comes from. Those are serious. For example, majorities of people in the Middle East, in the Arab world, believe that our engagement in that area is to destroy Islam and to supplant it with Christianity. I mean, that is just wrong and we have to address that.

Finally, there are people who just don't agree with our specific policies, such as those in Iraq, and we need to do a better job of explaining those policies, but global public opinion should absolutely not set our foreign policy.

So my feeling is that the first two areas are ones that we can absolutely work on, and I believe we can work on the third one as well and explain our policies better. But this is a major concern of

mine. I believe that we are making headway already and I am very happy to report back to this committee after a few months of work and tell you where we stand.

Senator LUGAR. Well, that would be very helpful, because clearly this is a crucial area which you've discovered. Mr. Kohut and the Pew Foundation have done a lot of work in this area and sort of flood us with material of this sort, all of which is pretty sad news.

Do you have any particular strategies in terms of changes in broadcasting or in contacts with newsmen? Or really, how would you proceed, having noted these deficiencies?

Mr. GLASSMAN. One of the things I think we need to do better is amplify what we're doing in our exchange programs. These are fabulous programs. They're really the crown jewels of what we do in public diplomacy. But you take a program like the Fulbright programs, which are great. Currently 7,000 people a year are participating in Fulbrights and that's a good number historically. But how do we get the rest of the world to know about these programs and, let's say electronically, come into contact with more Americans?

Most people in the world have never met an American and ordinary Americans are our best ambassadors. So one of the things that I want to try to do, especially in concert with Goli because both of us have a background in telecommunications and Internet, is to amplify what we're doing.

The second thing is quite simply to engage in a much more vigorous way. We're already doing that, but we need to do more of it in the war of ideas, explaining what we're doing, pushing back against the lies and misperceptions.

Senator LUGAR. That leads me to a question for Ms. Ameri, because clearly the exchange programs are an extraordinary aspect of public diplomacy, but they're really much more than that. Now, one of the problems that you will face, I suspect, although you may be more optimistic, is the Congress has not increased the ECA budget and so rapidly you're going to come up against barriers, which you may already have discovered even as you begin to move into this thing.

Have you given any thought just creatively as to how the Department of Defense budget or other budgets might be utilized? I mean that sincerely, not as an invasion into their territory, but again and again our committee is trying to think through in the constructive work, for instance in Iraq, how if we are going to be successful in nation-building defense funds could be utilized. Secretary Gates is very much in favor of this sort of collaboration.

It just occurs to me that some good diplomacy on your part, given the short framework here, would be important. But have you thought about, how do you do the Lord's work with exchanges with very little money and what kind of plans do you have?

Ms. AMERI. Thank you, Senator, for that question. Actually, the President's \$501 million budget for ECA in 2008 will certainly allow the bureau to expand exchanges, and particularly its English language programs and international visitors. Clearly, the President and the Secretary of State have mentioned on a number of occasions their support for all the exchanges that the bureau does.

In addition, I would actually like to extend my gratitude to Congress and yourself in particular for having always been such a big supporter of the programs of the ECA.

Having said that, as you mentioned, we can always clearly use more funds. One of the ideas that I had, which Jim and I have discussed, is, No. 1, we need to get the private sector more involved and more engaged. Both of us coming from that kind of background, we've talked about it. I've talked to a couple of NGOs regarding this, talked to a couple of contacts, just briefly, to kind of get some feedback and ideas. If confirmed, that will be one of the main items on my agenda—to make sure that we bring the private sector in to fund more of our exchanges, more of our incredibly successful English language teaching programs, English Access Microscholarship Program, which has taught English to 32,000 young kids, especially in Muslim countries.

We've done, ECA has done, an evaluation on this and the results are phenomenal—close to 90 percent say that they have a more favorable view of the United States. Ninety-six percent of parents, for example, say if they had another child they'd put them through the program. This is a program that clearly moves the needle.

On your question regarding the Defense Department, this was a very brief conversation that Jim Glassman and I had yesterday. I know he's had a meeting over there, and that is certainly an issue that I think we both need to take into consideration, concerning Secretary Gates' recent announcement on this subject. We welcome your input on that as well, Senator.

Senator LUGAR. Well, thank you very much. I came to this hearing from a wonderful meeting with 10 students from St. Petersburg University. These are all future diplomats, and they are deeply interested and very sophisticated about foreign policy in our country. These things occur every day in Washington, thank goodness. I hope for many more, because I was telling them about a group of young Georgians that came here 15 years ago, including the now-President, Mr. Shakashvili. They were graduate students then. They went back to Georgia and a while later the Rose Revolution occurred. Thus, this is serious business in terms of our public diplomacy and likewise the right outcomes of history.

So I appreciate very much your leadership and your collaboration with Mr. Glassman.

Ms. AMERI. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Bill NELSON. Thank you, Senator Lugar.

Senator Feingold.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing. I want to thank all the witnesses for their commitment to public service. Your dedication to supporting U.S. foreign policy goals is commendable, particularly since you would be taking on these positions with only a year left in the current administration.

Let me just ask a few questions. First for Mr. Glassman. In our meeting earlier this week you mentioned your intent to work to improve the structure of the Bureau of Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, and I appreciate your attention to strengthening this Bureau, particularly since it has undergone many changes since the

U.S. Information Agency was folded into the Department of State operations.

To your predecessor's credit, she undertook a difficult task when accepting this assignment in 2005 and she should be recognized for her accomplishments. As you are well aware, however, this Bureau has been criticized for having a weak communications strategy, which obviously raises questions about its ability to meet its important mission.

I'd like to hear from you if you have spoken with your predecessor first about the development of a communications strategy and how you'll work to improve it; and secondly, how you see the communications strategy fitting into the broader "structural" changes you intend to implement?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Thank you very much for the question, Senator. I have indeed spoken at length with Karen Hughes and I agree with you, I think she did a superb job in her 2½ years as Under Secretary and, frankly, just speaking personally, I don't think she received credit, at least in the media, for all that she did. I think people within the Department understand it, people who know public diplomacy understand it.

She did a number of very important things. One of the things she did was really help to liberate ambassadors and other public officials throughout the State Department to get out and advocate for American policies and American principles. You know, many of them are looking at their own careers and worried that they might say something wrong. And in fact when somebody might—in one case did say something a little bit wrong, she backed that person up and said that we all make mistakes. That was a very important signal to send.

I want to, if I'm confirmed, continue on that same path. The fact is that we need a multiplicity of voices out advocating for United States policy and for American principles in the long term.

Two other things that she did that are tremendously important, I think. One was establishing media hubs in London, Brussels, and Dubai. In fact, when I was in Dubai 2 months ago I met with the people there. It's a very small staff. There are really only six people throughout the world who are doing this. But what they're doing is getting out into the Arabic language media as well as other media on a very fast, very quick response basis and engaging.

When I was on the Djerjian group 4½ years ago, one of the points that we made was we need to get into the conversation. Four and one-half years ago we were not in it. We're now in it more and more.

Finally—and I got an impressive demonstration of this the other day—the digital outreach team, which is now I believe eight or nine people who are blogging, identifying themselves as U.S. Government representatives. They are on blogs, they're on Web sites in the Arabic language, Farsi, Persian, and Urdu, again trying to get the facts out, because that's the big problem.

So I am deeply committed to a program of vigorous communication. In that sense I will be following in Karen's footsteps, and I think my entire career of 40 years in communications is background for that, sir.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you very much, Mr. Glassman.

Mr. Kramer, I'd like to just ask you a question about Russia as we just touched on it briefly when we met. I'm concerned, as I'm sure you are, by the significant weakening we've seen in Russia's democratic institutions. Promoting the rule of law and strengthening democratic institutions are an important part of United States foreign policy and we cannot afford to see Russian democracy backslide.

I'd be interested to hear what you've done in your current position to address this backsliding and, should you be nominated, how would you promote democracy and the rule of law in Russia?

Mr. KRAMER. Senator, thank you very much for the question. It is an issue that has occupied me both in my service in Government and before I joined the Government, working in the think-tank community. I would note that while working at the Carnegie Endowment in the 1990s I played a key role in setting up the first independent think tank in Moscow, the Carnegie Moscow Center, which continues to this day as a vibrant institution of free expression.

In my Government service, have tried to draw attention, particularly when the Chechen War flared up again in 1999, to the plight of Chechens and what was happening there. In my current capacity as Deputy Assistant Secretary responsible for Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova, I've also been outspoken on the problems that you've identified—the backsliding and the internal situation in Russia—even to the point where my public criticism of last December's Duma election earned me a condemnation from the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

My intent is not simply to speak out from on high, but to actually try to make a difference. I think we have to be realistic about our ability to influence the situation in Russia these days. It's a different Russia than what we saw emerge from the initial period of the breakup of the Soviet Union, but it doesn't mean that we give up and let Russia continue without drawing attention to the democratic backsliding that you've identified. So Russia will remain a key challenge for us as we continue to try to address the problems there.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you.

Finally, as we discussed briefly yesterday, there are many countries across sub-Saharan Africa that require assistance in consolidating recent democratic gains. A good example is Nigeria, which is an important United States ally and a leader on the continent. But the last Presidential election there was the latest in a line of troubled elections, with this most recent one heavily, if not completely, rigged in favor of the ruling party. More recently, the Nigerian President has deposed the head of the country's anticorruption commission, undermining a previous commitment to fight corruption that plagues this resource-rich country.

So although the administration has certainly paid lip service to democracy and good government in both cases, the State Department's response to these inexcusable actions was, in my view, seemingly little more than a slap on the wrist and then back to business.

If confirmed, how would you in your role as head of DRL seek to address the significant discrepancies between our government's actions and words?

Mr. KRAMER. Senator, I greatly appreciate your involvement and interest in matters dealing with Africa. It is a continent of enormous importance to the United States. If confirmed in this new position, I pledge to you a great deal of attention will be focused on Africa by me and by the bureau.

I also am aware of the letter you sent to Secretary Rice drawing attention to the concerns you have with the situation in Nigeria. I know when the Nigerian President came for meetings and met with President Bush that concerns were raised at the highest levels. Certainly the issues that need to be addressed include corruption, the problems facing democratic institutions, and the ability for people to associate in opposition parties.

I would also just add that countries don't deserve a pass just because they may be important because of energy resources or because they may contribute to peacekeeping operations. Nigeria is very important on both scores, but that doesn't mean that Nigeria or any other country, for that matter, should earn a pass when it comes to being held up to democratic standards.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Bill NELSON. Mr. Kramer, is Putin the next czar of Russia?

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the question of where Mr. Putin is going has perhaps been clarified by his statement saying he would be willing to serve as prime minister following the March 2 election. The expectation, and I think it seems more and more clear, that Dmitri Medvedev will be Russia's next president. His standings are above 80 percent and given the difficulties of registering opposition candidates, the way seems fairly paved for Mr. Medvedev to become president.

Mr. Putin has said on numerous occasions in the past that he would not stay as president. He now does in fact seem to be living up to that. But I think, in responding to Senator Feingold's question, we have seen significant rollback on democratic progress in Russia in the centralization of power, the elimination of gubernatorial elections, the crackdown on NGOs, the harassment of journalists, even the murder of several journalists, including Paul Klebnikof, an American citizen. All of these things point to disturbing trends in Russia and President Putin has been President during that time.

It is my hope, whether from my current position or if confirmed as Assistant Secretary for the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, that we would be able to engage in a productive and effective and serious way with new Russian leadership on how to get Russia back on the right democratic path.

Senator Bill NELSON. As prime minister, do you think he will be the power behind the throne?

Mr. KRAMER. Now you're asking me to look into my Kremlin crystal ball, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Bill NELSON. I'm asking your opinion.

Mr. KRAMER. Indeed. I would say, and President Putin has said himself, that he plans to remain an influential figure in Russian politics. I would not question that statement in the least. I think that will remain the case.

Senator Bill NELSON. Tell me what you think about human rights in Cuba.

Mr. KRAMER. Cuba stands out in the Western Hemisphere. There are other countries in the hemisphere that have their problems, but Cuba has for decades. Our policy, the U.S. focus, has been on getting ready for the post-Castro transition. We've been ready for quite a while, but the day is getting closer. So we want to help forces in Cuba that are fighting for democracy, for respect for human rights, for release of political prisoners.

If confirmed in this new position I would work very closely with colleagues, through the inter-agency process, to make sure we are ready to help Cuba once it reaches that phase.

Senator Bill NELSON. Waiting until that point or acting now?

Mr. KRAMER. Acting now.

Senator Bill NELSON. Doing what now?

Mr. KRAMER. Providing the necessary support for NGOs, speaking out when there are human rights abuses and transgressions against democratic freedoms, and also trying to reach out to support democratic groups for when that day comes.

Senator Bill NELSON. Do you support humanitarian assistance to family members in Cuba?

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I would. Humanitarian assistance would fall beyond the purview of the Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau, but whenever humanitarian assistance is needed that appeals to the hearts of the American people. So my instinct would be to provide humanitarian support wherever it's needed.

Senator Bill NELSON. How do you grade the new president of Nigeria and his record of human rights?

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the problems in Nigeria are serious—human rights abuses and corruption, the lack of ability of people to speak out and to organize in opposition parties. When the Nigerian president came to Washington last December, these issues were raised. So it is my intention if confirmed in the new position to continue a dialog.

We want to see Nigeria succeed. It's critically important, given Nigeria's place in Africa and, frankly, on the global scene that Nigeria become a success story. So we want to do what we can to help Nigeria develop in a more democratic fashion.

Senator Bill NELSON. It's ironic that some of our best international friends are also some of the greatest abusers of human rights, and yet we support these allies for other reasons. So tell the committee, how do we strike the balance between the security interest and seeing that our commitment toward human rights is adhered to in those countries?

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, that's a key question that you've asked. My approach, if given the opportunity to serve as assistant secretary, would be to avoid tradeoffs and even avoid trying to balance things. My approach would be to try to push on all cylinders on all issues. Security interests, economic interests, democratic in-

terests all work for the same ultimate goal, which is promoting a more secure, stable, democratic global community.

So, while some issues may rise on the priority list given certain exigencies, it would be my goal to try to push countries to become more democratic, not in a lecturing or hectoring way, but in a way that tries to demonstrate to them it is in their own interest to do so. Countries that crack down on opposition forces or on religious minority groups run the risk of producing the very kinds of extremist activities that we don't want to see. So to me these interests go hand in hand. If given the opportunity, it would be my goal to push and work very closely with my colleagues in the regional bureaus in the State Department, as well as in the inter-agency process.

In my current capacity, I am coming from a regional bureau so I bring that experience. I can work to make sure that the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor has the same relationship with all the bureaus in the State Department.

Senator Bill NELSON. What would you do differently than the previous assistant secretaries?

Mr. KRAMER. If confirmed, I would inherit a bureau that is in extremely good shape, and if confirmed, I thank my predecessors, Lorne Craner, Glen Davies, Mike Kozak, and Barry Lowenkron of course, and old dear friend of mine. They have positioned the bureau to become an effective vehicle for providing money to those in need, to support NGOs who are promoting democratic activities.

Barry Lowenkron, the immediate predecessor, has left a bureau that's in very good shape. Perhaps I would speak out a little more publicly on some issues, but I think Barry also has a very strong and proud record on that. I'm not known in the State Department as a shy person and, if confirmed, I don't plan to become shy in this new job.

Senator Bill NELSON. Well, kudos to you on that. Other than speaking out publicly, any other changes?

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, if confirmed in this job, I would have less than a year, and I think it would probably be not the wisest thing for me to do to try to turn the bureau upside down. I also don't feel there's a need to do so. My interests would be to ensure that focus on democracy, human rights, and labor rights remain an issue for the next presidency, the next administration. To me, support for democracy and human rights, freedom, liberty, justice, labor rights, those issues transcend politics. There's bipartisan support for that. And so I'd want to ensure that the bureau would be in the best shape possible for the next team, and also make sure we focus on some of the crises right now that we're looking at, whether it's in Darfur, focusing on the issue of Burma, dealing with problems in Belarus or Zimbabwe or Cuba, as you mentioned, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Bill NELSON. Will you cooperate with your successor?

Mr. KRAMER. Absolutely.

Senator Bill NELSON. Regardless of party?

Mr. KRAMER. Yes, sir.

Senator Bill NELSON. Do you have a history of that?

Mr. KRAMER. I've only been serving in the Government since the start of the Bush administration, but I certainly had extensive contacts and dealings with people in the Clinton administration when

I worked in the think-tank community, and many of those friendships and relationships have carried over into the current administration.

Senator Bill NELSON. Well, tell me what you think about the United Nations human rights organizations?

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, you raise a very important point here. The Human Rights Council has been a serious disappointment. Its predecessor was not a great organization and the current institution is not a good one either. When you have countries like Saudi Arabia and China and Russia on the commission, that's a problem.

We work with other U.N. mechanisms, the third committee, as it's called, in trying to bring attention to problems, whether it's in Belarus or in Cuba. I will say that the Human Rights Commission did draw attention to the problem in Sudan last fall. But there has been an extremely unhealthy focus on Israel in the current Human Rights Council.

So we try to work with it, make the best of it. We're not a voting member, as you know. We also look to the possibility when universal periodic reviews start in a few months to use that as a mechanism to focus some attention where it so far has not occurred.

Senator Bill NELSON. What do you think it takes to stop them being an Israel-bashing club?

Mr. KRAMER. A sense of shame. They seem to focus on Israel to an unhealthy degree, while overlooking problems elsewhere in the world. I would hope that there would be a greater sense of balance brought to the agenda of the HRC. So far, alas, I have not seen that.

Senator Bill NELSON. If we make some progress in the settlement in a two-stage solution, should that help?

Mr. KRAMER. I would hope that would contribute to a more productive HRC, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure it will, but certainly that would be a positive step in and of itself, regardless of the impact it may have on the Human Rights Commission.

Senator Bill NELSON. Who do you think in the State Department or elsewhere ought to make the decision about whether or not the United States would join the Human Rights Council?

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, that would be a matter decided at the highest levels of our building, I'm sure in full consultation with our colleagues at the NSC and the White House. I think we have not been hindered by the decision not to be a full voting member. We have participated in informal meetings as well as formal meetings. We have an opportunity to speak out in those.

So it's my intent, Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, to continue to do what we can while recognizing that we're dealing with an institution that does not have a good track record at all.

Senator Bill NELSON. Do you recall who was the most recent country to be put on the council?

Mr. KRAMER. I don't, Mr. Chairman. I'd be happy to get back to you on that. I apologize; I don't have that answer.

Senator Bill NELSON. No, I should have that answer, and maybe we'll have it here in a minute.

Last November, the Secretary of Defense made a very insightful statement, Mr. Glassman. Secretary Gates said, quote, that "The U.S. is miserable at communicating to the rest of the world what we are about as a society and a culture, about freedom and democracy, about our policies and our goals. It's just plain embarrassing that al Qaeda is better at communicating its message on the Internet than America." End of quote.

Do you agree with that assessment?

Mr. GLASSMAN. I think that assessment's a little on the extreme side, but I generally agree with its spirit. I think there's an important history here, which is that in the 1990s this country unilaterally disarmed [our public diplomacy apparatus], for reasons that I think were understandable. We had won the cold war, so why did we need the greatest public diplomacy apparatus in the world any more? And we got a rude awakening 6 years ago, and since then we have been rebuilding [our public diplomacy apparatus].

I think that absolutely in the last 2 years that there is a new spirit and I think a successful beginning at rebuilding that apparatus so that it can do the kinds of things that Secretary Gates and I myself and many others want it to do is underway.

Senator Bill NELSON. Well, this is January and that was 2 months ago that the Secretary of Defense said that. You think that it's been fixed. What else would you do to fix it?

Mr. GLASSMAN. I think it's on the way to being fixed. What else would I do? Well, in many parts of the Government, including the Department of Defense, including the intelligence community, there is an effort under way in ideological engagement or the war of ideas. That effort, however, is not coordinated and it is not led to the degree that it should be. The President has given the lead to the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs and my main focus will be to lead the war of ideas.

So it's not just a matter of getting the right words or the right messages. It's a matter of leadership and getting that out, and I think if I'm confirmed in the year that I have that will be my focus.

Senator Bill NELSON. Well, let me tell you one thing that Secretary Gates said ought to fix it. When he made that statement, he called for increased funding for the foreign affairs budget and diplomacy. Do you support that suggestion?

Mr. GLASSMAN. In the past 5 years the budget for Education and Cultural Affairs has doubled, and I think that is an excellent indication of the concern that the Congress and the administration have.

My general feeling is this, and I certainly expressed it when I was on the Djerjian group. Resources are important, absolutely; no doubt about that. But we need the leadership and the structure to put those resources to work properly. I think we're there now. I don't think we were there 4 years ago or maybe even 2 years ago. Absolutely the Department of Defense has a great deal of resources and they're spending some of their resources, and certainly they have a great deal more resources than the Department of State.

Senator Bill NELSON. So when I see Secretary Gates next week, do you want me to tell him that he should fund it?

Mr. GLASSMAN. No, I want you to give us his money and we'll take care of it.

Senator Bill NELSON. Well, that's what I mean. So you want the DOD to fund DOS?

Mr. GLASSMAN. No, I don't want DOD to fund DOS. However, DOD does provide some funding that is very important in the overall ideological engagement struggle, and that money is very, very useful. Let's put it that way.

Senator Bill NELSON. All right, we'll leave it that way. But I'm going to ask him to talk to you.

Mr. GLASSMAN. Absolutely.

Senator Bill NELSON. Because he's torqued up about this.

Mr. GLASSMAN. Absolutely. I want to talk to him. I've read his Landham Lecture that you referred to at Kansas State University last November. I thought it was an excellent speech. He extolled soft power. I agree with that. He also understands the roles that the different parts of government have. He knows that the State Department has been given the lead in the war of ideas, and there may be some concern at DOD, in the intelligence community, and in other areas of government, about the commitment to the war of ideas by the State Department. I can tell you that if I'm confirmed there won't have to be any doubts about that, and I want to work very closely with DOD and the other participants. I've already spent the 6 weeks since my nomination talking to many of the key players in that area.

Senator Bill NELSON. The Pew Charitable Trust did a survey between 2002 and 2007. They found that favorable views of the United States fell and fell considerably. For example, in Germany—this is from 2002 to 2007—fell from 60 percent to 30 percent; in Indonesia, fell from 61 to 29; in Turkey fell from 30 to 9; and in Egypt three out of four Egyptians and Turks and Palestinians all express unfavorable opinions of the United States.

Now, you say that what has happened in the past couple of years has improved, but that being a difference over that 5-year period of 2002 to 2007, what are you going to do to try to change that?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Favorable views of the United States are tremendously important. Our job in public diplomacy is to help achieve the goals, the national interest goals of the United States of America, and that's a lot easier to do if people are favorably disposed to us. Now, I don't know if it's a question of liking us or loving us. It's more trust and respect. You're absolutely right, Senator. Those numbers are disturbing.

A lot of the numbers are quite unstable. You know, we've seen, for example—I'm looking at the same table—in Jordan in 2002 there was 25 percent approval for the United States. Then it dropped to 1 percent the next year. Now it's back up to 20 percent. These numbers are low, but they are somewhat unstable. It's also true that in other parts of the world, such as Africa, Latin America, parts of Europe, we do have much more favorable ratings, if you want to call them that.

Senator Bill NELSON. Would you agree that Germany definitely has fallen?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Germany has definitely fallen, as has most of Europe. Italy is still 53 percent.

Senator Bill NELSON. Okay, what can you do? You've only got a year to do this.

Mr. GLASSMAN. I think there are a number of things we can do. No. 1, as I said earlier, I think it is important that this perception that the United States doesn't care or does not take into account the views of people of other nations really needs to be dispelled or worked on. I think there are a lot of ways we can do that and show that we're listening more. So that's No. 1.

No. 2, we have got to fight back against the lies that are being told about us. That is more in the Arab and Muslim world. That's not so much in Europe. But there are a lot of misconceptions in Europe as well.

Finally, there's the policy question. If you look at the Europe numbers, you see that they took a dive when the Iraq war began. They don't like the Iraq war. I'm not telling you anything you don't know. But policies come, policies go. I support the administration's policy in Iraq. Lots of people in Europe clearly do not. We need to explain those policies better, but we also have to understand that people will disagree with our policies.

Let me just give you one example from another Pew survey. In May Pew looked at Muslim Americans, especially at foreign-born Muslim Americans. Here's what they found. Muslim Americans do not like the Iraq war by a 6-to-1 or seen to one margin. There is huge opposition to the war, compared at the time to about 50-50 view within the United States. However, Muslim Americans completely support American values, American principles. A majority of them are optimistic about the settlement of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. They are ideal citizens.

That seems to me to be the paradigm that we need to go for throughout the rest of the world. People will disagree with our policies and we should never set policies based simply on global public opinion. But people need to understand what those policies are and also have the kind of feelings about American principles that Muslim Americans have. That should be our goal.

Senator Bill NELSON. The war aside, what new tools would you use to improve our image in the Muslim world?

Mr. GLASSMAN. I think that a lot of the new tools have to be through technology. As Secretary Gates said, to some extent our enemies are—and this is my term—eating our lunch when it comes to getting their word out on the Internet. But we are coming back and we are coming back forcefully. The digital outreach team that I talked about earlier, where actually we are, as far as we can tell, the only government that's actually participating in blogging, is going online and saying, here's the truth, we're pushing back. We need to do that more and more.

YouTube is being used at the Broadcasting Board of Governors. We're using more and more of the tools that exist on the Internet to get our word across. That will be a major focus of my attention, as well as, if I'm confirmed, as well as if she is confirmed, Goli Ameri's attention, because both of us have a background in the Internet and in telecommunications.

Senator Bill NELSON. One of the problems that this Senator sees is that a bastardized version of Islam is being promoted by folks like al Qaeda. What should we do to show that for what it is?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Senator, that's a tremendously important question and it raises a difficult problem. The ideology of al Qaeda is

based on a distorted view of a religion, and it's very difficult for us as Americans or as non-Muslims to say to them or to their followers, you know, this is what the Koran really says, it's not what you say it says. We're not particularly credible in that sphere.

It's important to have credible Muslim voices. I believe that is an area that we need to do better in, in encouraging Muslim voices to step forward and say exactly what you're saying, that [al-Qaeda has] built an ideology—which is a violent and vicious ideology—on top of a religion that is not like that at all.

Senator Bill NELSON. So have we identified one of your new tools?

Mr. GLASSMAN. That is definitely a tool, absolutely.

Senator Bill NELSON. All right, tell me about Cuba? How are you going to increase communication with Cuba?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Our major means of communication with Cuba is through what's being done at Radio Marti and TV Marti. I'm proud to say that this is a major—and as far as we can tell, successful—effort of the Broadcasting Board of Governors. We are beaming into Cuba through shortwave, through medium wave, and by television, now 6 hours a day, the truth about not only what the rest of the world is saying and the United States is saying about Cuba, but what's going on within that island itself, because the people who live there have no way of finding out what the truth is.

So we're doing that and we're doing it very vigorously. I think that's the most important thing we can be doing.

Senator Bill NELSON. What do you think about the visits of family members as a means of communication?

Mr. GLASSMAN. I have to say, Senator, that this is not an area of knowledge that I have, and I will look into that certainly. But I'm really not up to date on exactly what the policies are in that regard.

Senator Bill NELSON. Do you think that TV Marti gets through?

Mr. GLASSMAN. As far as we can tell, TV Marti definitely gets through. We can't do the kind of research that obviously we can do in many other parts of the world. We gather as extensive research as we possibly can from people who have left Cuba, from help that we have within Cuba, and we have anecdotal evidence that people are watching TV Marti. As I think you know, one of the first things that I did when I became chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors was to go down to Key West and see our operation there, which is quite impressive. We put up a plane that is able to beam signals from United States waters into Cuba much more effectively than previous means, and we believe that people are watching.

Senator Bill NELSON. How frequently does that plane fly?

Mr. GLASSMAN. The plane flies, I believe, every night. There may be one day that it doesn't fly. I'm not sure. But I think it's every night, from 6 to 11 p.m., or maybe 6 p.m. to midnight. I've been in the plane although I haven't been up in it. You know, people in corporate life like to brag about their G4s and G5s. This is a G1. This is the first Gulfstream. It's a two-engine plane. It's a very impressive operation, done very much on a shoestring.

Senator Bill NELSON. Well, at least it's not a Piper Cub.

Mr. GLASSMAN. No, at least it's not a Piper Cub. It's a very well equipped and very well maintained plane and, from what we can tell, it's effective.

Senator Bill NELSON. I wish you would provide for the committee, please, the frequency of the flight and the estimate of the degree of penetration, along with the hours of broadcast, the estimate of the penetration, because that's been the problem on the TV Marti in the past, is ability to penetrate his jamming.

Senator LUGAR.

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Chairman, I have two short questions for Mr. Kramer.

Senator Coleman of our committee has visited with me specifically about the decision of Canada not to send representation to the Second World Conference on Racism, which is now scheduled for 2009, to be held in Durbin, South Africa. We note that the United States cast the lone "no" vote against the latest proposed United Nations budget, specifically because it included costs for the 2009 Durbin conference.

Obviously, the Durbin conference in 2001 failed to live up to its potential. The United States walked out. I'm just simply curious. Canada has already decided not to attend. We apparently have not made that decision at this point, although we walked out of the last one.

What is your overview of the Durbin conference, the 2009 affair?

Mr. KRAMER. Senator, I appreciate your flagging this issue. As you rightly point out, there were huge problems with the first Durbin conference, to the point where we certainly made the right decision in walking out. From what I understand so far, we have similar concerns about how the second one is shaping up and certainly, if confirmed, would take a very close look at this issue and the question of attendance and would be happy to discuss this matter further with you at the appropriate time.

Senator LUGAR. Well, good. It would be good to keep the committee informed, because questions will be raised, for obvious reasons, given the previous experience and our vote on the U.N. budget.

My second question concerns legislation that I offered a while back, which has passed, fortunately, to establish the Center for International Media Assessment, CIMA, as a part of the National Endowment for Democracy. Your Department, the Department of Human Rights and Labor, made a grant to CIMA, and they have had I think very good success during the past year, and have reported to all stakeholders on their remarkable results.

So I am hopeful as another grant request comes from CIMA to your Department that you would give it high priority in terms of consideration. It appears to me, having witnessed some of the meetings, press conferences, and what have you, that they have done a good job on behalf of their mission in terms of public diplomacy.

Mr. KRAMER. Senator, I appreciate your raising this issue and I think as of now I wouldn't be in much of a position to give you a response, but certainly if confirmed on the job would pledge to you to give this very serious consideration.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Bill NELSON. Yes, sir. Thank you, Senator Lugar.

Ms. Ameri, in this fiscal year, Congress is providing a little over a half a billion dollars for exchanges, and that was an increase of some \$75 million in the last 2 years. How much of that money would you like to see for educational and cultural exchanges for next year, 2009?

Ms. AMERI. Senator, are you asking what is the increase that we'd like to see?

Senator Bill NELSON. In the past 2 years we've had a 17 percent increase.

Ms. AMERI. Right.

Senator Bill NELSON. Now, of that total amount of money for exchanges, how much of it would you like to see go into educational programs?

Ms. AMERI. Right now, Senator, in the 2008 budget, which is about \$501 million if I remember correctly, about \$280 million is spent on academic programs, of which the majority is Fulbright. What I would like to see happen more this year, Senator Nelson—and that's why I brought the help and support of the private sector in—is for us to be able to increase our sponsorship and activities in these very successful micro-access scholarship in the English language programs that we have overseas, especially in the Muslim world.

The evaluation of ECA clearly shows that that's a program that moves the needle. So I want to make sure that we put a tremendous amount of emphasis on that. Of course, you know our international visitor leadership program, the ECA's international visitor leadership program, is incredibly successful. And as you very well know, as Senator Lugar mentioned at the beginning of the hearing, over 270 heads of state, current or former heads of state, have been a part of that program, including Hamid Karzai, Tony Blair—you're aware of the names—and about 1500 cabinet-level ministers. Forty-four alumni of this Department are Nobel Prize winners.

So we need to make sure that that's an area that we focus on as well. That's why I brought up the topic of getting more help and support from the private sector to make sure that we can really create a certain level of mass in these activities.

Senator Bill NELSON. How would that work, over and above the Federal money?

Ms. AMERI. Well, if confirmed, Senator, I've given a bit of thought to this issue and we've had some discussions with Jim Glassman—we would like to be able to reach out to the private sector, to corporate America, to other NGOs, possibly to the U.S. Chamber. These are all preliminary thoughts, Senator. We haven't done any of those right now. Possibly to the rotaries and to local organizations. The Rotary Club, for example, already sponsors some exchange programs. We'd like to really—I'd like for us to really go all out and to reach out to a large segment of the private sector and potentially bring them together in a summit to be able to announce a significant program by which the private sector becomes involved in a big way in all our exchange and English language activities.

In addition, Senator, one of the ideas that I have—and I certainly welcome the committee's feedback on this—is getting some of the private sector involved overseas. For example, with our Fulbright programs right now the governments provide 40 percent of our contribution to these programs. That's one of the reasons that our Fulbright programs are as successful as they are.

In my conversations with some private sector individuals, particularly in the Arab world—these are folks that are doing a lot for their communities right now. They've done well in life. The majority of them have been educated in the United States. They understand that spirit of philanthropy that is so prevalent in this country and they like to do more of that. And they are interested in Fulbright, and they are interested in the English language.

So one of my ideas, with feedback from you, of course, and making sure that we follow all the rules and regulations that we need to, is to reach out to them and to see if we can make a partner with them as well.

Senator Bill NELSON. Now, one of the problems with some of these exchanges is that there's been a lot more of the exchanges with European and Asian countries and less so with Africa, the Middle East, various Muslim countries. Tell me what you think that we can do about that? You mentioned you want to reach out to the Muslim world.

Ms. AMERI. Absolutely, Senator. That's definitely another one of the top items on my agenda. Let me just tell you a little bit about what ECA has done up to now with the Muslim world. We have more than 700 students from the Muslim world, high school students, that are in the United States today and are staying with wonderful, generous host families here. Our Fulbright scholarships have tripled in the last few years. Pakistan, for example, is one of our largest programs. The Government of Turkey has doubled their sponsorship of our Fulbright scholars.

Our international visitors have increased from the Muslim world. In fact, I had the privilege to meet with four Muslim scholars/leaders from Africa. When I was in Oregon, I served on the board of trustees of the World Affairs Council of Oregon. They were very interested in Islam in America and they were interested in learning more about the whole electoral process in America. I guess I was sort of a natural candidate for them to meet with.

I tell you, after that meeting was over, that was a good meeting. I had a much better understanding of some of the issues that they brought up. To them, it was just amazing that a person of Iranian heritage, of Islamic heritage, can—has been able to accomplish what this country has allowed me to accomplish in this country. So we sort of had a moment of enlightenment on both our parts.

These are very powerful programs. But clearly we need to do even more in Islamic countries. I think you asked some very good questions from my colleague, Jim Glassman. One of the issues that I see, Senator, is that the American people are a very humble people. Despite the great accomplishments of this country, we are not very good at talking about the wonderful things that this country does for the rest of the world. I think we need to talk a little bit more about that.

I think my nomination in itself, Senator, sends a tremendous message to the rest of the world about the level of tolerance and open-mindedness that exists in this country. We need to take advantage of this. We need to talk to the rest of the world about this, especially to the Islamic world.

Senator Bill NELSON. Well, and that's why I ask about the Islamic world. You're only going to have a year, so what can you do about it, to rev it up, to increase these, what has been imbalanced in the past?

Ms. AMERI. You know, Senator, I'm actually painfully aware of the fact that I only have 11 months to do the job that I want to do. So clearly, as Jim said, one of the first things that we need to do is to build upon the successful programs that we already have. Our English access micro-scholarship programs work. It moves the needle. I gave you some statistics at the beginning. Close to 90 percent of the participants, their attitude changes about the United States.

If we want to increase that, we have to create mass. The way we create mass is to bring in partners, so private sector is one important thing.

We need more technology. We live in the Internet age and, as Jim said, both he and I have a technology background. We need to bring our activities into the 21st century. We need to be able to get more on YouTube. Jim and I have talked on a very preliminary basis on how can we put some of our English language programs for free on the Internet. This is just in the talk phase. I don't really know about the logistics yet. But it's a program that worked, that moves the needle, that changes values. We need to do that.

My goal is to reach out more to the Muslim American community because I know they are our best friends. Just like Jim said, they understand and like and admire American values. We need to get more of them to go overseas. We need to reach out more to our alumni, which are our very good friends, because these folks have understood what's happening.

If I may, Senator, just to give you a very brief anecdote here. I had the opportunity to meet with a couple of our Fulbright teaching language folks that have been brought here, about 300 of them. These were Iranians. One of them teaches at Emory, the other one teaches at Portland State University. I had an opportunity to meet with both of them, and one of them was this wonderful young lady, practicing Muslim, fashionably dressed, who clearly did not have a lot of information about the United States, and here she was in Portland, OR, teaching Farsi at Portland State.

I wish you were there, Senator, and heard the things that she was saying. She has seen nothing but kindness and graciousness from her American hosts. She's blown away by our election process. She loves what she's learning. Needless to say, it's been a life-altering experience for her.

I know it's been the other way around as well, because her colleagues, her students, the people around her, are seeing this young Islamic woman that is very different from the image that they see from al Qaeda.

So these exchanges work. We just need to find a mechanism to make more of them happen.

Senator Bill NELSON. Well, one of the problems you're going to encounter is that there are 63 separate entities that run these exchange and training programs and there are 243 of them. Now, I don't expect you to have an answer for that now. But since you only have a little less than a year, would you try to get your arms around that?

Ms. AMERI. Senator, are you referring to the private sector entities or are you referring to the different programs at the bureau?

Senator Bill NELSON. The different programs at the bureau, the U.S. Government.

Ms. AMERI. Right. In fact, Senator, that's an excellent question. Indeed there are 60 different programs at the bureau, and I have asked that question as well. The thing that I know is that clearly the bureau reaches out to a very diverse audience. That's a fact. Having said that, and coming from the private sector, Senator, I'm very focused on making sure that we only commit resources to programs that move the needle. You have my commitment that that will be an important item on my agenda.

Senator Bill NELSON. Thank you.

Ms. AMERI. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Bill NELSON. Mr. Kramer, just to complete that question of the recent appointees, paragons of virtue and human rights such as Bolivia and Nicaragua are recent appointees to the U.N. Human Rights Council.

Senator Menendez.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me welcome you all. I want to start off with Mr. Glassman. First of all, I want to acknowledge your service on the board of governors, the Broadcasting Board of Governors. I do believe, in response to the chairman's questions on Cuba, I think we have made progress on using a process that penetrates into giving the Cuban people an opportunity for an outlet to the rest of the world, and I want to salute you on the work that's been done in that regard.

I want to raise the concern—this past December, Senator Reid—the Majority Leader—I, and a few other Members took a trip to Latin America, including some countries that in fact had not received delegations from the Senate in the past. One of the things that we heard in the five countries that we visited overwhelmingly was the incredulousness of the leaders of those countries as to how difficult it is to have students from Latin America come to the United States, particularly when Cuba invites their students to come in very significant numbers to study, when Chavez is doing the same thing.

It is a tremendous challenge to us in a hemisphere in which we have invested so much money and effort in Central America, to now see many countries moving in the opposite direction, where they do not believe that democracy brings good things to life.

I had been enthused when I read the President's comments in March of last year about the Partnership for Latin American Youth. However, I am disappointed in having information that basically says that that wasn't submitted for funding and therefore we are doing relatively very little in that regard. The goal was to have \$75 million for 5,000 Latin American young people to improve their English and study in the United States.

If you are approved by the committee and by the Senate, confirmed by the Senate, will you be an advocate within the administration to try to move some of our resources to ensure that the President's own initiative becomes a priority and making sure that we see more Latin American youth come to the United States?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Thank you, Senator Menendez. You know, one thing that I want to say to everyone on this committee is that we've been concentrating on the Arab and Muslim world to a great degree, but we can't forget our own backyard. I'm very happy that you brought this issue up.

I also thank you for the kind words about broadcasting into Cuba. We're also broadcasting through Voice of America 40 hours a week into Latin America in general, and we are doing our darnedest to get into Venezuela. We are broadcasting in Venezuela, but it's an extremely difficult environment, as you can imagine, including television.

As for your question about the Partnership for Latin American Youth, I have taken a look at the initiative and I know the President's commitment to it, and it appears to be exactly the kind of thing that we should be doing. I will do my best to get this program rolling. We already have, I've been told, the initial funding for fiscal 2008. If I'm confirmed, this is definitely the kind of thing that we should be doing and that I will dedicate myself to.

I can also tell you probably more broadly that if I'm confirmed I will look at the regional allocations of all of our public diplomacy money. I realize that it's possible that this is a job that if I'm confirmed I'll only have for 11 months to do, but we're going to hit the ground running and this is what we have to do. Job one is to make sure the money is being allocated to the right places and also, as Goli Ameri said, to make sure that we apply a "culture of measurement"—my mantra when I was on the Djerijian group, to every program that we have and only use and focus the resources on the ones that work.

But Latin America has been a focus of attention certainly in the past year of this administration. The President took a five-country trip there with the First Lady. We had the naval hospital ship COMFORT in Latin America. We are doing our best on exchanges.

The visa situation is difficult. I'm happy to say, though, that this year, the academic year 2007–2008, we will almost certainly set a record of 600,000 foreign students coming to the United States to learn. Education is our best brand.

Senator MENENDEZ. Well, let me follow up on your answer. First of all, I would urge you, when we speak about Latin America in the future as part of public diplomacy, I like to think of it as our front yard, not as our backyard, and you might want to consider that phrasing.

But the bottom line is, you know, our problem is there's a difference between words and actions. That's our problem in Latin America. We have seen an occasional blip on the radar screen over the last 7 years about some words, but we haven't seen a hell of a lot of action outside of narcotics interdiction, which is important, and some trade agreements, which are important. But when you only deal with Latin Americans in that context, you run a great

risk of having them believe that they are marginalized to those issues.

So therefore it is nice to have the COMFORT down there, but it almost seems like we're chasing Cuban doctors at the end of the day. What is real, what will be real, is if the President's words are matched with action. So when we talked about \$75 million over 3 years, that would have been approximately \$25 million a year or so. The reality is from the information that we finally received from the Department we're talking about that, since this wasn't pursued as part of the 2008 fiscal year budget request, that there may be the moving of some money around.

I hope, even though you have a short period of time, that we can begin to move on the road in which Latin Americans understand that we are fully engaged with them. This is probably—of all those things those presidents said, that they could have said to us in terms of our engagement with them, it's interesting that so many of them raised the issue of having their students be able to come to the United States. So I hope you'll be a strong advocate of that.

We have challenges in this hemisphere—Venezuela, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Ecuador, just to name a few. So while I know we are engaged in the rest of the world, here in our own front yard we have a real challenge.

I appreciate both your comments and Ms. Ameri's comments about the Internet and that is very important. But there is no substitution for person to person, people to people engagement. The reality is that's why members of the Congress seek to visit both leaders and civil society in other parts of the world. We could have teleconferences, but we in fact seek to engage people in a direct context. So while that's a good dimension, I don't want to undercut the very essence of what I hope will be more people to people diplomacy as a critical soft power tool of the United States, and I hope that you will be a strong advocate, as well as Ms. Ameri will be a strong advocate, in that respect.

Let me ask you an overarching question, if I may, about public diplomacy, in general. It seems to me that to a certain extent there's a simple fundamental question in almost any discussion of public diplomacy. Put simply, do we put a priority on developing a following for the United States or do we tell it like it is? In effect, do we broadcast what people want to hear or what they need to hear? Are we in fact honest in our engagements with others in the world or are we willing to move from that direct honesty on both what our positions are and our expectations are and therefore move from there?

I'm wondering, how is it that you view it in terms of public diplomacy and how would you—well, let me start there. How do you view it?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Well, that's an excellent question, Senator.

Senator MENENDEZ. I'm waiting for an excellent answer.

Mr. GLASSMAN. You'll have to judge the excellence.

The answer is that we have to be honest. We live in a world in which people are very sophisticated. They have numerous sources of information. If we tell them lies they're going to figure that out pretty quickly.

You know, Edward R. Murrow famously said when he was the head of USIA: "The news may be good, the news may be bad; we shall tell you the truth." That has been the watchword of the Broadcasting Board of Governors. We don't do propaganda. We're not allowed to do propaganda, but one of the reasons we don't do it is it's not particularly effective. People have more than one source of information. We can't really fool them very well.

I think part of the big problem in public diplomacy, in fact, has been that we have not aggressively enough countered the lies that our enemies have been telling. So I don't think it's a question of twisting the truth. It is a matter of being honest, but being aggressively honest, being advocates that are out there unabashedly telling our story, which is a good story.

Senator MENENDEZ. So in that respect, let's talk about a challenging part of the world for us—I think the chairman referenced it—the Middle East. Should we be talking about the need for civil society, for democratization, civil rights for women, minority groups and their rights in that society? Should we convey our views of those who support terrorism and incitement?

Mr. GLASSMAN. We should and we do. Maybe we should do more of it, but we absolutely should. We should never shrink from advancing our—they're not only our own and the global principles of democracy and freedom. We should be out there doing that.

Now, sometimes in an official diplomatic sense that becomes difficult. That may be difficult in certain circumstances. Public diplomacy is different. Public diplomacy is people to people. There's no need for us to shrink from advocacy of our own principles.

Senator MENENDEZ. So to the extent that we have, for example, in the Arab world talked about our interest in having good relationships with the Arab world, but also talking about how very often those, several of those countries are undemocratic, face autocratic regimes, and do not respond to the aspirations of the Arab street and its people, you feel we should be direct about that, as well?

Mr. GLASSMAN. I do, absolutely, in public diplomacy we should be direct. At the Broadcasting Board of Governors we had a big problem in Egypt in that we can't get a radio station to broadcast Radio Sawa, an Arabic language radio network which is quite effective. We've been doing our best to try to get that. There's no reason in the world for us to back down on that or not to support—and I was recently in Egypt—not to support people who are advocating for freedom there.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, one more line of questions, to Mr. Kramer.

I have a great interest in, as the chair of the subcommittee that deals with all of our foreign assistance, as to how effective we are about that foreign assistance. In September of 2007, the GAO issued a report that found that—and I'm going to quote from it—that "The State Department did not have an accurate picture of the number and type of staff responsible for overseeing and monitoring foreign assistance responsibilities."

The amount of money that the Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau has available to program has increased substantially

over the last several years, and since DRL provides grants, not contracts, from Washington instead of from the field, how does the Department manage these programs and ensure that they are coordinating with other parts of the U.S. Government? If you were to be confirmed, what would you do to improve the coordination with other parts of the U.S. Government, particularly USAID, in the implementation of these grants, and what would you do to improve the Department's ability to monitor these grants when they are all managed from Washington, DC?

Mr. KRAMER. Senator, thank you for raising this issue, and I am aware of the GAO report. As you rightly point out, sir, the amount of money that has been provided for the Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau has increased significantly. My sense, in talking with folks and colleagues in the bureau, is that the bureau is in a position to handle those moneys appropriately.

My hope, if confirmed, would be to ensure that the bureau is an organization that can provide money in a timely fashion, that can get money out, do it quickly, provide support to the vital work that NGOs and activists are doing. Obviously, the bureau would need to ensure proper oversight and management of the funds, and grant oversight is a major responsibility.

Coordination within the Department and with other agencies is vital. We want to avoid duplication. We want to ensure that we are covering the issues that really matter. Funds are not limitless and so we want to make sure we get the biggest bang for the buck.

As I mentioned to the chairman when he asked me, I currently work in a regional bureau in the Department, and I think the European and Eurasian Bureau is a perfect example where there is assistance money available through the assistance office in that regional bureau, but it's a bureau that also works very effectively with the Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau. I would, if confirmed, work very hard to ensure that that continues throughout the Department and maintain the EUR, the European and Eurasian Bureau, as a good example of that. We should all be working for the greater good here, and it's my view that the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor should be the bureau that many organizations go to for the necessary support they need to carry out the work they do.

Senator MENENDEZ. Well, let me just close on that and say that I understand there's no one in the bureau's chain of command that works in these embassies. So the bureau needs to rely on informal or ad hoc assistance to ensure that programs are being implemented in the best possible way. I'm not sure that that's a good way to manage what is rather complex and context-specific programs.

It seems to me that one of our challenges is making sure that your staff in Washington and any staff that helps you overseas are qualified to manage these kinds of programs. It's just like, a little bit I guess, what we do in a Senate office. We've got so many things going on that we grab the staff assistant and before you know it they're writing letters and everybody else is doing something else.

The question is, when we are talking about large amounts of money, for which there is a purpose in terms of foreign diplomacy

of the United States, that to ad hoc grab somebody at an embassy for the purposes because you have no person in your bureau who is in the line there at the embassy on the ground where these grants are being implemented—it seems to me if that's going to continue to be the case for the next year, there needs to be an alignment at least of those individuals who have within the embassy context the best expertise to be able to pursue that specific grant. I often find that isn't the case. It's something that I hope you will pay attention to should you be confirmed.

Mr. KRAMER. Senator, I certainly promise to you that, if confirmed, that is an issue I will look at very closely. To state the obvious, I would want to assure that there are no problems with oversight and monitoring of grant moneys. So I would be happy to engage with you and your staff on how that looks, if confirmed, once I would be in the job.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Bill NELSON. We want you to be successful and so we want to encourage you as you tackle this task within a short period of time. So within a few months, what I'd like is to have a visit with you personally, without staff, privately, and find out how your progress is coming along. Will you do that, Mr. Glassman?

Mr. GLASSMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator Bill NELSON. Mr. Kramer?

Mr. KRAMER. Without hesitation, sir, yes.

Senator Bill NELSON. Ms. Ameri?

Ms. AMERI. It would be a pleasure, Senator.

Senator Bill NELSON. We are going to keep the record open for 2 days so that members of this committee can submit further questions for the record, and the meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:52 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF DAVID J. KRAMER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

LABOR

Question. What is your view of the role of labor in our democracy promotion agenda? How can the Department best advance labor rights? What measures do you think are necessary, if any, to strengthen labor diplomacy?

Answer. Like any other freedoms such as association for political parties, the freedom of association for worker organizations is essential to building grassroots democracy. Supporting worker organizations is not just a matter of supporting democracy, it is a matter of human rights.

The Department of State can best advance labor rights by continuing to engage governments, worker organizations, and employers, individually and collectively, on issues such as freedom of association, prohibitions on child labor and forced labor, and the promotion of acceptable working conditions.

The Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau (DRL) already engages governments on labor rights in bilateral human rights dialogues, such as those with Vietnam and Azerbaijan, as well as in multilateral forums like the International Labor Organization. DRL also provides technical assistance to worker organizations and NGOs dealing with labor rights in countries where they can open up democratic space. DRL has consistently committed to use a portion of its Human Rights and Democracy Fund to provide this assistance to build the capacity of worker organizations to advocate for and protect their rights.

DRL's Office of International Labor and Corporate Social Responsibility engages multinational corporations in promoting the respect of labor rights throughout their

supply chain, including in operations which they outsource. DRL also engages these stakeholders collectively through multi-stakeholder dialogs that bring representatives from government, NGOs, and companies together to determine how to address specific labor issues in a country.

The Department also works through labor rights mechanisms signed in conjunction with Free Trade Agreements; trade preference programs, such as the Generalized System of Preferences; OPIC financing; and ExIm Bank financing to promote greater respect for internationally recognized worker rights.

Labor attaches have a long and distinguished record in the Foreign Service. The Department's Labor officers and other Foreign Service officers with labor responsibilities are critical to labor diplomacy. It is important that the Department has these positions at posts where labor diplomacy can most effectively contribute to the promotion of democracy and human rights. Last year, the Department undertook a review of labor-designated positions overseas, and 45 labor-designated positions were formally recognized by the Human Resources Bureau and the regional bureaus. The review also resulted in new operating procedures regarding the labor function; it formalizes the need for officers assigned to labor-designated positions to take the Foreign Service Institute's Labor officer skills course and ensures DRL a role in filling all labor-designated positions.

I noted the importance of labor rights in my statement to the committee, and at the January 30 hearing I pledged that, if confirmed, I would take an active role in the promotion of labor issues. The "L" in "DRL", after all, is just as important as the first two letters.

Question. In recent years, the Congress has repeatedly expressed concern that the Department of State does not adequately reward, train, and promote officers who chose to serve in the DRL Bureau or to otherwise place a high priority on human rights and democracy. Will you make it a priority to address these concerns? If so, how? Do you believe that there is a need for expanding Foreign Service training programs in human rights and democracy promotion tradecraft?

Answer. The Department is committed to excellence in democracy and human rights training. Improving the incentives and rewards for service in the Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau (DRL) and strengthening training in Human Rights and Democracy promotion has been a DRL priority, and I will continue to make this a priority, if confirmed.

DRL has been working with the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) on an ongoing basis. FSI has been steadily expanding the number and content of Human Rights and Democracy training modules and courses to ensure the integration of human rights, religious freedom, labor rights, democracy building, and conflict resolution into a broad range of FSI courses and seminars.

DRL is working with FSI now to increase training on grants management for program officers. Special training for Labor officers was introduced last year, in conjunction with the annual DRL Human Rights officers conference. The Department recently submitted a report to Congress on Democracy and Human Rights training. Finally, DRL has established a Democracy and Human Rights Training Working Group, along with FSI, USAID's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, and the Office of the Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, to review, assess, and recommend further strengthening of our training.

If confirmed, I will work with the Under Secretary for Democracy and Global Affairs and the Director General's office to review promotion and performance pay criteria with an eye toward increasing the incentives for Foreign Service officers to take on these challenging issues.

Question. In passing the Advance Democracy Act, Congress strongly urged the Department to work to increase the percentage of Foreign Service officers serving in the Bureau. While the civil servants in the Bureau are talented and dedicated, an effective Bureau needs a good mix of employees, including a substantial percentage of Foreign Service officers who have served abroad and are familiar with counterparts and processes in other Bureaus. Do you agree that it is an important priority to increase the number of Foreign Service officers serving in the Bureau? What steps will you take to encourage talented FSOs to serve in the DRL Bureau, if confirmed?

Answer. A good mix of Foreign Service and Civil Service officers is important for a strong and effective Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau (DRL). For the first time ever, DRL has two overseas positions, established last September and located in Baghdad. Other functional bureaus such as the Bureau of Populations, Refugees, and Migration, the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, and the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental Scientific Af-

fairs have overseas positions and this has proved to be an effective way to attract more Foreign Service officers to serve in these bureaus domestically. I expect the new overseas positions for DRL will have a similarly positive effect for the Bureau. Changing the ratio of Civil Service to Foreign Service in DRL will be a long-term effort, especially given the resource constraints under which DRL operates. Unfortunately, since the Foreign Service has a shortage of employees in relationship to the demand for positions, and the Department has critical foreign policy priorities and mandates requiring service abroad, the Department's emphasis has been on filling overseas positions.

If confirmed, I will work with the Office of the Under Secretary for Democracy and Global Affairs and the Director General's office, as well as with other bureaus, to identify additional measures to attract Foreign Service officers into the valuable work of the bureau. I want DRL to be as competitive and sought-after a bureau in the Foreign Service bidding process as any other bureau in the Department.

Question. Prison conditions in many countries around the world are far below acceptable minimum humane standards. Do you agree that this is a serious problem? If so, what will you do to insure that the Bureau places an appropriately high priority on investigating inhumane prison conditions and working to ameliorate them?

Answer. Yes, inhumane and life threatening prison conditions around the world are a serious problem. The attention of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL) to prison and detention center conditions is ongoing and is an inseparable part of U.S. efforts to promote democracy and respect for human rights.

Prison conditions are highlighted in section 1.c of the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, where DRL describes prison conditions in each country in straightforward language. In requiring this information from all posts, it is clear that many embassy officials visit prisons personally, meet with prison officials, talk with released prisoners, their families and attorneys, and consult with local and international NGOs to closely track conditions and put together a complete picture.

DRL plays an essential role in ensuring that the United States remains active on this issue bilaterally. DRL works to ensure U.S. representatives consistently encourage governments to grant access to our embassy personnel and to international experts such as the ICRC. For example, DRL last year raised the issue of prison overcrowding and poor sanitation during its Human Rights dialog with Vietnam, and urged that members of the diplomatic community be allowed the opportunity to visit prisons. Subsequently, United States political officers were able to visit two prisons in southern Vietnam. So it is important that DRL continue to raise the issue in future bilateral dialogs with Vietnam and other countries.

In multilateral fora, the United States supports the work of the Human Rights Committee and the Committee Against Torture, the treaty bodies charged with monitoring implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment of Punishment, respectively. We follow closely reports from the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention which last year visited Angola, Equatorial Guinea, and Norway.

DRL is also funding a successful program in Morocco designed to enhance the ability of the Moroccan Observatory of Prisons, a local NGO, to process and monitor prisoner complaints, raise awareness of the treatment of prisoners, and conduct advocacy on behalf of prisoner rights.

While there are other bureaus (such as the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement and the Bureau of Consular Affairs), departments (such as the Department of Justice), and organizations (such as OSCE and the Council of Europe) involved in work to improve prison conditions, DRL should remain at the forefront of U.S. efforts to promote improved prison conditions.

COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES

Question. Section 116(d) of Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 provides that the Secretary of State "shall transmit" the annual human rights report to the "Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate by February 25 of each year." The committee has been informed by the Department that it does not intend to meet this statutory deadline this year.

a) Is that in fact the case? If so, please elaborate why that is so.

b) Do you think it makes sense for the bureau charged with promoting adherence to the rule of law abroad to ignore a statutory requirement in U.S. law?

Answer. The annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices is a document important not only for the information it contains. Its value lies also in the manner in which it is presented to the press, the NGO community, and to the many world-

wide readers of the report. To have full impact, the Secretary of State in recent years personally has presented the report, followed by a press conference that is reported prominently in the local press of many diverse countries abroad. Secretary Rice believes fervently in the advancement of human rights worldwide, and she is determined to use the presentation of the report as a tool to help the United States Government achieve this goal.

The Secretary's launching of the human rights report and highlighting those cases of severe abuses, and the cases where progress has occurred serves as a powerful message to world leaders that we will not compromise on human rights to advance our other national interests, and that human rights abusers will be held to account for their actions.

The Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor takes statutory requirements very seriously and acknowledges that it would miss the statutory deadline of February 25 by delaying the rollout until March 11, the closest date possible to the statutory deadline when the Secretary will be available to preside over the rollout.

RESPONSES OF DAVID J. KRAMER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

INDONESIA

Question. I have been informed that the administration has ended prohibition on training and other assistance to Indonesia's special forces, the "Kopassus," and the Brigade Mobil (BRIMOB). These forces continue to abuse human rights and senior officials of both continue to evade justice for past crimes, as noted by the State Department's annual human rights reporting. Why has this policy changed? How can the State Department justify such cooperation with an organization whose record of abuse amounts to state sponsored terrorism directed against peaceful political dissidents and human rights advocates?

Answer. Our goal, working with the Government of Indonesia, is that United States interaction with the Indonesian military would promote the adoption of democratic norms such as greater transparency, respect for human rights, and increased civilian control of the military, as well as build capacity to address immediate threats such as terrorism and natural disasters.

As the elite units within their respective forces, KOPASSUS and BRIMOB must be part of this transformation. The Department is currently considering on what terms and how to best engage both KOPASSUS and BRIMOB, and looks forward to consulting with Congress so that we can accomplish our twin goals of advancing our human rights interests and professionalizing these key parts of the Indonesian security forces. Indonesia's human rights record has improved in recent years as the Indonesian Government has sought to reform its security forces. Reform of the security forces has been an important part of Indonesia's overall reform of the military. We share your concerns regarding ongoing challenges Indonesia faces in bringing past human rights violators to justice. The Department continues to raise accountability as an important element of our bilateral relationship.

Question. When Secretary Rice in November 2005 exercised a national security waiver to resume full military cooperation with the Indonesian military despite the absence of significant reform, she noted that future assistance would be "calibrated" on the basis of measurable reforms. Human rights groups have raised concerns that the military continues to commit abuses and are concerned that the assistance has not been "calibrated" to address the lack of reform. What criteria does the administration use in evaluating the provision of military assistance to Indonesia? What steps are in place to monitor the impact this assistance has on human rights and reform in Indonesia? What military assistance is currently being withheld because of human rights concerns?

Answer. All Indonesian soldiers now receive human rights training. In recent years, the Indonesian military has made progress in reform. The military is under greater civilian control and out of politics. However, there is still much to be done in professionalizing the Indonesian military and accounting for past abuses.

All Indonesian security forces who receive United States training are checked for allegations of past human rights abuses, in compliance with the Leahy law. Individuals with credible allegations of past human rights abuses do not receive training. In the past 3 years, the Department has denied training for 122 Indonesian applicants after finding credible allegations of past human rights abuses.

Question. I have supported greater equality for the LGBT population in the United States [and] am pleased that the State Department has taken steps to identify human rights abuses committed against the LGBT community throughout the world in its annual Human Rights Report. I am, therefore, interested in what further actions you intend to take to address violence and discrimination against LGBT communities across the globe.

Answer. Several years ago, the Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor Bureau (DRL) took the initiative to add information to its annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices regarding discrimination and violence against the LGBT community worldwide. The information in the reports has been praised by representatives from the community in meetings with DRL. At our request, in the past year, the LGBT community has compiled for DRL information from authoritative sources on discrimination and violence on a country-by-country basis. We will consult with the community as we develop more precise instructions to pass to our embassies in garnering information on this subject.

HUMAN RIGHTS GENERAL

Question. Just over a year ago, Secretary Rice reaffirmed that protecting and supporting human rights defenders is a "central component" of U.S. foreign policy and announced a set of Guiding Principles on Non-Governmental Organizations and a fund to support defenders. How have the Principles guided DRL decisions? How has the fund supported human rights defenders? What steps can the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor take to ensure that these measures have an impact on the ground and that support for human rights defenders is integrated into foreign policy more broadly?

Answer. Last year, amid crackdown on human rights and democracy NGOs and human rights activists in various parts of the world, Secretary Rice responded in several specific ways to defend these NGOs and individuals.

First, she announced 10 core NGO Principles which guide our own treatment of NGOs. We actively encourage other governments to respect these principles, which distill and complement existing U.N. and European Union documents.

Second, the Secretary established a \$1.5 million emergency fund to protecting and assisting human rights defenders who advance democracy and promote human rights, women's rights, fair labor, anticorruption, independent media and journalism, rule of law, and other issues where defense of such issues might result in personal and safety risks. The fund became operational in October 2007 and thus far has provided assistance to over 30 defenders.

DRL routinely uses the NGO Principles as a foundation for discussions with foreign governments, and indeed, President Uribe of Colombia has publicly embraced the NGO Principles. Another good example of the use of the NGO Principles took place at the last OSCE Human Dimension (HDIM) meeting in October when Acting Assistant Secretary Jonathan Farrar made an intervention on the need for NGOs to operate freely, to participate in open dialog with each other and governments, and to be recognized as an essential component of any free society.

Also in preparation of this year's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices we asked posts, in particular, to report on restrictions and/or repression of NGOs and other human rights defenders.

These principles will continue to be an important tool for the United States and other governments in measuring governmental treatment of NGOs. I also hope they will also be a useful tool for civil society groups and the media as they monitor the treatment of NGOs across the globe.

RESPONSES OF HON. GOLI AMERI TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

Question. Cultural Property Protection: On May 27, 2004, China submitted a request to the United States that we restrict the import of artifacts and archaeological materials subject to looting in China under the Cultural Property Implementation Act (CPIA). In July 2005, the State Department's Cultural Property Advisory Committee made its recommendation to Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs Dina H. Powell with regard to China's request. It is my understanding that, to date, the State Department has not made a final decision with regard to China's request. What do you consider an appropriate timeframe in which to render a final decision in cases such as these to ensure that delays within the State Department do not result in the loss of invaluable cultural material?

Answer. I have not yet had the opportunity to look into this question in detail, but I have been apprised of this matter and understand that the China request remains under review at this time.

Any issue involving the bilateral relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China is of utmost significance.

If confirmed, I will begin discussions of this matter with the relevant bureaus, including the Undersecretary for Public Diplomacy, and the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

Question. Cultural Property Protection: CPAC was created to represent a diverse group of interests, including those of museums, archaeologists, collectors, art dealers, and the general public. I have heard from a number of constituents of mine who are concerned that all of these groups were not fairly represented in the recent State Department decision to impose import restrictions on ancient coins of Cyprus. Please explain the standards your office uses to determine that the diverse group of interests have been represented during the decisionmaking process.

Answer. The Cultural Property Advisory Committee (CPAC), appointed by the White House, plays a vital role in our efforts to preserve the world's cultural heritage from pillaging and looting. The members, as you point out, represent a variety of interests. They provide their input at the outset of any consideration of a bilateral agreement so that their deliberations can inform the entire onward process.

In addition to the statutory composition of the committee and the representation it provides for diverse views, the Department has taken a number of steps over the past several years to increase the access of members of the general public to the process. These steps include sessions that allow members of the public to present their viewpoints directly to the committee and the committee staff; solicitation of written comments; advance notification of such sessions on the cultural property Web site inclusion of all such comments in the documents provided to the decision-maker, and a Web site that posts public summaries of incoming requests.

The current committee includes a member who is a coin collector and dealer and whose views were expressed and considered. Also, a public session of the CPAC was held during which the views of others concerning coins were also expressed. In addition, the Department took the extraordinary step of proactively seeking further public comment from organizations representing the coin collecting community and others representing the scholarly community.

If confirmed, I assure you I will pay close attention to this matter.

Question. Exchanges: I am a strong supporter of ECA's work and believe that education and cultural exchanges are critical to strengthening our public diplomacy programming. I would like to know your plans to increase ECA programming in the next year.

Answer. First and foremost, if confirmed, I am committed to expanding and creating scale for the many achievements of the Department's educational and cultural exchanges. My plan is to:

1. Engage and enlist the private sector more fully in our public diplomacy efforts to ascertain that we can reach a greater audience for our successful programs including, but not limited to, the English Access Microscholarship Program, Youth Exchange Programs, and programs for women.

2. Use new trends in technology and the Internet to expand the reach of ECA's programs to youth and youth influencers and to create a connected community amongst our alumni so they can sustain a dialog years after the formal end of their program.

3. Find creative ways of engaging ECA alumni and leveraging their goodwill and the knowledge and experience they gained during their exchange experience.

Other than these top three priorities, I will also be focused on the following activities:

- Encouraging more women and girls to participate in our exchange programs; and
- Exploring more opportunities for engagement with the Muslim world and with countries like Iran and North Korea (when the time is right), where we seek to better relations between our citizens. Exchanges and outreach promise lasting relationships and have such extraordinary potential for positive relationship building and mutual understanding.

I would, of course, be in close touch with you and your staff as any new program initiatives are developed and would welcome feedback from the committee.

RESPONSES OF HON. GOLI AMERI TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

Question. What are your top three priorities for this position, if confirmed? On the assumption that you may only serve until the start of the next administration, what do you hope to report to the committee next January that you have achieved during your tenure?

Answer. First and foremost, if confirmed, I am committed to expanding and creating scale for the many achievements of the Department's educational and cultural exchanges. My plan is to:

1. Engage and enlist the private sector more fully in our public diplomacy efforts to ascertain that we can reach a greater audience for our successful programs including, but not limited to, the English Access Microscholarship Program, Youth Exchange Programs, and programs for women.
2. Use new trends in technology and the Internet to expand the reach of ECA's programs to youth and youth influencers and to create a connected community amongst our alumni so they can sustain a dialog years after the formal end of their program.
3. Find creative ways of engaging ECA alumni and leveraging their goodwill and the knowledge and experience they gained during their exchange experience.

Other than these top three priorities, I will also be focused on the following activities:

- Encouraging more women and girls to participate in our exchange programs; and
- Exploring more opportunities for engagement with the Muslim world and with countries like Iran and North Korea (when the time is right), where we seek to better relations between our citizens. Exchanges and outreach promise lasting relationships and have such extraordinary potential for positive relationship building and mutual understanding.

I would, of course, be in close touch with you and your staff as any new program initiatives are developed and would welcome feedback from the committee.

Question. The Bureau has received substantial additional resources in recent years. Has the Bureau allocated sufficient resources to financial systems and grants management to assure accountability and oversight of these additional resources? Please provide specific examples.

Answer. The Bureau has allocated sufficient resources to financial and grants management systems to assure accountability and oversight over its resources. Over the past 3 years, ECA has integrated three distinct databases into a single system housed in ECA's Office of the Executive Director. The system links ECA's congressionally mandated pre-award grants process with both the budget and grants offices and allows for the effective integration with the Department's financial management system and Grants.gov. The system allows ECA staff members to more effectively monitor and manage ECA institutional grant awards through all phases of implementation and closeout. It also provides the ability to reconcile program and administrative budgets bureau-wide and provide congressional, departmental, and OMB-mandated reporting on bureau activities and expenditures.

Additionally, I understand the Bureau is building an integrated information management, analysis, and reporting capability that will track the full life-cycle of ECA programs and provide an executive/user dashboard for data retrieval and reporting. This system will then be linked to the Executive Office System so that Bureau grant, financial, and program data can be centrally monitored and reports tying resources to program activities can be more quickly and easily produced. This initiative will result in a fully Integrated Management System (IMS) for key ECA program, grant, and financial activities.

Coming from the private sector and with a strong background in technology I know what is possible and necessary to effectively manage a complex organization and budget. If confirmed, I will devote my focus and expertise to accelerate the implementation of the Bureau's internal management systems to ensure that the Bureau spends its resources wisely, effectively and with maximum impact.

Question. Do you believe there are any existing exchange programs that are unjustified, and therefore should be discontinued?

Answer. I have been pleased to learn in the last several weeks that the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) is a leader in the area of evaluation and performance measurement. ECA has an office staffed by professional evaluators and

social science researchers. It oversees independent in-depth evaluations of major exchange programs, such as Fulbright and the International Visitors Leadership Program. Coming from the private sector, this is particularly important to me.

The Bureau recently completed an evaluation of the English Access Microscholarships Program—a groundbreaking new program for high school students in underserved communities—that showed, among other findings, that:

- Eighty-seven percent of Access students reported a more favorable view of the American people due to their participation in the program;
- Ninety-six percent of parents said they would encourage their other children to participate in the Access Program; and
- Fifty-four percent of Access students reported more favorable views of the U.S. Government due to their participation in the Access Program.

Moreover, the Bureau constantly innovates with its proven, tested models to achieve current objectives. The Fulbright Program, International Visitor Leadership Program, English Language Program, and Youth Exchange Programs remain flagship programs of the Bureau, but they are constantly changing as the world changes and as foreign policy challenges evolve.

Here are a few specific examples:

- The Fulbright Program now offers Fulbright's Science and Technology awards that are designed to provide top-level students in science and technology with the U.S. Government's most prestigious and valuable scholarship.
- The International Visitor Leadership Program brought over 100 Iranian professionals, academics, and cultural figures to the United States last year—the first International Visitors since 1979.
- Our English Language Office pioneered the groundbreaking English Access Microscholarship program which provides a foundation of English language skill to high school students from disadvantaged sectors in their countries.
- The Bureau's Youth Exchange Office conducts the highly successful Youth Exchange and Study (YES) program, the U.S. Government's first-ever program designed for secondary school students from the Arab and Muslim world.

There is more that can be done. You have my full commitment that, if confirmed, I intend to review the effectiveness of all of our programs.

Question. The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (the "Hague Convention"), and the Hague Protocol, concluded on May 14, 1954, were submitted to the Senate for advice and consent by President Clinton on January 6, 1999. This administration has urged the Senate to act on the Hague Convention, but not the Protocol. Please provide your views on the Hague Convention, including whether in your view it should be a priority for the committee and if so, why.

Answer. Thank you for bringing this to my attention. While I am not personally familiar with the 1954 Hague Convention, I have looked into the matter and learned that the Department has identified ratification of the Convention as a priority, and also supports removal of the First Protocol from consideration for ratification at this time, leaving open the possibility of resubmission for ratification at a future date.

If confirmed, I will look into this matter further and would be pleased to work with the committee.

Question. The United States ratified the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property on February 9, 1983 (the "1970 Convention"). Under Article 9 of the Convention, a state party "whose cultural patrimony is in jeopardy from pillage of archaeological or ethnological materials" may call upon other states parties who are affected. Each state concerned is to take provisional measures to the extent feasible to prevent irreparable injury to the cultural heritage of the requesting state. How many requests has the United States received in the last 10 years (through 2007) pursuant to Article 9 of the 1970 Convention? Please provide details, including the date of such requests and the country making the request.

Answer. Since 1997, under Article 9 of the 1970 Convention, the United States has received 9 new requests for import restrictions (from Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, and Peru) and 13 requests for extensions of existing restrictions, including those imposed as a result of a bilateral agreement or of an Emergency Action (Bolivia, Cambodia, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru). An Emergency Action differs from an agreement in that it is meant to address an emergency condition, entails action only on the United States' side, and may be extended only once. Please see the attached chart for the details.

Country	Emergency Action Date in Force	Emergency Action Date Extended	Date of Request to USG under Article 9 of the 1970 UNESCO Convention	Memorandum of Understanding Date in Force	Date of Extension(s) (with amendments) of MOU
Bolivia	Mar. 1989		Sep. 1999	Dec. 2001	Dec. 2006
Cambodia	Dec. 1999		May 1999	Sep. 2003	
Canada			Oct 1985, with supplemental info provided Jan 1988	Apr 1997 (currently expired)	
China			May 2004		
Colombia			Apr. 2004	Mar. 2006	
Cyprus Ethnological	Apr. 1999	Aug. 2003	Sep. 1998	Jul. 2007	Jul. 2007
Cyprus Archaeological			Sep. 1998	Jul. 2002	Jul. 2007
El Salvador	Sep. 1987	Mar. 1992	Jan. 1995	Mar. 1995	Mar. 2000, Mar. 2005
Guatemala	Apr. 1991	Sep. 1994	May 1997	Oct. 1997	Sep. 2002, Sep. 2007
Honduras			Aug. 2001	Mar. 2004	
Italy			Sep. 1999	Jan. 2001	Jan. 2006
Mali	Sep. 1993		Sep. 1992	Sep. 1997	Sep. 2002, Sep. 2007
Nicaragua			Nov. 1995	Oct. 2000	Oct. 2005
Peru	May 1990	Jun. 1994	Jan. 1997	Jun. 1997	Jun. 2002, Jun. 2007

Question. In accordance with the implementing legislation for the 1970 Convention, the President, upon making certain determinations, may enter into an agreement with a state party that has made a proper request under Article 9 of the 1970 Convention, in order to apply certain import restrictions. Please provide a list of the agreements that have been concluded as of today's date under the authority provided for in the implementing legislation. See 19 U.S.C. § 2602.

Answer. Under Article 9 of the 1970 Convention, the United States currently has bilateral agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru.

Question. In 2004, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) issued an extensive report of inspection of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Have you read the report, or been briefed on its findings? What major recommendations remain to be implemented?

Answer. Thank you for bringing this to my attention; I have now read and been briefed on the report. It is my understanding that the Bureau responded positively and quickly to the findings of this report. All changes/actions necessary to comply with the Inspector General recommendations were completed, and as a result, the OIG closed the inspection report in July 2006.

RESPONSES OF HON. GOLI AMERI TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BILL NELSON

Question. What is your position on United States sanctions and multilateral sanctions against Iran?

Answer. I fully support administration policy on Iran including current United States sanctions on Iran, and the need for multilateral sanctions. We must maintain pressure on the current regime.

Question. Have you ever advocated that sanctions against Iran imposed by the United States, any other country, or the United Nations, be lifted or reduced in some way?

Answer. I have opposed lifting or reducing sanctions imposed by the United States, the United Nations, or any country against Iran.

As U.S. Representative to the 60th Session of the U.N. General Assembly in 2005 and the senior diplomat at the U.S. Desk in the chamber, I rose and walked out of the General Assembly Hall in protest against the policies of the Iranian regime as Iranian President Ahmadinejad took the podium.

Question. What is your position on dialog with the Iranian regime?

Answer. I fully support the administration's position on direct dialog with Iran. Secretary Rice stated on January 23, "Should Iran suspend its uranium enrichment and reprocessing activities—which is an international demand, not an American one—we could begin negotiations, and we could work over time to build a new, more normal relationship—one defined not by fear and mistrust, but growing cooperation, expanding trade and exchange, and the peaceful management of our differences." The ball is in Iran's court. Tehran must halt its current activities that violate its international obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and come clean on its past nuclear work before we can engage in further talks on nuclear and other issues.

I support the President's call to reestablish regular educational, professional, athletic, and cultural exchange programs with the Iranian people for the first time since 1979. Through these programs, we are promoting dialog between the citizens of our two countries. The Department sent the United States National Wrestling Team to compete in Iran in January 2007; we have also brought well over a hundred Iranian professionals to the United States since the Department restarted these people-to-people exchange programs in late 2006. In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in March, 2007, Under Secretary Nicholas Burns said, "Part of charting a new course for U.S.-Iranian relations is intensifying our engagement with the Iranian people. While it is now not feasible for us to have formal diplomatic relations with Iran, it is within our grasp to bridge the divide between our peoples."

Question. Have you ever advocated that the United States engage in direct talks with the Iranian regime on any matter?

Answer. I have not advocated direct talks between the United States Government and the Iranian regime.

My record on this issue is clear and was stated most concisely in a 2004 "open letter" to Secretary of State Colin Powell. In that letter, I cautioned the Secretary that "any such dialog with the ruling clerics will only lead to more deceit and reinforce their belief that they can pursue their radical agenda without consequences."

At the same time, I support efforts by the President and Secretary Rice to reach out in appropriate ways to the Iranian people. It is important that we reinforce the message sent by President Bush in his historic 2002 radio address to the people of Iran that "if Iran respects its international obligations and embraces freedom and tolerance, it will have no better friend than the United States of America."

Question. Please provide the committee with a complete copy of the "prospectus" of the Public Affairs Alliance of Iranian-Americans.

Answer. A copy of the June 2007 prospectus of the Public Affairs Alliance of Iranian-Americans (PAAIA) is attached. As far as I know, it is the final version.

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The prospectus mentioned above was too voluminous to include in this hearing. It will be retained in the permanent record of the committee.]

As the prospectus indicates, PAAIA is a bipartisan, nonsectarian, national organization open to all Iranian-Americans regardless of ethnicity, religion, or political belief.

Question. If confirmed, what steps will you take to ensure that the Cultural Property Advisory Committee, established under the implementing legislation of the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, conducts its work in an appropriately transparent manner?

Answer. The Cultural Property Advisory Committee (CPAC), appointed by the White House, plays a vital role in our efforts to preserve the world's cultural heritage from pillaging and looting. The members represent a variety of interests. They provide their input at the outset of any consideration of a foreign government request for assistance so that their deliberations can inform the entire onward process.

In addition to the statutory composition of the committee and the representation it provides for diverse views, the Department has taken a number of steps over the past several years to increase the access of members of the general public to the process. These steps include a Web site that posts public summaries of incoming requests; sessions that allow members of the public to present their viewpoints directly to the committee; advance notification of such sessions on the cultural property Web site; solicitation of written comments, and inclusion of all such comments in the documents provided to the decisionmaker.

RESPONSES OF HON. GOLI AMERI TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR NORM COLEMAN

Question. I commend the Department for their leadership on the National Security Languages Initiative (NSLI), and urge continued consideration of innovative ways to teach foreign languages to children at a young age. If confirmed, will you commit to working with innovative programs to this end, such as those offered by Concordia Language Villages in northern Minnesota, which offers intensive training in 15 languages?

Answer. Please let me assure you, that if confirmed, I will be a strong advocate of all programs that improve the opportunities for our young people to master foreign languages. This is a critical strategic need that I fully support. I know that through its NSLI exchanges, the Bureau is supporting opportunities for American high school students, teachers, and undergraduate and graduate students to study critical languages abroad, and is strengthening foreign language teaching in the United States by placing native speakers as teachers and teaching assistants in elementary through post-secondary classrooms. Participants and alumni of Concordia Language Villages are encouraged to apply for summer, semester, and year-long programs abroad for high school students, supported by the Office of Citizen Exchanges, and for university level study in the future through the Critical Language Summer Institutes, Gilman and Fulbright Scholarship Programs. The Bureau can also work with Concordia to determine whether some Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistants might extend their academic year programs in the United States, and serve as teaching assistants at the Concordia Language Villages during the following summer, before returning home. The Bureau is also developing a study abroad program for high school students in certain countries in Africa, the Near East, and East Asia. The Bureau will be looking to organizations like Concordia for

qualified participants for these exchanges. In this sense, Concordia and other programs that encourage instruction of critical (nontraditional) foreign languages may be seen as important potential “feeder” programs for the NSLI youth exchange.

RESPONSE OF GOLI AMERI TO QUESTION SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BARBARA BOXER

Question. Senator Feinstein and I support innovative public diplomacy initiatives like the Global Perspectives Project, a media exchange program funded by the State Department and run by the congressionally mandated Independent Television Service that promotes the international exchange of documentary films made by independent producers. The United States Ambassador to Indonesia has said that this program has been opening minds in my country about the America behind the headlines. I am convinced that documentary film has an important role to play in advancing cultural exchange and international civic dialog.

What kind of impact do you think innovative media strategies such as the Global Perspectives Project can have on improving America's image and standing throughout the world?

Answer. Although I am not familiar with this project, I believe that such efforts can be very helpful in helping us improve the United States' image abroad. As I noted in my testimony, one of the reasons behind the decline of America's image is that we are not perceived as paying attention to the concerns of foreign governments and people. As we know from decades of experience, when we are able to put foreigners in direct contact with Americans, or aspects of America, their attitudes toward our principles become more favorable. To the extent that such projects as the Global Perspectives Project can become two-way exchanges that not only bring insight about America to foreign publics, but also information about other countries to U.S. audiences, this helps show that America is listening—and worth listening to.

RESPONSES OF HON. JAMES K. GLASSMAN TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

Question. I would like to follow up on a question I asked during the nominations hearing relating to strengthening the structure of the PD bureau. As you are aware, the GAO released a report in May 2006 titled, “State Department Efforts Lack Certain Communication Elements and Face Persistent Challenges (GAO-06-707T).” The report, in part, found that, “posts' public diplomacy efforts generally lack important strategic communication elements found in the private sector These elements include having core messages, segmented target audiences, in-depth research and analysis to monitor and evaluate results, and an integrated communication plan to bring all these elements together.” I am interested to know what the Bureau has done to address these concerns, particularly the creation of an integrated communications plan, and what you will do to improve upon the work done thus far in response to this report.

Answer. I am aware of the GAO report and its recommendations. As you know, the U.S. National Strategy for Public Diplomacy and Strategic Communication put in place by my predecessor includes a planning model for strategic communications, the so-called “ABCDE” model, which is intended for posts to use in preparing communication plans. At this point I cannot say whether this model—or any other model that includes the critical steps of research, evaluation, and assessment—is being implemented in the field, but if confirmed, I will certainly be examining this question.

If confirmed, I also plan to issue implementation guidance that would flow from the national strategy already in place, to ensure that strategic communication planning—whether in Washington or the field—is consistent with strategic objectives.

Question. You stated in your testimony that the main focus of your attention will be “global ideological engagement” and that part of the answer to successfully fighting the “war of ideas” involves “directly entering the conversation to confront lies and distortions with truth.” You identify the media hubs in London, Brussels, and Dubai and the Digital Outreach Team as part of this movement toward direct engagement. While improving our efforts to counter incorrect information is important, I also believe that direct engagement involves more than monitoring and improving media reporting. What other initiatives do you support to improve the U.S. Government's direct engagement with people and institutions overseas?

Answer. I agree with you that direct engagement entails much more than monitoring media reporting and responding to distortions and inaccuracies. I believe that we must engage with foreign publics and elites using the broad array of programs and capabilities at our disposal, including academic and professional exchanges, broadcasting, technology-based information programs, speakers, citizen ambassadors, binational centers, libraries, American Corners, and English teaching and other youth enrichment programs to reach so-called "marginalized" or "underserved" youth populations, to name just a few. I plan to use research, including polling and attitude surveys, to help determine which tools make sense in different programming environments, and as I indicated, I also intend to use evaluation to measure the impact of these efforts, and to refine them as necessary to maximize their effect on our strategic objectives.

Question. Your predecessor succeeded in increasing the number of participants in exchanges and increasing both the public diplomacy and education and cultural exchange budgets. How will you work to protect these advancements?

Answer. The President's fiscal year 2009 budget request includes \$522.444 million for the educational and cultural exchange programs of the U.S. Department of State, the fourth year in a row the President has proposed an increase for these programs. Within the State Department's budget request, \$394.806 million is included for public diplomacy international information programs, an increase of \$33.9 million over the \$360.905 million provided in fiscal year 2008.

I support the request and hope that the Congress approves it. As I have stated, I believe it is crucial that we gain a very solid understanding about the impact of these programs. To this end, if confirmed, I intend to stress evaluation and measurement, not just of program "outputs," but also of "outcomes." If it appears that a particular program is not meeting its objectives, is too costly for the results it achieves, or fails to address the strategic goals we have outlined for our communication and public diplomacy efforts, then I will not hesitate to recommend changes. If we are successful in evaluating our efforts and the impact they are having, then I believe we will be in a much stronger position, in future budget cycles, to recommend continuing the trend of increasing these resources.

RESPONSE OF HON. JAMES K. GLASSMAN TO QUESTION SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BARBARA BOXER

Question. Senator Feinstein and I support innovative public diplomacy initiatives like the Global Perspectives Project, a media exchange program funded by the State Department and run by the congressionally mandated Independent Television Service that promotes the international exchange of documentary films made by independent producers. The United States Ambassador to Indonesia has said that this program "has been opening minds in my country about the America behind the headlines. I am convinced that documentary film has an important role to play in advancing cultural exchange and international civic dialog."

What kind of impact do you think innovative media strategies such as the Global Perspectives Project can have on improving America's image and standing throughout the world?

Answer. Although I am not familiar with this project, I believe that such efforts can be very helpful in helping us improve the U.S. image abroad. As I noted in my testimony, one of the reasons behind the decline of America's image is that we are not perceived as paying attention to the concerns of foreign governments and people. As we know from decades of experience, when we are able to put foreigners in direct contact with Americans, or aspects of America, their attitudes toward our principles become more favorable. To the extent that such projects as the Global Perspectives Project can become two-way exchanges that not only bring insight about America to foreign publics, but also information about other countries to U.S. audiences, this helps show that America is listening—and worth listening to.

RESPONSE OF HON. JAMES K. GLASSMAN TO QUESTION SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BILL NELSON

Question. What is the frequency of AeroMarti flights to broadcast television into Cuba? What are its hours of broadcast? What is your estimate of the Marti signals' penetration into Cuba?

Answer. The Office of Cuba Broadcasting (OCB) has several methods to deliver TV Marti signals to the people of Cuba.

AeroMarti flies its broadcast missions 6 days a week, Monday through Saturday, from 6 p.m.-11 p.m. Cuban authorities usually attempt to jam these broadcasts.

TV Marti is carried on Hispasat 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with each 5-hour programming block repeated throughout the day. TV Marti is also carried on DirecTV's "TV Azteca," which carries two 30-minute newscasts, Monday through Saturday, at 6 p.m. and 11:30 p.m. DirecTV is available to about 30,000-40,000 households that have dishes, according to estimates that OCB has received and that they deem credible. Neither of these satellite broadcasts are jammed by the Cuban Government.

Although OCB does not have the ability to carry out research inside Cuba to measure TV Marti's viewership, some surveys have been conducted by telephone. The most recent showed a penetration rate of 0.3 percent, in a survey of 28 percent of Cuban households with telephones. Other methods of measurement include personal interviews with Cuban émigrés. In 2007, 410 respondents were asked about TV Marti viewership, and their responses suggest that TV Marti's market share may be as much as 17 percent on the island.

Neither of these methods is necessarily representative or reliable.

OCB also gets considerable anecdotal feedback from Cuba that the TV Marti programs can be seen, including e-mails, call-ins to TV Marti talk shows, and other sources. For example, a Cuban governmental document presented to the International Telecommunications Union dated June 22, 2007, shows the AeroMarti TV signal strength to be in a range of 64 dB u-v/m to 74 dB u-v/m in Central Havana. In this case, the AeroMarti signal was about equal to or stronger than local Cuban television signals. This suggests that the signal is getting through despite Cuban efforts to jam it.