

**THE INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN
AGAINST TERRORISM**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 25, 2001

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

75-947 DTP

WASHINGTON : 2001

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

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

PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland	JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts	CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin	GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota	BILL FRIST, Tennessee
BARBARA BOXER, California	LINCOLN D. CHAFEE, Rhode Island
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey	GEORGE ALLEN, Virginia
BILL NELSON, Florida	SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, West Virginia	MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming

EDWIN K. HALL, *Staff Director*

PATRICIA A. MCNERNEY, *Republican Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Powell, Hon. Colin L., Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC	4
Prepared statement	9
Response to additional questions submitted for the record by the committee	47

THE INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST TERRORISM

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2001

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:14 p.m. in room SR-325, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Joseph R. Biden, Jr., chairman, presiding.

Present: Senators Biden [presiding], Sarbanes, Dodd, Kerry, Feingold, Wellstone, Helms, Lugar, Hagel, Smith, Chafee, Brownback, Allen, and Enzi.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come to order. Welcome, Mr. Secretary. Our colleagues will be filing in as the vote winds down. I guess it wound down now, and they will have an opportunity to question. But I think in the interest of your time we should begin.

With your permission, if and when we get a quorum here, which I fully expect, we may interrupt you and pass out 12 Ambassadorial nominees while we have a quorum if we can. I am sure that will not offend you.

Secretary POWELL. It will not offend me in the slightest, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I want to compliment you personally, and I want to compliment the President on the way you have both united the Nation and I think equally important in a sense for this undertaking, clearly equally as important, the way you have put together a coalition of the willing here and some of the timid, it seems to me. You put together a coalition of not only our traditional friends, but you put together a coalition of our friends in the Muslim world as well as some who are not automatically considered to be rallying to our concerns and needs.

We need the support in the Islamic world, as you know better than I do. And as you said yesterday about bombing during Ramadan, we will do what we need to do, but we will be sensitive to that concern.

I think the President has been incredibly skillful along with you in keeping the coalition together, in keeping Muslim leaders on board who are experiencing demonstrations and protests about U.S. bombings and accusations that we are attacking the whole Islamic world, which is simply not true. It is also a significant credit to your personal diplomacy.

Let me say that I cannot speak for all Democrats—I do not think there has ever been a man or woman born who could speak for all Democrats—but I am confident when I say both political parties

are united in our resolve to pursue and conclude successfully this war and to support the President's efforts.

The world should know that we support our President and our military forces in their mission. To the best of my knowledge, there is no daylight, no daylight, between the parties or between the Congress and the administration on the way in which you are pursuing this effort.

The world should also know that there is broad agreement, not only on eliminating Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda network, as well as the Taliban that supports him, but there is also broad agreement and support for the President's resolve to keep a coalition together to help feed displaced Afghans as well as put together, possibly with extraterritorial help from the United Nations or some other international fora, a viable government that will be a source of stability and not a source of unrest after we successfully prosecute this war effort.

I need not tell you this will not be easy. But be assured, many of us will stand shoulder to shoulder with you in what are bound to be some very difficult decisions that you and the President are going to have to make.

On that score, I would like to personally thank you for keeping me and the ranking member, who is still my Chairman, and all the committee informed. There has never been a time, speaking for myself, that I have ever called you or called any of your people that I have not gotten an immediate response, and the same can be said for Senator Helms and I expect for all of our colleagues here.

I think, to state the obvious, that is awfully important to keep this kind of cohesion which you have put in place. I also want to publicly acknowledge how much I personally appreciate, and Senator Helms can clearly speak for himself, the personal briefings he and I together and separately have received from the President of the United States. This has not been an on again, off again thing. It has been roughly about once every week or 10 days he has us down there, and is not only telling us what is going on, but genuinely asking for input.

I have been impressed. I have been impressed, so impressed I have said it publicly. Some of my colleagues wonder whether or not I am under his influence. I have said to them what I will say to you: As long as he is right, I am for him. I am for him, and I think he is doing it the right way.

So Mr. Secretary, there are going to be—as you said, you know better than we, having prosecuted another difficult war, this one I think is even more complicated. There is going to be some tough decisions. It would be really easy to Monday morning quarterback. I commit to you that I will not do that, and I do not think most of us up here will do that. We know this is risky business and this is very difficult.

One example is, if the newspaper is correct, Tuesday's successful mission in Kabul shows the importance of our air power and the partnership with folks on the ground who are in the coalition of those assets working together. If the initial reports are accurate, we targeted and killed 22 hard-core terrorists linked to bin Laden in a single pinpoint strike, based on human intelligence provided from ground assets.

That requires both things. It requires the air and the coalition. We carried this out without jeopardizing U.S. servicemen unnecessarily and without causing any collateral damage. So they are the success stories and they are significant.

We are going to hear the occasional mistake. I hope the American people can keep this in perspective and I believe they will; that there will be some collateral damage, but that is a decision, a tough decision the President is going to have to constantly make.

So Mr. Secretary, you have just returned from Shanghai, where you said, as you have the ability to do better than most—you capitalized in one sentence how the world has changed. You said, “Not only is the cold war over.” You said, “The post-cold war is over.”

Out of the tragedy of 9/11, and from the President’s initiative and your diplomacy building this worldwide coalition, I believe we have a number of opportunities to enhance our relationships with countries from Russia to China and possibly even change on the margin the dynamics with Iran. I believe if we succeed in seizing these opportunities, continuing the path the President has put us on, the 21st century has the significant possibility of being safer than the 20th century; and you and the President, if that occurs, will have made an historic contribution to the wellbeing of this Nation.

I yield to my friend Senator Helms.

Senator HELMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As a matter of personal privilege, let me say that this morning at about 6:15 when I was reading the newspapers I ran across an item about the distinguished chairman of this committee. I said, this cannot be so, because both papers that I saw implied strongly, if they did not state outright, that Joe Biden has broken with bipartisan support for the President.

Now, Senator Biden and I attend a lot of meetings at the White House and sit side by side with the President, and I know how this fellow operates and I know that those reports were not accurate. I understand how first-hand accounts can happen, but I want to do what the chairman is not going to do, I am sure, and I want to say that these reports were taken out of context and were not accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HELMS. Now, also on a matter of personal privilege, Mr. Secretary, I have got a long memory and I remember sitting to the right of a President named Ronald Reagan, and there was a handsome young Army general testifying with all of his charts and everything and he was doing an impressive job. The President and I had a habit, he would write a little word or two. He said, “Like,” question mark? I said, “Yes.” It went back and forth and he said, “Bright future.” I wrote back, “I hope so.” Then he wrote, “Joint Chiefs.” I said, “Chairman.”

Well, it turned out that way. But President Reagan is not in a position to speak for himself, but I think the greatest compliment that can be paid you, sir, is what he thought of you.

So all of us appreciate your coming to be with us this afternoon, especially in the light of your heavy schedule. I want to echo, perhaps not as eloquently as Joe did, that you are doing a fine job under the most difficult of circumstances.

In the 6 weeks since the terrorist attacks of the September 11th morning which all of us remember, the President and his national security team, with your leadership on the diplomatic front, have succeeded in building a significant coalition in the war against terrorism. The President was on the mark when he declared that the United States must root out all of the terrorists and those who support them, wherever they may be found, not just terrorists in Afghanistan, but in Iraq and Syria and the West Bank and all the other places.

Now, Mr. Secretary, you and the President have emphasized many times over and over again that we must not sacrifice our long-term interests for the sake of coalition-building. Building our relationship with the Iranians before they renounce their support for terrorist organizations or turning a blind eye to China being one of the world's leading suppliers of weapons of mass destruction to those rogue states located in the Middle East would be the wrong thing to do in my judgment.

Furthermore, we must resist even the urge to modify the principled position of the United States regarding Chechnya in order to maintain Russian support for U.S. operations in Central Asia, or the temptation to gut important U.S. nonproliferation laws in an effort to buy Pakistani, Indian, or Chinese assistance, because to do so would only hasten new threats, new threats to our security interests, and risk future attacks inflicting far greater harm and instilling much more fear than we can sit here and imagine this afternoon.

The American people, bless their hearts, have shown their strong support for a long-term campaign now in progress to rid the world of terrorism before terrorists acquire weapons of mass destruction. The recent anthrax attacks have demonstrated that we must do whatever it takes, with or without the approval of the other nations, to defend America and the American way of life.

Those of us, Mr. Secretary, who have followed your hard work have the utmost confidence in you. Your handling of this crisis as America's top diplomat has not only reassured the American public, but has instilled confidence in and earned praise from our friends overseas.

Thank you for being here this afternoon.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Secretary, the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF HON. COLIN POWELL, SECRETARY OF STATE

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for welcoming me back to appear before the committee. Let me also say that I happened to read the same newspaper articles that Senator Helms did this morning and when I saw the glaring headline I said, "Whoa, wait a minute, this cannot be right." So I immediately asked my staff to get the transcript of what you had said, and I saw that it was not right, that it was clear that you were speaking in a stereotypical, what other people think. Then at the tail end of the sentence that was taken out of context, your final words were "And that's not right."

So I was much relieved because I knew that could not have been your view, and I am appreciative, as I have been for these past weeks and since I became Secretary, of the support, Mr. Chairman, that you have provided to the Department, that you have provided to me on a personal basis. I want to express to you and to Chairman Helms and the other members of the committee the same sentiment. Thank you for your support and especially thank you for the solid bipartisan support that the administration has enjoyed from the committee during this crisis that began on the 11th of September.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Secretary POWELL. It means a lot to us. It shows a lot to the world about what kind of a Nation we are, what kind of a people we are. In the midst of all the anthrax scares and other things that are going on, we are here on Capitol Hill to conduct the people's business. We will not be frightened, we will not be scared. We will get on with the people's business, and I am pleased to be here today to participate in that solid historic democratic process that we enjoy and that we believe in to the depth of our hearts.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for your comment and your confidence. I appreciate it.

Secretary POWELL. Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to provide a written testimony for the record and I would like to summarize it very briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be placed in the record.

Secretary POWELL. Mr. Chairman, we will always remember the 11th of September, where we all happened to be on that day. It is seared into our individual memories. It is seared into our individual souls. I was in Lima, Peru, at breakfast with the President of Peru, President Taledo, when the notes were handed to me, two notes in a quick row, making it clear that it was not an accident, but my country had been hit by the worst terrorist act we had see in our history.

It was a long day for me as I got on my plane and flew all the way back from Peru, unable to communicate with anybody in Washington until I arrived and joined the President in the White House with the other national security advisers to the President.

When I walked into the Situation Room and joined the President, I found a President who was seized with the mission that had been handed him that day, a President who had already seen that a challenge had been presented to him that would change the entire nature of his presidency and his administration, and a President who took up that challenge I think in a bold way, a way that history will long remember.

He knew right away that he not only had to go after the perpetrators of these terrible attacks against us, he knew also that we had to go after terrorism. It would not be enough just to deal with these perpetrators who were soon identified as the al-Qaeda network and Osama bin Laden, but in order to be the kind of leader that he is, in order to show leadership to the world, we had to undertake a campaign that goes after terrorism in all of its many forms around the world.

It is a campaign that has many dimensions to it. It is a campaign that some days involves financial attacks, other days law enforce-

ment attacks, intelligence attacks, and sometimes, as we see now in Afghanistan, military attacks. We have to secure our borders. We have to do a better job of talking to other nations about who travels across our borders. We have to make sure we go after the financial networks that support terrorist activity.

To do that, we built a broad coalition, a coalition of nations that came together to respond to this attack, not just against America but against civilization. Hundreds and hundreds of people who were not Americans died in the World Trade Center. Five hundred Muslims died in the World Trade Center. Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda killed Muslims on the 11th of September, 2001, in New York City, as well as men and women representing every race, color, and creed on the face of the Earth and a large number of American citizens.

We are going after them with this broad coalition to make sure that they are brought to justice or justice is brought to them. It was an attack against civilization. Civilization must respond.

People have said, well, you know, it was an attack against America really, not civilization. No, it was not. It was the action of an evil man and it was an evil act. It bears no connection or relationship to any faith. There is no faith on the face of the Earth that would sanction such an evil strike against innocent people, and we cannot let Osama bin Laden pretend that he is doing it in the name of the Iraqi people or the Palestinian people. He does not care one whit about them. He has never given a dollar toward them, he has never spoken out for them. He has used them as a cover for his evil, criminal, murderous, terrorist acts, and he has to be seen in that light.

We have put together a grand coalition. People have said, well, coalitions sometimes come with problems; when you bring all these people together, do you not have to take into account all of their interests and do not these kinds of coalitions sometimes hamstring the President in his ability to do what he thinks he has to do?

The answer to the question is the President has not given up any of his authority. There are no arrangements within this coalition which in any way, shape, fashion, or form constrain the President in the exercise of his constitutional responsibilities to defend the United States of America and to defend the people of the United States. So that should not be a concern on anyone's mind.

At the same time, without this coalition the President could not do what needs to be done. Without this coalition, we could not be cooperating with 100 nations around the world on going after financial networks of terrorist organizations. Without this coalition, we would not have countries that were supporting us in the prosecution of our military campaign, giving us overflight, giving us basing rights, and contributing military forces to fight along side American forces.

So this is a coalition that is of enormous value. What is unique about this coalition, what makes it different than any other coalition anyone has ever put together, is that, except for about three or four countries, every other country on the face of the Earth has signed up. They have signed up in many ways, whether it was NATO, 19 nations invoking article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the NATO Treaty, for the first time in history, saying that an attack

on one is an attack on all and that attack in New York City, Washington, and Pennsylvania was an attack on one and it is an attack on all of us, and NATO has responded.

The United Nations Security Council, the United Nations General Assembly, the OAS. The Rio Treaty was invoked, the ANZUS Treaty was invoked. The Organization of Islamic Conference had a meeting earlier this month and 56 Muslim nations came forward and said this was a dastardly attack which does not represent Islam, it is a disgrace, the United States is right to see it as an attack on civilization and an attack on America.

One more point I would make about the coalition is that, whether we want it or not, it showed up. Within 24 hours NATO acted. Before I could really get on the phone and ask them, they were there. The U.N. showed up within 48 hours. A lot of people pat me on the back and say, good job with the coalition. I have to sort of cock my head slightly. They all showed up. Our friends showed up when we needed them.

People have also said, well, this coalition will start to come apart after a while, they will not stick together. Well, they have stuck together. It is now 6 weeks. The President just returned from an important meeting in Shanghai, the APEC conference, where 21 Asian and Pacific nations all came together to talk about economic issues, to talk about the world trading system, to talk about breaking down barriers to trade. But the first thing they talked about was terrorism, and all 21 of these nations reaffirmed their support for what we are doing.

As my colleague Don Rumsfeld often says, it is not just a single coalition; it is a shifting set of coalitions, really, that have come together. Members will do different things at different times in the life of this coalition. Some member nations have said, "Look, all we can do really is give you political and diplomatic support; we do not have the wherewithal or because of our political situation we cannot do much more than that." Others have said, "We will participate fully on intelligence-sharing and financial digging up of terrorist organizations, and we will provide military assets as well."

What we have said, "Let each contribute according to your ability to contribute, your willingness to contribute, and the situation you face within your country." So far, after 6 weeks, this coalition is gaining strength, not getting weaker.

Our attention now is focused on the military campaign in Afghanistan. I am so proud of the men and women in uniform that I used to be so closely associated with as they once again go in harm's way in such a professional manner to serve the American people and in this case to serve the cause of civilization. They are doing a fine job, but, as the chairman noted, it is going to be a tough campaign. It is a tough campaign, tough in the air and even tougher on the ground as we use, not American forces directly, but other forces who are like-minded and recognizing that the Taliban must be removed. It is quite difficult to coordinate them, but we are working on that very hard, and with each passing day the coordination links between the air campaign and what is happening on the ground become tighter, become more direct, and are moving in the right direction.

Our work in Afghanistan, though, is not just of a military nature. We recognize that when the al-Qaeda organization has been destroyed in Afghanistan and as we continue to try to destroy it in all the nations in which it exists around the world and when the Taliban regime has gone to its final reward, we need to put in place a new government in Afghanistan, one that represents all the people of Afghanistan and one that is not dominated by any single powerful neighbor, but instead is dominated by the will of the people of Afghanistan.

We are working hard at that. Ambassador Richard Haass, the Director of Policy Planning at the State Department, is my personal representative working with the United Nations, Ambassador Brehini, the King, and others to try to help Afghan leaders around the world find the proper model for the future Afghanistan.

But we have got to do more than that. We also have to make sure that when the Taliban regime is gone we remain committed to helping Afghanistan finally find a place in the world, by helping its people build a better life for themselves, by making sure they get the food aid and other aid they will need to start building decent lives for themselves and for their children.

While we are going through this conflict period now and thinking about the future, we also have to make sure that we are pumping as much humanitarian aid into the country now as winter approaches, so that we do not leave anybody at risk of starvation. There are lots of reports about that, but I can say that the reports I have this morning suggest that we have got quite a bit of food going in, blankets going in. It is still a tenuous situation, but the situation has improved in recent days and I think it will improve in the days ahead.

We are giving it the highest priority, working with our friends in Pakistan, Uzbekistan. I was pleased to see the foreign minister of Uzbekistan in the hearing room today. It gives me the opportunity to thank him and his government for the terrific support that they have provided to us.

The chairman mentioned that new strategic opportunities may come out of this crisis. I think that is absolutely right. We have seen Russia do things in the last 6 weeks that would have been unthought of 5 or 6 years ago even, long after the Soviet Union was gone. We are working with the Russians to take advantage of these new opportunities.

At the APEC meeting in China, my other dear chairman, you will be pleased to know that while we were talking about trade and economic development with the People's Republic, we made sure that they understood that, even though we want to move in that direction, we are not forgetting about human rights, we are not forgetting about religious freedom. The President talked about the Dalai Lama, he talked about relations with the Vatican, and we have seen improvement already with respect to dialogue between the Vatican and Beijing just within the last 24 hours. We talked about proliferation. We told them what we do not like about what they do with respect to rogue nations.

So Senator Helms, I can assure you and assure all the other members of the committee that we are clear-eyed about this coalition-building, we are clear-eyed about the campaign we have em-

barked upon. We understand the nature of some of the regimes that we are having some opening discussions with and they are not going to get in on the cheap: we are against the Taliban, but you have got to tolerate our actions with respect to other terrorist organizations that we like. It will not work. The President says you have got to choose now to move into a new world where you no longer support those kinds of activities if you want a better shot at good relations with the United States of America.

So I think we are off on a noble cause. I think it is a cause that is just, it is a cause that we will prevail in because we are doing the right thing.

Let me close by once again thanking the committee for the support that they have provided to us. I know how much it means to the President for you all to visit with him every week or so. Let me once again express my admiration for the men and women in uniform who are doing such a great job. Let me also express my admiration for the men and women of the State Department and the other civilian agencies of the U.S. Government who are serving in missions all around the world, sometimes in great danger, sometimes at the risk of their life. They are doing a terrific job, and I know that you share my admiration and pride in the men and women of our diplomatic service.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Powell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE COLIN L. POWELL

Mr. Chairman, Senator Helms, members of the Committee, I am pleased to appear before you today to update you on our Nation's diplomatic response to the September 11 terrorist attacks, as well as to report to you on my recent trip to Pakistan, India, and China.

Before I begin, I would like to take a moment to commend you, Mr. Chairman, along with this Committee and, indeed, the entire American Congress, for your courageous response to this national tragedy. I was deeply moved, as I believe the Nation was deeply moved, at the sight of our elected representatives standing on the Capitol steps the evening of the tragedy, singing "God Bless America."

The spirit of bipartisanship and cooperation which has emerged, on Capitol Hill and throughout our Government, has sent a powerful signal of America's resolve to the American people, to our friends around the world, and, just as importantly, to our foes.

Mr. Chairman, the perpetrators of what President Bush has described as "evil, despicable acts of terror" struck not only at the United States, they struck at the world. They struck at all who believe in tolerance and freedom.

Citizens of some 80 countries died that day in New York, in Virginia, and in the Pennsylvania countryside. Citizens of all countries recoiled in horror at the magnitude of the atrocity committed on American soil.

We have responded to these attacks with a campaign directed against the perpetrators of September 11, and the nations and organizations that help them—al-Qaeda, its leader Osama bin Laden, and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan that harbors and supports them.

But our fight does not end with al-Qaeda and the Taliban regime. As President Bush told a joint session of Congress September 20:

Our war on terror begins with al-Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated.

In our campaign, we are deploying every tool we have—political, diplomatic, intelligence, law enforcement, and financial, along with appropriate military means.

Because terrorism is a global problem, the response to terrorism must be global. We need the cooperation and support of a broad coalition of nations to use these tools effectively.

The coalition we have built does not tie President Bush's hands. It magnifies his efforts. The coalition is a force multiplier in our campaign—for all the tools we are using.

I am here today, Mr. Chairman, to update you and the committee on the diplomatic aspects of our campaign.

We have a good story to tell. Almost every civilized country has joined our effort—our European and Canadian allies, Western Hemisphere neighbors, and Asian and Oceanic partners, as well as our Middle Eastern, Gulf, and African friends. Russia and China have been remarkably forthcoming as active supporters of the campaign.

NATO for the first time in its history invoked Article V of the Washington Treaty, declaring the 11 September attack an attack on all members. The Rio Treaty signatories and Australia also invoked collective defense articles of our treaties.

Less than 48 hours after the attacks, the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly passed resolutions condemning the attacks, and supporting action against those responsible and the governments that aid them.

The OAS, ASEAN, APEC, and regional and religious organizations representing the vast majority of Muslims—including the Arab League, the Gulf Cooperation Council, the Organization of Islamic Conference, and the Organization of African Unity—have condemned the attacks and offered assistance.

Leading Muslim clerics, such as the Sheikh of al-Azhar, have joined in the chorus of condemnation.

Mr. Chairman, I can only name a few of the many supporting nations and organizations, but the message is clear. The world rejects Osama bin Laden's vile effort to cloak his crimes in the mantle of Islam. The world rejects his efforts to hijack a great religion in the name of murder.

So the coalition has come together, and the work has begun across a broad front.

The effort to stanch the flow of money to terrorists is one vital front in our campaign. Here, we are making good progress.

Security Council Resolution 1373, adopted under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter, requires members to act against terrorists' movements, financing, and operations. The Security Council has also formed a counterterrorism committee to implement 1373, chaired by the British, and with expert advice from the United States and others.

President Bush has issued an Executive Order freezing the assets of 27 individuals and entities. On October 12 an additional 39 names were added to this list. The total list of 66 names includes 17 groups and 49 individuals. We anticipate adding additional names in the future.

We have frozen approximately \$4 million in assets since September 11 and more is under review. Hundreds of additional accounts are presently being examined.

Over 140 countries have voiced their commitment to the campaign against terrorist financing, and over 70 countries are actively working to detect and freeze assets related to terrorists identified in the Executive Order, Security Council Resolutions, or their own files.

Another front is the intelligence and law enforcement component—making sure that all the nations of the world that have information about these individuals start to share it in a more effective way. After little more than a month, we are seeing success.

I must also say a word about our brave men and women in uniform, as they take the battle to al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan. I am not here to testify on the military aspects of the campaign, but I must salute their bravery and commitment to duty.

Mr. Chairman, we are not only combating al-Qaeda and the Taliban. We are also acting to ease the suffering of the Afghan people. We estimate five to seven million Afghans are at risk due to drought, famine, Taliban misrule, and the onset of winter. The United States was the largest donor of assistance to the refugees before September 11, and in response to the increased need we have announced \$320 million, in cash and commodities, to aid the Afghans. Other countries have pledged an additional \$466 million. We have also air-dropped some 500,000 humanitarian daily rations.

We are working with U.N. agencies such as the World Food Program and with private voluntary organizations to make sure this assistance gets to the people who need it, in Afghanistan and in surrounding countries where millions of refugees have fled.

While we are waging today's campaign, we are also looking ahead to the future of Afghanistan. We are working with coalition partners and with the United Nations, including Ambassador Lakhdar Brahimi, the Secretary General's Special Representative for Afghanistan.

The goal is the formation of a broad-based Afghan government that represents all geographical and ethnic backgrounds, not just one party or one group, and that will end Afghanistan's role as a haven for terrorists, permit reconstruction, and make refugee return possible.

To secure these goals, we are working with Afghan groups and the international community to address key political, reconstruction, and security issues. Afghan groups—including the Northern Alliance, Rome Group, Southern Pashtuns, and others—must come together to form a broad-based coalition capable of assuming administrative functions. There is, however, no place in the new Afghan government for the current leaders of the Taliban regime.

We are also working to get our message out, that our campaign is against terrorism, not Muslims. American officials are appearing daily in relevant media, including on al-Jazirah television. We are ensuring that the President's statements and speeches are transmitted worldwide, within 6 hours of delivery.

To give you a flavor of what we are doing, let me take one "day in the life." On October 20, Deputy Secretary Armitage was interviewed by the Indian national daily *Hindu*; Under Secretary Grossman, USAID Administrator Natsios and Acting PRM Assistant Secretary Kreczko took questions from Arab journalists in London via DVC; Under Secretary Grossman was interviewed by N-TV of Russia; EB Assistant Secretary Wayne was interviewed by MBC, LBCI and the Abu Dhabi Satellite Channel; EUR Assistant Secretary Jones appeared on Turkish Star TV; and NEA officials met Palestinian and Israeli journalists in the United States on the "Peace Partners" program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to describe the efforts we are pursuing to ensure the security of our people abroad.

We have added special agents to posts under critical and high threat, increased local and host government protection, and temporarily drawn down staff at certain posts under critical threat.

We have increased our vigilance toward chemical and biological threats, and initiated a chemical biological threat program.

Our Fiscal Year 2002 budget request for some \$1.3 billion is essential to fund secure new embassies, increase perimeter security, and add to our worldwide security readiness. We look forward to working with the Congress to secure this critical funding.

Mr. Chairman, it was in the pursuit of these counterterrorism objectives, as well as other important foreign policy interests, that I traveled to Islamabad, New Delhi, and Shanghai.

In Pakistan, I thanked President Musharraf for his bold and courageous actions since September 11. I emphasized America's support, and the support of the international community, for Pakistan's role in the campaign against terrorism. I also assured him that American support would extend to the financial and economic measures needed to help Pakistan get back on its feet again, and that those measures would come not just from America but from other coalition members as well.

President Musharraf's commitment to the campaign against terrorism is steadfast, but he also raised the Pakistani public's concerns about extended bombing operations in Afghanistan. I assured him that targeting has been judicious, with every effort made to reduce civilian casualties.

In India, I thanked Prime Minister Vajpayee, Foreign Minister Singh, and other senior officials for India's prompt offers of unconditional cooperation, and for all the support that India has provided and continues to provide to the campaign. Both the United States and India were quick to realize the attacks of September 11 were attacks on the world, and we have stood shoulder to shoulder in this fight against terrorism.

In both countries, we discussed how to ease the plight of the Afghan refugees and shared thoughts on how to begin the process of rebuilding Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, the campaign against al-Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, and those who harbor them is our top priority, and it was largely in order to better wage that campaign that I traveled to the subcontinent.

But, even while we pursue this campaign, we cannot allow our foreign policy to be hijacked by terror, to the exclusion of other important interests, including our enduring interests in South Asia.

In that spirit, my talks in Pakistan and India also covered ways to expand cooperation and deepen our relations, as well as ways to enhance stability between those two great countries.

I assured President Musharraf that our improved relationship is not just a temporary spike but, as a result of the actions taken by Pakistan over the previous five weeks, the beginning of a strengthened relationship that will grow and thrive in the years ahead.

On the domestic front, President Musharraf stressed that improving the economy is his priority, reaffirmed his commitment to hold elections in October 2002, and pledged cooperation on nonproliferation issues.

Regarding economic and commercial issues, we agreed on the importance of continued economic reform, and the United States reaffirmed our commitment to work both bilaterally and multilaterally to address Pakistan's enormous debt burden.

In New Delhi, my conversations with Prime Minister Vajpayee and Foreign Minister Singh covered the broad range of our relationship and the steps we are taking to transform it even further. Well before September 11, President Bush made it clear that putting our relationship with India on a higher plane is one of his highest priorities. As two great, multi-cultural democracies that believe in a common set of values, we are natural allies.

With the strong support we have received from the Indian government since September 11, we are seizing the opportunity to accelerate the pace of change. I am pleased that, during my visit, Prime Minister Vajpayee accepted an invitation to visit Washington next month.

In both countries, I urged restraint in their nuclear and missile programs and the need to avoid onward proliferation.

My trip occurred amidst the highest tension we have seen in almost a year along the Line of Control in Kashmir. I emphasized to both sides the need for military restraint and the resumption of bilateral talks between India and Pakistan on all issues, including Kashmir.

I concluded my trip in Shanghai, where I attended a meeting of APEC foreign ministers and, later, joined President Bush at the APEC Leaders Meeting.

Our overriding focus in Shanghai was to bolster the international response to the events of September 11, both in the President's bilateral meetings and in the APEC context.

The APEC Leaders assembled in Shanghai put APEC squarely on the record against terrorism, with their Statement on Counterterrorism. This was a remarkable step, given APEC's traditional reluctance to venture outside the economic realm, and a strong signal of the unity of the international community.

APEC Leaders called for the early signing and ratification of all anti-terrorist conventions, including the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, and pledged to implement U.N. Security Council resolutions 1368 and 1373. They also mandated cooperation against terrorism encompassing finance, customs, immigration, transportation, energy and infrastructure activities.

In that regard, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the committee to act quickly on the two conventions we have not ratified, Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. I know the Senate held hearings on those two conventions yesterday, and I appreciate your attention to this matter.

APEC's importance as an economic forum was also increased by the September 11 attacks. Since its founding, APEC has been an important vehicle for encouraging the adoption of market-oriented trade, investment, and financial policies by countries that together represent two-thirds of global GDP and over half of world trade. Now more than ever, these policies are critical for ensuring the economic vitality needed to restore confidence in the global and member economies, and to support our goals of fostering stable, prosperous democracies in the region.

APEC Leaders sent a strong signal of support for the global economy with their commitment to launch a new round of WTO talks next month and their adoption of the Shanghai Accord, an American initiative to revitalize APEC's role in promoting trade and investment liberalization.

President Bush and I also held a series of bilateral meetings in Shanghai.

In our meetings with the Chinese, including President Bush's meeting with Chinese President Jiang Zemin, we sought Chinese commitment to increased cooperation against terrorism, including the long-term law enforcement effort to eradicate financing of terrorist organizations and the need for immediate humanitarian assistance to Afghan refugees.

We also discussed ways to honestly address our differences so that our areas of difference do not prevent us from cooperating on other issues of mutual importance. I am confident that as we advance our counterterrorism cooperation with China we will be in a stronger position to sustain meaningful consultations with the leadership in Beijing on subjects such as Taiwan, nonproliferation, and human rights.

Russian President Putin's reaction to September 11 marked the beginning of a new period in our bilateral relationship, one in which a new spirit of cooperation on counterterrorism may also make many of the tough issues on the agenda more resolvable. Indeed, in the wake of 11 September, it has become clear that not only is the Cold War over, but the post-Cold War period is also over.

In President Bush's meeting with President Putin, and mine with Foreign Minister Ivanov, we discussed the future of post-Taliban Afghanistan. We also had a good discussion on the new strategic framework.

The President's meeting with Japan's Prime Minister Koizumi, while focused primarily on the campaign against terrorism, also covered global economic developments. President Bush urged the Prime Minister to remain steadfast in his ambitious reform agenda for Japan's faltering economy. He emphasized the importance of Japanese economic recovery to both our nations, and the world.

Also in Shanghai, President Bush had an excellent meeting with President Kim Dae Jung of Korea, who was very forthcoming about South Korean support and pledged to provide all necessary cooperation and assistance. The two Presidents also discussed our two nation's continuing readiness to seriously engage North Korea to bring about North-South reconciliation and peace on the Korean Peninsula. The United States remains prepared to resume dialogue with the North Koreans any time, any place, and without any preconditions.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to commend the men and women of the State Department who are serving in Washington and, often in harm's way, in our embassies abroad.

Our people have helped secure landing and overflight rights from more than 50 nations that are vital to our military operations. They have pressed host governments to choke off the financial lifeblood of terrorist organizations and deny them safe haven. They have helped generate and distribute humanitarian aid to the Afghan people and the frontline states. And they are working to maintain international cooperation on the full range of counterterrorism initiatives ranging from fighting money-laundering to improving airport security.

In Islamabad and New Delhi, I met with the skeleton staffs who are working under extraordinary difficult conditions to wage this vital campaign against terrorism.

The President, the American people, and I are counting on them to do their duty; and, in the finest tradition of service to our Nation, they have risen to the challenge. I am immensely proud of these dedicated men and women, and I believe our country should be proud of them too.

Mr. Chairman, our record is strong, but we have only begun. This is a campaign that will be measured in weeks, months, and years, a campaign that we will pursue with patience and perseverance, in close consultation with our friends and allies. As President Bush told the Nation on October 7:

Given the nature and reach of our enemies, we will win this conflict by the patient accumulation of successes, by meeting a series of challenges with determination and will and purpose.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, we will be patient, we will be persistent, and we will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I am glad you mentioned the last point, because I think people do not realize that we have had more diplomats and more members of the foreign service killed in the last, I do not know how many years, 5, 6, 7, 8 years. I must tell you very bluntly, my son, who worked for the Justice Department, was assigned to, volunteered to go to Pristina and Kosovo to work on their criminal justice system. Quite frankly, I wish he had gone with the military, literally, not figuratively, because of the difference in terms of exposure. But they do take great risks and I appreciate that.

Mr. Secretary, with your permission, I think I technically have to go into an executive session here, if I may, to be able to move, as our colleagues have all and their staffs have been briefed, to vote out some nominees while we have a quorum in these confusing days. So I move we move to executive session.

Senator HELMS. Second.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a second and we are now in executive session.

[Whereupon, at 2:45 p.m., the hearing was recessed and the committee proceeded to other business, then reconvened at 2:47 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, we will do 7-minute rounds if we can to get everybody in as quickly as we can.

I would like to pick up on two things that you said. One is, and I only want to speak to it briefly if you could—if not, you can expand on it if you would like. I was quite frankly almost close to amazed by how far Putin seems to have come in throwing his lot with the West. He seems to have, from all the briefings I have gotten, actually stiff-armed his military here and stiff-armed some of the browns and reds in his government and out of government and made a very—I do not think anybody since Peter the Great has made such a significant at least initial move to the West.

I have two questions. One, is it real in your view? Two, could you specifically comment, unless it should be done in another forum, could you specifically comment on the reports—not reports—comment on what may have transpired relative to his discussions with you or the President on NATO expansion? So A, is it real; and B, has his view changed or moderated relative to the NATO expansion?

Secretary POWELL. One, I think it is real, Mr. Chairman. I was in all of the meetings, the whole meeting that the President had, two meetings really, a dinner meeting and a private meeting before. I was in both meetings with President Putin. It is clear that President Putin understands that Russia's future primarily lies to the West. That is its source of inspiration, that is its source of technology, it is its source of capital, it is its source of debt relief, it is its source of security.

He of course has to worry about his East and be concerned about his East, and he has a deep concern about the South, the Stan's as they are often called, not as an enemy threat, but a threat of smuggling and other problems and drug trade and traffic that come from that part of the world. But he knows that, while he has to watch the East and be concerned about the South, his future has to be to the West, and I think he is acting on that knowledge.

I also think this is not new knowledge. I think this is what drove another Soviet president that I came to know very, very well, Michail Gorbachev. Michail Gorbachev knew he too had to come to the West, and what was keeping him from coming to the West was something called the Iron Curtain. The Iron Curtain was keeping them in, not keeping us out. He got rid of the Iron Curtain so he could come to the West.

I remember in 1998, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze giving a lecture to all of his foreign ministry officials, and we got a copy of the speech, and he said, "Comrades, look, we have wasted all these billions of dollars for all these years and what has it gotten us? Friendship with North Korea, North Vietnam, and several other busted regimes. What has it cost us? The thing we needed the most, a good relationship with the West."

I think Mr. Putin understands that. I think he was given another opportunity to demonstrate that on the 11th of September. So on the 11th of September he was the first head of state to call President Bush. In that conversation he not only expressed his condolences, he said, "By the way, Mr. President, we were running a major military exercise here in the Russian Federation; I have just

shut it off. I do not want any false signals to be out there as you are going through this period of challenge and crisis.”

Then some time later, a few days later, he made his very important speech which aligned himself solidly with the campaign against terrorism. He also raised the issue of Chechnya and we are discussing that with him, but we have not given up our concerns about human rights in Chechnya. But we want to see if we can help him move into a political process that will solve the problem of Chechnya.

So I think it is for real. With respect to NATO expansion, it was discussed. I think that the Russians still have some concerns about NATO expansion, but I sense those concerns are far less than they were just a few months ago. I think they are looking for a way to align themselves with NATO, if not necessarily become a member right away or even perhaps at any time in the future, but to have a better relationship with NATO, finding some sort of way of connecting with NATO without being in NATO or a part of NATO.

I think if we can explore that concept it would make it even easier, if we are successful with that concept, easier for them to accept any enlargement to the alliance when that comes up for decision in Prague in the fall of 2002.

One point I like to make to my Russian counterpart, Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov, who I have now met with eight times. Everything I have said to you is reinforced by my discussions with Igor. But as I like to say to him: You know, we added 3 members about 4 years ago and you have better relations with those 3 new members than you ever had with them before when they were part of—the Warsaw Pact. He has to acknowledge that.

So I think there is a way to square this circle with respect to Russian concerns about the expansion of NATO.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is very encouraging. If I have a second round, I might pursue that a little bit more.

Let me ask you my concluding question. You have indicated that, and you reiterated today, the President has personally stated it to Senator Helms and to me and I am sure to others, that we have to be in this for the long haul. We cannot “drain the swamp and let it fill up again.” To use your words here, you said, “We need to put in place a new government in Afghanistan, help Afghanistan with food aid, and so on.”

Could you update us on the progress—and I realize you are doing two things at once here. You are prosecuting a war and, wisely, thinking about, *a la* Roosevelt—I am told during World War Two, we have all read that while we were “losing” he assembled the best minds in the country and said, “How are we going to put together the world after we win?” This is a smaller version, but you are doing both. You are doing both.

Now, could you update us on the progress you are having in assembling this coalition for the long haul, for the long haul after we win, particularly what, if you are able to tell us, what kind of response you are getting from the Muslim world, you are getting from countries that are predominantly Muslim countries, their willingness to participate and so on? Would you be willing to?

Secretary POWELL. From our European Union partners, G-7, G-8 partners, strong support to participate in the post-Taliban Af-

ghanistan rescue operation. I will call it that. The U.N. recognizes that it will have to play some kind of role for some bridge period until the Afghan government comes into existence and can actually function.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they realize that? Because in speaking to Brahimi—I did not speak to him personally—in listening to what he had to say, and Kofi’s not silence, but not having said much on this—have you spoken to them about this?

Secretary POWELL. I have spoken to the Secretary General several times. I will be seeing Mr. Brahimi and some of my colleagues have met with him. Maybe my second point on this question might deal with the contradiction that you are suggesting. There is a debate as to what kind of force might be necessary to go in there during this bridge period. Mr. Brahimi at this point is not inclined toward a blue-helmeted force. Neither is the Secretary General. That takes a lot of time, a lot of preparation, to put in a blue-helmet force.

So maybe you just bring in some peacekeepers who are from willing nations, so you do not have to go out and sort of recruit all of these people. You just find people who are ready to go in there right away and to serve as peacekeepers. I think it will be hard to get peacemakers, countries willing to send their troops in to fight somebody. But I think once the Taliban regime is gone and there is hope for a new broad-based government that represents all the people of Afghanistan and when aid starts to flow in, I think that will cause most of the groupings in Afghanistan to realize this is not the time to fight, this is the time to participate in this new world. That is our hope.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. My time is up.
Senator Helms.

Senator HELMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, several months ago President Bush nominated Otto Reich to serve as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs. Now, for one reason or another this committee has not been able to give him a hearing even after the attacks of September 11, when you and the President stated your need for your national security team to be put in place to fight and win the war against global terrorists.

What I want to know is, would you like to see Otto Reich confirmed by the Senate?

Secretary POWELL. Yes, sir, I would. I knew Mr. Reich back in the Reagan days, not well. But as I was putting my team together I asked Otto to come in and have a chat. We did. We had a long talk. He knows the western hemisphere. He knows Central and South America, has a great deal of experience. He is energetic, he is willing to leave his civilian life behind, give up his business and come back in and serve his Nation.

I went over all of his past history. I looked at the documentation. I have looked at some of the accusations that have been made against him. I note that he has never been charged with anything, only lots of speculation and rumors. I was quite confident that Otto Reich would do a superb job and I recommended him to the President of the United States, who nominated him to the Senate for your advice and consent.

So, President Bush stands behind Otto Reich. I stand behind Otto Reich. Unfortunately, we have not been able to get a hearing before this committee for Otto Reich.

Senator HELMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to embarrass you in any way, but I want to ask for a show of hands by this committee, all Senators who favor the nomination of Otto Reich, if you would hold your hand.

[A show of hands.]

Senator HELMS. All opposed?

[A show of hands.]

Senator HELMS. Did you count them, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary POWELL. I thought it would be wise not to, Mr. Chairman.

Separation of powers.

Senator HELMS. Mr. Secretary, this morning I met with Prince Idris—is that the way you pronounce the name—of the Libyan royal family. He came to my Capitol office, which is all I have. The rest of my office is closed down. He expressed concern about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles in the Middle East. Now, of course his mind is on Libya and its programs, but I would like for you to give me your opinion about what is the administration doing to stem the proliferation of these weapons, not only to countries such as Libya and Syria and Iran and Iraq, but to terrorists like bin Laden?

Secretary POWELL. As you know, Mr. Chairman, this kind of technology does not come from the K-mart store. It comes from countries that have the ability to develop this kind of technology and then sell it to states that have often been called rogue states, such as the ones you describe, or to terrorist organizations, or at least make them available on the open market so that terrorist organizations can get at them. Sometimes some of this technology comes, frankly, from the West.

In all of our discussions with the countries that we know have the capability to do it and have arms sales programs, the Russians and the Chinese and the Indians and the Pakistanis and others who have the ability to sell this kind of technology, we tell them that this is not wise, not prudent, and will be a negative factor in your relationship with us.

For countries like North Korea that also have the capacity to sell this kind of technology and proliferate, we have made it clear to them that if they want to re-enter a dialogue with us this kind of activity must stop. We do not step back from this position.

One of the big irritants we have in our relationship with China now is they have not yet satisfied our concerns with respect to the November 2000 agreement that they entered into with the previous administration. We have a missile technology control regime. We have export controls. We have a variety of legislative tools that are available to us, and we use all of these tools to do everything we can to keep this kind of technology, whether it is technology to develop weapons of mass destruction or the means to deliver them, out of the hands of irresponsible, broken states and out of the hands of terrorist organizations or individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. One more thing that bothers me. Egypt, which has always been a friend since I have been in the Senate, and

Saudi Arabia have yet to clamp down on terrorist financial networks within their borders. Now, that fact and the fact that the government-controlled press in those two countries are still spouting anti-U.S. rhetoric lead me to worry about the commitment of our allies in the Middle East.

Do you have any concern about that?

Secretary POWELL. Not with respect to either Egypt or Saudi, the two you mentioned. Both countries, the leaders of both countries, the King and Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia and President Mubarak in Egypt, have been strong supporters of the campaign against terrorism. They have been there from the very beginning. Both Egypt and Saudi Arabia have played leadership roles in our efforts. They have responded to every request we have put before them.

There may be more that they can do, especially Saudi Arabia since a number of the people involved in the terrorist acts at least originated in some way or another from Saudi Arabia. They have been very forthcoming with respect to intelligence information. We are still working on financial information, but they are being responsive.

I think it is really not fair to characterize them as not being supportive. They are very supportive, and I stay in close touch with my colleagues both in Egypt and Saudi Arabia. We should note that Saudi Arabia many years ago disavowed Osama bin Laden, took away his citizenship. As soon as the crisis began the 11th of September, within a few weeks time, Saudi Arabia broke diplomatic relations, one of the three countries that still had diplomatic relations with the Taliban regime. They broke those relations, and they have been very supportive.

They were especially supportive at the Organization of Islamic Conference meeting on the 10th of October by pushing for a joint statement that was supportive of our efforts, and we can count on that kind of support as well from President Mubarak.

Senator HELMS. Thank you, sir. My time is up.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Kerry.

Senator KERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, thank you very much, on behalf of all of us, for your remarkable continued service, and we are grateful to you for the time and effort and leadership that you are providing us at a critical time. Not the first time you have done so, either.

Mr. Secretary, I have a number of questions. The first one I wanted to ask you is regarding the concerns many of us have about the potential of a growing humanitarian disaster in Afghanistan. I know you said yesterday in the House that there are difficulties with it. I wonder if you would share with us a little bit more here. I think we need to augment our effort. I think the UN Security Council Permanent 5 need to really step up on this, as well as the governing situation in Afghanistan. But could you share with us how we are going to respond to this as winter sets in? What are the difficulties? Is there a way we can be helpful, and how do you see this unfolding?

Secretary POWELL. First, Senator Kerry, you are giving us terrific support. As you know, the President has allocated another \$320 million to this effort. The Defense Department has air dropped something like 800,000 rations, the ubiquitous yellow bags

that now everybody has seen on their television sets and in the newspapers. We are working with the World Food Program, the United Nations relief organizations.

Just in the past 24 hours there has been an improvement in the tonnages of food getting in.

Senator KERRY. Is that by truck?

Secretary POWELL. By truck for the most part.

We expect that to even improve more in the next several days with some new openings coming down out of Uzbekistan. I had the chance to speak to the Foreign Minister about that a few moments ago. So things are improved.

There were a number of reports that the Taliban had taken over warehouses or had stopped distribution. The latest information is that the Taliban leadership has now returned those facilities back to distribution agencies. It is still not a good situation. We are counting on Afghans what have worked for these NGO's for long periods of time to stay on the job and do the distribution.

So I do not want to suggest that the problem is solved. We have to manage it every day and we do. Every morning I am briefed by the AID Administrator, Mr. Natsios, and every day my staff gives me a series of charts and briefings that I then show to the President on where we are with respect to the tonnages that we have gotten in, the air drops that may be required beyond just packages, but bulk air drops that might be required, new avenues that are opening up to get the food in.

Some days an avenue closes and things get bad for a day or two. Then it opens again. But as of yesterday, the tonnages going in were up to the level we needed for them to go in and to keep going in at that level in order to deal with the problem that you have mentioned.

Senator KERRY. Are we getting adequate support on the Pakistan border?

Secretary POWELL. We have had to do a little more work on that. The Pakistanis have been concerned about the number of refugees flowing across into Pakistan. They hold the largest number of refugees now of any country on the face of the Earth. So they do have concerns about that. But I think the U.N. is working closely with the Pakistani government.

If I can take this opportunity also, Senator, to say a word about the Pakistani government and the courageous and bold action that they have taken under the leadership of President Musharraf to be a part of this coalition and to cut their ties with the Taliban, to realize that they have now to join the coalition for a new Afghanistan. They have done a terrific job and responded to our every need.

Senator KERRY. Well, I think the committee would join you. I think every member of the committee would join you, and we want it to be very clear to the government that we appreciate and understand it. It is not without its risks. I think there are many other things we need to do to buttress that decision now.

With respect to that kind of decision, Mr. Secretary, you have mentioned a number of times publicly that both Saudi Arabia and Egypt have assisted us. We have certainly been involved with their governments for many years. Is it fair for us, however, at this point

in time to expect more in terms of their public statements? I mean, even though you have said what you have said, many observers have written about what they have called the deafening silence and the lack of sort of visibility here.

We all understand there are tensions. In Saudi Arabia there has been some funding and there has been some—the mosques and schools presenting a new generation, many of whom are in a place we would rather they were not politically. Is it fair for us now to raise some of these governance issues in the interest of addressing the long-term problem of trying to deal with the “swamp” of terrorism?

Secretary POWELL. I would think it is quite appropriate for us to raise some long-term issues that go beyond this crisis with respect to some of the school systems that are being funded in the Arab world, where youngsters are learning extremism in those schools and they are not learning their A's, B's, and C's on how to get along in a twenty first century economy. This will hurt those countries in the long run and raise up a generation of youngsters who may well be a threat to those countries.

So I think it is quite appropriate for us to discuss that with them aside from this crisis. This crisis gives it new immediacy, and I think you are quite right.

Mention was also made a moment ago about some of the terrible things that are often said about Americans in their press, government-controlled press. I would like to show you some of the articles about me out of some newspapers from the region. They did not brighten my day when I read them.

Senator KERRY. We will trade you the ones that are written about us.

Secretary POWELL. At the same time you have to be careful here, because you cannot say because you are in a coalition relationship with us all the articles have to be kind and friendly. If I could make that happen in Washington, I would feel that to be a momentous achievement. I think we have to be a little careful before we go a little too overboard on lecturing what the media says in other countries with respect to us.

We do have a problem with the Arab street, with the souk [market], in terms of getting them to have a better understanding of what we are trying to do. To that end, if I could take advantage of your time, Mr. Kerry, we are going to do a better job in public diplomacy. I approved earlier this morning some important new public diplomacy documents and web sites that will take our case to the street a little bit better than we have been taking it to the street lately.

Senator KERRY. Mr. Secretary, I am pleased to hear that.

My time is up. If I could just say in closing, I do think that the on-the-ground component post-Taliban will require I think not just an Afghan structure, but a presence that I hope is global. I would particularly commend the concept of the UN Security Council Permanent 5 contributing to that, because there is no better statement about a global commitment to that will answer some of the divisions you have just addressed in terms of public diplomacy.

Secretary POWELL. I agree. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen and ladies, we have been joined by and I would like to welcome a delegation from the French Foreign Relations Committee, led by their Chairman, Francois Lanca, and by their Co-Chairman, as well as the French Ambassador. We welcome you and wish to personally—

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. We wish to, on behalf of all the American people, to thank you, thank you for standing with us, thank you for your support. It means a great deal. Again, welcome.

Senator Kerry, who lived in Normandy for a while, wants to know whether you would like that translated.

Senator KERRY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I would just like to hear him speak French.

I would now yield to the Senator from Indiana, Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I join you in your greeting to the French delegation. It is really very important that you join with us in this consideration with our Secretary of State of these very vital problems.

I commend you, as we all do, Mr. Secretary, for a magnificent piece of work in pulling together this coalition. What I want to ask, though, of you today is to think aloud about the education of the coalition as well as our education in America in public life and in private life. At least as we in the Congress and now you in the State Department and people in the White House are contemplating terror by anthrax and the biological situation, no one knows for certain the relationship with that and the activities of Osama bin Laden. But nevertheless, as we all think through the network as it is now described of people who have been trained at camps of al-Qaeda in Afghanistan or elsewhere, some of these people come from many nationalities, with apparently very disparate political agendas, not necessarily all of the Arab street people that you were just mentioning, but nevertheless a common desire to disrupt, to act out in violent ways their destiny or what they believe might affect humanity in one way or another.

This is very hard for all of us to understand. We all are acquainted now with the fact that this is not going to be an army and a frontal assault and a nation state and all the things for which we are equipped in our armed services. But we are not really exactly sure who it is and what it is and where the enemy is.

Trying to describe this to all the members of the coalition would seem to me to be even more difficult, because some people have an instinctive fear and maybe many countries have much more experience with terrorism and with these people in various ways than we do. So we are being initiated in a rough way.

But at the same time, it seems to me it is important for us all to keep discussing who the enemy is, because otherwise I sense at various points, as was suggested, people will flake off from the coalition. Or even some say it may be a moving coalition: have a few countries here, a few there, and so forth as you begin to take a look at where the cells are, what the agendas are, and what the definition of terrorism is, as you were plagued with in questions in the House yesterday or other fora.

How do we achieve this business of defining the enemy in a way that we can have some constancy over the course of time in which

the coalition matures and strengthens, as opposed to saying, we have really had enough bombing here, or we are tired of this particular operation, or we wish it was just all over, which we hear continuously even as we are attempting to try to bring to justice some people who have killed 5,000 Americans and it is very vivid still for us?

Secretary POWELL. It is an excellent question, Senator Lugar, and a difficult one to answer. In the first instance, it is easy to identify an Osama bin Laden. He is right out of central casting. He represents no country, no religion. He is an invader in Afghanistan. So there is no difficulty in identifying him as a terrorist and getting everybody to rally against him.

Now, there are other organizations that probably meet a similar standard. The FARC in Colombia comes to mind. The real IRA comes to mind, both of which are on our terrorist list at the State Department.

But then you start to run into areas where one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter, and that is where you have to apply judgment. You have to apply judgment that says is there a better way to express grievances, or is there a better way to change the political problem that you are dealing with, is there a better way to gain your rights, and are you fighting for the kind of rights we believe in, are you fighting for the kind of values that suggest you respect human rights and democracy?

These are difficult calls to make. As you noted, yesterday—you can be quite challenged in explaining these differences with respect to the Middle East. I think most of the members of the coalition have suffered terrorism in their own country in one way or another. So they are sensitive to it and know it when they see it. I think this coalition can be kept together, and I think we can use this coalition to go after the clear cases of terrorism and then to start to explore the gray areas, where there have been long-standing differences that have not yet been resolved.

It is going to take patience. It is going to take diligence. It is going to take the kind of patience and diligence that gave us the breakthrough the day before yesterday in Northern Ireland, where two groups fighting all these years finally realized that this was not going to do it and found a way hopefully now to move forward.

So we are just going to have to persuade everybody to stick to it and continue to make distinctions between that which is legitimate protest and legitimate movement toward freedom against an oppressor and that which simply does not meet that standard. But there are not going to be black and white rules and every instance.

Senator LUGAR. On an entirely different tack, you mentioned in your early comments today the remarkable invocation of article 5 by NATO right off the bat, as you say. That was extremely important and heartening. Then this was reiterated as further evidence was provided.

One of the questions, though, that many Europeans are asking, maybe some Americans, is what does this mean? Now, granted that it may not be appropriate in the special operations in Afghanistan to involve many other countries side by side with American Special Operations Forces, and we are in the early innings of this. But it would seem to me to be important that we think through carefully

how this article 5 is to be utilized. This is a precedent and it is a remarkable first.

To leave our NATO partners along the sidelines, simply accepting their gratitude or their support, but not to invoke really their forces, their money, their organization, all the rest, would seem to me to be quite a loss. You cannot organize everybody at the same time and others in NATO are doing a lot, Lord Robertson and others. But at the same time, what thought is being given as to what the article 5 means and how NATO really is to be invoked here?

Secretary POWELL. Well, as you recall, Senator, they teed up article 5 within 24 hours, and then they waited for us to identify an enemy who had attacked us. When we were satisfied that it was Osama bin Laden and the al-Qaeda network, we then made that case to NATO. We sent them classified information. We gave them a briefing from my special Ambassador for counterterrorism, Ambassador Taylor. Once he convinced them, they then invoked article 5, a couple of weeks, maybe 2 or 3 weeks after the September 11th incidents.

Then once they did that, we immediately gave them a list of things we wanted all members of the alliance to sign up to, overflight rights and some other things that all of the 18 other nations could participate in. But beyond that then, we then went individually to each country to see what assets they might be willing to provide.

Some are able to do much more. Our French colleagues are able to do quite a bit more than some of the other NATO members and they have been generous in their offer. We are now integrating their contribution into the overall plan.

So at this point, once we got these general agreements across the NATO and all of those countries have signed up to those general requests, now we are really handling it more on a bilateral basis with each of the NATO members. Now, we could have done that without invocation of article 5, but the invocation of article 5 makes it cleaner and it puts it under the overall umbrella of NATO.

I also think that NATO, not so much as a military institution but as a political institution as well, might well have a role to play in the future of Afghanistan. We will have to wait and see.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

Senator Dodd [presiding]: Thank you, Senator.

Senator Biden had to step out of the room for a minute to take a call, so as acting chairman here for a minute or so, Mr. Secretary, thank you, and let me join my colleagues in expressing our tremendous gratitude to you. You have done a terrific job and it is appreciated not only here, but I think around the world. We are very lucky to have you doing the job you are doing. I commend you for it.

Just a couple things. One, I do want to express my gratitude to you for meeting with Martin Maginnes. What you and Richard Haass have done has been tremendously helpful. You rightly point out, while it is not complete and there is work yet to be done, this was tremendous news in Europe with the decision to proceed with the decommissioning process. I think that happened in no small measure because you and others decided to continue the continuum

of foreign policies between administrations where appropriate. Obviously, from time to time there will be differences, but I think it is very healthy that the world can see us handing the ball off one administration to the next where there are matters where there are common interests and not have these breaches and breaks that occur. This is a wonderful example of where the ball was passed off and, because you were there and Dick Haass did such a good job, I think it contributed to the events that we saw unfold in Northern Ireland. I commend you for it.

I am glad you are here. I appreciate your doing this. I know you are busy, but I think it is so important for people here at home and around the world to see the Secretary come before the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and the House as well and have an open public discussion. It is further evidence of the differences between how we function as a governing institution or institutions and those with whom we are at conflict today. So I know this takes time, but I appreciate your being here.

I want to talk about the notion of sort of the public diplomacy, if we can, in the Islamic world. There are those who are going to suggest that we should have foreseen September 11th, we could have predicted it. That is a debate for another time. What we certainly should have done I think to some extent is been more involved or understanding of what was going on inside Afghanistan, given our involvement there during Afghanistan's efforts to expel the Soviet Union from that country.

To see emerge a radical regime that is aiding and abetting Osama bin Laden or terrorist organizations and doing so under the name of Islam, just the contradiction is so glaring. It strikes me that, while you have said on countless occasions, the President has said on any number of occasions, I think most of us up here have, if not all of us, that this is not a conflict with the Muslim world or the Islamic faith at all. I do not know how many times you have said it, but I do not think I have ever seen you speak where you did not mention that over and over again.

Yet it just seems to be a disconnect with this. It strikes me that something far more systemic and fundamental needs to be understood about this chasm that exists between the western thinking, if you will, and the thinking and understanding of the Islamic world and how we view each other.

So I wonder if you might just take a couple of minutes and share some thoughts about how we might really do a better job of getting at this problem. It is not going to happen overnight. The thought occurred to me as a former Peace Corps volunteer that maybe we ought to up that kind of a program in that part of the world. I know we have had volunteers there in the past. I know there is some risk involved. But it has proved to be a successful program in having people understand who we are anyway.

But maybe you have some other thoughts as well on how we can begin a process that may take a long time. But I think if we begin it, down the road we can maybe close that gap of understanding that is so wide today. I read about these madrasses with a million children learning by rote every day to hate us and to hate western civilization. These are kids 8, 9, and 10 years of age. The notion that somehow this is a long conflict gets extended when you realize

there is a generation coming along that may be more embittered than the one we are dealing with now.

Secretary POWELL. You are absolutely right, Senator Dodd. We have got to do a better job of it. The madrasses are troubling. In fact, President Musharraf when I spoke to him, we were talking about debt relief and providing more resources for Pakistan. He wants to use some of those resources for education, public education, not just religious education, in order to prepare youngsters for the whole world and not just this one narrow part of the world.

I think we have to do a better job in our public diplomacy efforts. We are about to come out with a very excellent document, but it is more than a document. It is a document that talks about September 11th, that talks about Osama bin Laden, but every page has a Muslim leader condemning the actions of the 11th of September. We are going to translate this into 12 languages. It is going to be electronically transmittable, so that every embassy in our system can download it and print it locally and get it out to the people.

The new Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy, Charlotte Biers, a very, very successful executive from the advertising and marketing world, one of the most successful business persons and businesswomen in America—the Wall Street Journal this morning, Mr. Al Hunt too a slight tap, suggesting that I had hired somebody who used to sell Uncle Ben's Rice to do public diplomacy. Well, guess what. She got me to buy Uncle Ben's Rice, and so there is nothing wrong with getting somebody who knows how to sell something.

Senator DODD. I am going to give Al a call right after.

Secretary POWELL. Give Al a call for me.

The point is we have got to get creative people from the most creative media society on the face of the Earth to put their time, attention, and mind power to this, and I am determined to do that.

We are putting more and more of our administration officials on Al-Jazeera. We have just brought in one of our retired Ambassadors what is fluent in Arabic and he will be spending all of his time giving interviews on Arab radio, on Arab television.

We have got to do more, for example, with IMET, International Military Educational Training activities, bringing young officers over here and exposing them to our system, exposing them to the kind of value system we believe in.

We have got to use Muslim Americans to communicate back to the rest of the world. We have got these few hundred or perhaps a thousand terrorists wandering around Afghanistan claiming that they represent the Muslim faith. I have got tens upon tens of thousands of Muslims who want to come to the United States of America to become Americans, to join this value system, because they see opportunity here, they see a way of life here that is totally consistent with the faith of Islam. That is the kind of—we ought to show this out and not these clowns in a cave somewhere, but Muslim Americans who have made a new life here, to describe the kind of value system that this country has and represents to the rest of the world.

We have just been asleep at the switch on this one for many years and now we have to work on it. We also have to work on

those irritants that are out there—more than irritants, they are tragedies, but they cause an irritant in public diplomacy work: the Middle East peace process. Things of that nature also require our attention.

Senator DODD. I thank you.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Lugar, by the way, I thought that suggestion of the NATO allies and others who have a strong involvement and long history of dealing in the Muslim world as well would be a good source of that exact kind of thinking.

Secretary POWELL. Yes.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. On that point, I say to my friend from Connecticut, the President had asked Senator Helms and I when we were down last with the ranking member and the chairman of the House committee about some ideas. Yesterday—I take no pride in authorship—yesterday the President asked whether I would put in writing a proposal, and we have put in writing a proposal dealing with one aspect of this, just merely the aspect as it relates to broadcasting. It is beyond that.

This is a way to target, we believe, that population between the age of 15 and 30, which is very important, by doing programming that they will like and in the process of the programming also expose our system. I must warn my colleagues now, the cost is about \$280 million startup cost and it is about \$200 million a year, and the President seems intrigued by it, I suspect.

The reason I did not give it to you first, Mr. Secretary, he asked me to give it to him.

Secretary POWELL. You did that overnight, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I did it at our meeting yesterday.

So again, I am confident we can work together. I was really impressed that the President felt very, very strongly about changing the nature of our public diplomacy. So we may have the circumstance here to do something very good. It need not be what I propose, but it could be whatever.

Senator HAGEL.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. Secretary, thank you. Thank you and your team for what you are doing. The President, you, your team, Secretary Rumsfeld, all who are involved in this great purpose and noble effort are doing it with not just an understanding of purpose and a clarity of purpose, but you are doing it in a way that makes all Americans proud, and we appreciate that.

I would add my strong support for what Senator Dodd has just talked about and the chairman. I think there is nothing more critical to the ultimate destination that we are embarked on than defining our purpose clearly to the world. I congratulate you for thinking that way, Mr. Secretary, and in fact exercising some options that we need to exercise in thinking that way.

I might also say that I appreciated your comments about Chairman Biden's, and also Senator Helms' comments, about Chairman Biden's recent dust up in the press. There obviously was some confusion in what he said, how he said it. I read what he said. It was very clear to me it was taken out of context.

What is more troubling about that, and I am glad that most of the responsible leaders in this country recognize it was troubling, is because the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, just as when this committee was under the able stewardship of Chairman Helms, must be always in a position to exercise his thoughts or her thoughts. Those thoughts are important as we form policy because they represent the people of this country.

I would encourage—I am not sure Chairman Biden needs further encouragement on this point, but I would encourage him to continue to speak out and talk about the things that many of us do not have the courage to talk about.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Senator HAGEL. Now, that probably will not move me up on the committee, but—

The CHAIRMAN. I will try not to speak out more.

Senator HAGEL [continuing]. I will be given privileges with the coffee machine.

Mr. Secretary, I know you spent some time with the Israeli Foreign Minister, Mr. Peres, who was in town. He spent a little time with us this week. There is no question that the Middle East is a very important dynamic of what we are about here. That is debatable certainly as to how much the Middle East factors into what we are about. But nonetheless most of us, certainly this Senator does believe that this is part of the overall challenge that we have—the Middle East, Central Asia, South Asia, the Caucasus.

I would welcome your assessment of where you believe we are in the Middle East and if we have time I would like you to drop a little bit further south and another area that troubles some of us is the Philippines and Indonesia. I know you had some opportunity to meet with some of the officials when you were in China as well. So thank you.

Secretary POWELL. With respect to the Middle East, Senator Hagel, it is one of the most difficult problems which the President and I wrestle with every day. We took over the 20th of January this year at the time that the last attempt at a settlement totally collapsed, not only collapsed despite the very best efforts of President Clinton and Madeline Albright and others, but it collapsed and it also resulted, frankly, in the demise of the Barak's regime.

Prime Minister Sharon came in on a platform of bringing security, safety to the people of Israel, and he has been pursuing that objective ever since, in the face of violence and terrorist attacks against Israeli citizens. We put in place the Mitchell plan, which your distinguished colleague, former colleague George Mitchell, and a number of others came up with, which provided us a road map to get out of the violence and get back to discussions on peace on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338.

We then put George Tenet into the region to get a startup plan to the Mitchell plan. Unfortunately, we have not been able to get the violence down to a level where we can get started through Tenet, through Mitchell, back to 242, 338 negotiations.

We saw a little progress about 10 days ago. I was encouraged finally. Chairman Arafat had brought the violence down a considerable amount, not zero and not to where it should be, but brought it down enough so that Prime Minister Sharon was able to respond

with some openings so that people can get back and forth to work. He also indicated once again that he understood that a Palestinian state was there at the end of a process of mutual discussions and agreement.

Then on that terrible next day, the cabinet minister was assassinated, Mr. Zeivi, and that threw everything out of whack again. Since then the Israelis have found it necessary as acts of self-defense, as they say, to go into some of the Area A villages and towns and there has been quite a loss of life.

We have been trying to stabilize the situation by encouraging Mr. Arafat even more than we have in the past, with all the pressure we can put on him, to get the violence under control, arrest these people who are responsible for this violence, so they do not commit violence again, so they do not commit terrorist acts again. We have been pressing Mr. Sharon and the Israeli government to withdraw from the Area A settlements they have gone into, in order to get a separation so that we can get back hopefully to where we were some 10 days ago.

The Israelis went into one village and came out yesterday, and I hope that is a positive sign that perhaps they are able to start pulling back. We have to get back to the point we were at some 10 days ago, where we can start to see some small steps toward confidence in each other, toward a little bit of trust in each other. But it is very, very difficult, and for every two steps forward it takes one terrorist to knock you three steps backward.

We have got to get beyond that. We just cannot let terrorists stop us every time we see some progress. But I know what it is like, I can imagine what it is like for Prime Minister Sharon to face the death of a cabinet minister at the hands of a terrorist, his responsibility to protect the citizens of Israel.

Israel is our best friend. We will never do anything that would put them at risk. But at the same time, the best way to get them out of risk is to try to move forward and to get the peace process moving again. That remains our commitment and determination, and I spend part of every single day on it. I may not be bouncing back and forth in the region, but I have got enough foreign ministers of other nations who do that as part of a team, because we are all united. Russia, the European Union, NATO, all of us together are pushing the same consistent message.

Last night I spoke to Foreign Minister Joshka Fischer, who is there now. Xavier Solana, the High Representative of the European Union, is there now. We are all a single team, trying to apply a consistent message. I will hope to talk to Foreign Minister Manley of Canada this evening and he is heading there as well—all applying pressure.

With respect to Indonesia, I had good discussions with President Megawatti in recent weeks and saw her at the APEC meeting in Shanghai. I thanked her for what she has been doing in recent weeks to take care of the security of our embassies and citizens in Indonesia. I had a great deal of concern in the weeks immediately following 11 September that the situation was a little volatile there and our people were being put at risk. There was a large number of demonstrations, in Indonesia perhaps more than anywhere else. Frankly, we asked the Indonesian government to speak out more

about these kinds of disruptive activities, and they have been forthcoming in the last 2 weeks and our people are feeling much safer than they were 3 weeks ago.

The Philippines, I did not have an opportunity to spend too much time with my Filipino colleagues on this trip. I just welcomed the new Philippine Ambassador to the United States in my office and received his credentials yesterday. I think that President Arroyo is moving forward with a positive agenda. She knows what she has to do in the Philippines. They have some economic difficulties they have to get through. We have also offered our support to them, technical support, to go after some of the terrorists and guerrillas what are threatening innocent civilians and American citizens who are resident in the Philippines as well.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Feingold.

[The prepared statement of Senator Feingold follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

I am particularly pleased to welcome Secretary Powell here today. I join my colleagues in congratulating the Secretary on his tireless diplomatic efforts in bringing together an effective international coalition to fight terrorism and defend the United States from future terrorist attacks. As Secretary Powell has made clear, the current coalition effort to fight terrorism is being waged on a variety of fronts, and the immediate diplomatic initiative by the Secretary to build broad international support for the U.S. response to the terrorist attacks is at least as important as the ongoing military campaign itself.

Appropriate military actions, under the authority of the War Powers resolution, must be balanced by an immediate effort to restrict terrorist financing and improve our public diplomacy. Indeed, as we now recognize, the relatively unrestrained financing of terrorist activities made us vulnerable to attack, and gaps in the current international legal regime that make it difficult to track and control the financing of terrorist groups continue to handicap our fight against terrorism. Immediately following the attacks of September 11, the United States acted unilaterally to cut off all funding to known terrorist organizations and to the front groups that support them. We must now take similar legal steps to sustain that financial assault at the international level.

In our public outreach and public diplomacy, I believe that we must also take immediate steps to reach out to Muslim and Arab communities around the world to counter any unfortunate perceptions that might suggest that the entire Islamic world somehow stands united against our country or our way of life. As Chair of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, I would particularly urge the Secretary to seize the opportunities that may now exist to reach out to African Muslim communities. As an initial step, the Secretary should encourage U.S. ambassadors in the region to initiate a new dialogue with Muslim leaders in Africa. Over the longer term, we should also be prepared to offer appropriate counter-terrorism assistance to responsive African governments, but that assistance should be supplemented by appropriate support for civil society groups. For the moment, however, I believe that public outreach must be a priority, although it is admittedly difficult at this sensitive time.

I am also particularly eager to explore with Secretary Powell the diplomatic challenges that now confront us in pulling together and nurturing our new front-line coalition against terrorism. Diplomatically, I believe it is now essential to let our allies know that in shaping an effective coalition to respond to the September 11 attacks, the United States is not picking friends or determining the contours of future strategic alliances. We are engaged in an immediate self-defense initiative, and we are building an effective regional coalition to secure that defense. While our coalition members are important to us, our Nation's long-term strategic alliances with individual states will continue to be based on mutual understanding and a shared commitment to human rights and democratic reform.

I'm confident the Secretary will also agree that we must not ignore human rights abuses or long-term strategic alliances in the interest of building our immediate anti-terrorism coalition. Instead, we must continue to demand attention to human rights and democracy as a basis for building a mature relationship with any state,

and we must maintain the capacity and the will to support an ongoing dialogue at the international level with all of our allies, including all of our new coalition partners, over human rights practices. I strongly believe that we will do ourselves and our coalition partners a grave disservice if we ignore serious human rights abuses in a misguided effort to advance our immediate anti-terrorism needs.

We must also devise new mechanisms to ensure that our close strategic partners are not ignored as we move forward in building this new and unprecedented coalition against terrorism. Some states may continue to feel left out or ignored in the current period. We must act to reassure those states, although we must simultaneously recognize that there are few areas or regions of the world that have not been touched by the devastating events of September 11.

Finally, we must also guard against excessive reactions on the home front, as our own actions during a national emergency will serve as an important example to both our friends and foes. I truly believe that our actions here at home will have a lasting impact on human rights practices around the world. In short, we must secure human rights at home as we press for human rights abroad.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I just wanted to echo what not only every member of the committee, but I think just about every American, how fortunate we are to have you in this position at this point. I have felt that way before these events of September 11th, but especially since, and I am grateful.

I am also pleased at the way you are responding to the issue that we have talked about before and that Senator Dodd mentioned, the need for public diplomacy, especially with regard to the Islamic world. I would just add to the list, rather than ask a question about it, the need to encourage our Ambassadors in predominantly Muslim countries to reach out to those communities, particularly the moderate parts of it, that it should include not only the countries directly in the region that we are addressing here, but also African nations, and not just North African nations, but also some of the Asian nations that you were just discussing. I think that is all part of the picture.

In addition, I would just encourage you to come to us with any proposals for public diplomacy programs that might be useful in allowing the United States to send Muslim Americans to these countries or to these communities. I would like to follow up on whether the existing programs are adequate.

The questions I would like to ask first relate to a subject that both Senator Helms and Senator Kerry brought up, and that again is how Saudi Arabia is responding to our efforts and their level of cooperation. I know you gave general assurances. I am wondering if you could speak more specifically about whether you are satisfied with the information that you have received with respect to the Saudi citizens who participated in the terrorist attacks and those who have been detained in the United States for questioning.

Secretary POWELL. I may have to yield and perhaps provide you a more extensive answer for the record, because other agencies of government are the ones who are tracking the individual cases. But my impression in listening to briefings from the Attorney General and the FBI Director and others is that the Saudis have been cooperative in providing us access and chasing down leads for us. They were very helpful to us early on, but there was a lot of confusion about names and who was on the plane, who was not on the plane, who were we looking for, who were we not looking for, and helping us to sort out quite a few name glitches.

They have been supportive, as have our other Arab friends in the region. Remembering that they all have internal political problems and domestic concerns that they have to deal with, all of them seemingly have been very responsive in balancing their need to be a functioning, contributing member of the coalition and what they have to deal with inside their own societies.

Can I pick up on that?

Senator FEINGOLD. Please.

Secretary POWELL. You mentioned Africa and I should have touched on it earlier. We have also gotten strong support from Africa below the Sahara. I was very pleased to receive that. The Organization of African Unity made a statement and President Waddae of Senegal has taken the lead in pulling the south African nations together to do more than just give us rhetorical support, but to actually give us more positive support.

In a very meaningful ceremony to me, about 2 weeks ago just before I went to Shanghai, the entire African diplomatic corps came to my office to express their support, condolences, and to present to me for the President a letter expressing that support and their condolences to the American people from the African ambassadors here.

Senator FEINGOLD. I appreciate that and I agree with it, and make sure that we are mindful that many of Mr. bin Laden's crimes were perpetrated on African soil.

Secretary POWELL. Yes.

Senator FEINGOLD. And that the African leaders are very aware of that and are very much in the mind of trying to help us.

Also on the Saudi Arabian question, the question of cracking down on the financing of terrorist organizations. Has Saudi Arabia adopted new banking guidelines or regulations? Have they taken steps to really scrutinize the operations of some of the large charities that have allegedly funneled money to terrorist organizations?

Secretary POWELL. My best understanding is that everything we have asked them to do they have done. But I would rather get an informed answer on specific aspects of your question having to do with banking regulations and specific charitable organizations that they have been asked to go after or shut down and give you an informed answer that I will bring back from my Treasury colleagues.

[The additional information to which Secretary Powell referred follows:]

Saudi Arabia has taken a number of steps to turn off the flow of money to individuals or entities suspected of terrorist ties. The Vice Finance Minister and Deputy Governor of the Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency (SAMA) traveled to Washington on October 4 to consult with Treasury and State Department officials on this issue. On October 15, the Saudi Government blocked the bank accounts of 39 individuals designated by the U.S. as engaging in terrorist activities. We note that following the Treasury Department designations, SAMA issued instructions to its banks to search its records for such accounts and report them to the government. They continue to monitor bank accounts for terrorist links, and remain in contact with us on this matter. The Saudi Press Agency announced on November 5 that Saudi Arabia's cabinet decided to sign the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

Senator FEINGOLD. Fair enough, and if it turns out that we have not asked those things I would be curious to know if we are planning to and when, and if not why not.

Have there been any efforts to post information relating to the United States reward program for terrorism information in the refugee camps in Pakistan? Would this even be helpful or would it be too destabilizing?

Secretary POWELL. Reward information?

Senator FEINGOLD. We have a reward program. I am wondering if we are attempting to let people know in these camps and in these situations that such a program exists.

Secretary POWELL. I will have to check whether we have a way of getting it into the camps. We put it up on a number of web sites and other ways of getting to people, but you will not find web sites in those camps. But I will have to check and see whether there is another way to get that kind of information to camps.

Once we put it on the web sites, we started averaging 200,000 hits a day.

[The additional information to which Secretary Powell referred follows:]

The latest *Reward for Justice* Program advertising campaign is scheduled to begin in November. It will initially target all domestic audiences and then in late December will move to focus on Muslim American communities throughout the United States. In early 2002, we will begin an internationally focused effort to reach overseas communities, with specific emphasis on communities with a large Muslim population or connectivity.

This program is receiving unprecedented attention and support. The leveraging of multiple media, such as print, the Internet, posters, Public Service announcements, mass media programming, paraphernalia (e.g., matchbooks, bumper stickers, posters, lapel pins) and radio spots will convey our message to a diverse, global audience.

Through cooperation with the Ad Council and its member advertising agencies, we have revamped the program. Using multiple language and dialects, our intent is not only to reach the widest audience possible in a consistent and effective manner; but to specifically encourage members of Islamic communities to join in combating terrorism.

The proper utilization of Rewards for Justice advertising materials is dependent on multiple variables, some of which themselves are in a constant state of change. In certain environments, such as Pakistan, the program must rely heavily on the counsel of those on the ground as to the dividends and consequences of such deployments. While various media outlets throughout Pakistan have been used to advertise the program, there have been no such efforts directed at the refugee camps located there. The embassy acknowledges inherent difficulties in targeting that population, but continues to examine the potential.

The Department remains committed to the principles and the advancement of the program, and is aggressively pursuing its application.

Senator FEINGOLD. We had suggested posters.

Secretary POWELL. Yes, posters, flyers, leaflets, things we can distribute with the food.

Senator FEINGOLD. On the subject of the food, could you comment on concerns expressed by the Pentagon yesterday that the Taliban may be attempting to poison humanitarian deliveries of food? Do you share those concerns?

Secretary POWELL. We have seen that report. We have seen that report and we thought it was best for us to comment on this possible contamination by the Taliban before it actually happened. I do not think we have seen any evidence that it has happened. But we wanted to put that out right away to let everybody know that the food we have sent in is absolutely safe. You have seen lots of pictures of kids eating those rations. So those rations are absolutely safe coming in from the United States, and the Taliban may

have some ideas about poisoning them and blaming us or poisoning them just to make them useless, no matter whether they get caught doing the poisoning or not.

But I am not aware of any actual ration that somebody has identified as having been poisoned.

Senator FEINGOLD. I thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, thank you for coming here. It seemed to me as a supporter of NATO that prior to September 11th that, while we were functioning as an alliance in the Balkans and in other places, we were very much being pulled apart by forces, perhaps for want of a common enemy, that enemy no longer being Russia or the Soviet Union. But perhaps on September the 11th the North Atlantic Treaty Organization found a new purpose in a fight against terrorism.

Do you sense that? Is there an opportunity, as Dick Lugar talked about, to actually use article 5 in a constructive way to rebuild this alliance and also include some of the new applicant countries in a way that does not threaten Russia, but may actually include them in a coordinated way?

Secretary POWELL. I think that opportunity is there, Senator Smith, and I think we ought to try to take advantage of it. I just might argue with you a little bit. I never thought the alliance was being pulled apart or split apart. I remember vividly in 1990 and 1991 when I was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and everybody was watching the Warsaw Pact disappear, and my Russian colleagues would say to me: OK, now that we have busted up the Warsaw Pact, it is time for you to bust up NATO. It no longer has any purpose, any meaning. You brought it into existence to deal with us. We are gone, you do not need NATO. Get rid of it. It is an anachronism. Let us find a new security arrangement.

It was very troubling. There were seminars held all over Washington. Every tummy-rubber in town was having a seminar on "Whither NATO?" And guess what. It is 11 years later; NATO is here. And guess what. Everybody wants to join. So there must be something good about this organization. What is good about it is that it is a community of shared values.

The difference between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is they did not want to be members. But everybody who wants to join NATO wants to be a member of this community of democracies, but more important than that, they want to be linked to North America and they want to be linked to the United States, and NATO is the way to do it. Neither the EU nor any other European organization provides that same linkage.

So I gave up thinking that NATO did not have a mission some time around 1991, 1992, when I realized that all of these Warsaw Pact countries were going to want to join in order to become a part of the West. That is why Mr. Putin sort of every now and then says something like that.

Senator SMITH. I just want to encourage you and the administration to take advantage of it, because I agree with you, I do not be-

lieve that it was going to dissolve, but I also think it needed some vitality. I think we were reminded of the common values we have on September 11th and I think we should not lose sight of that. That is what binds the West together. So I hope you will find ways to truly pursue this.

Secretary POWELL. I agree with you entirely on that point, Senator.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Secretary, recently the State Department Deputy Spokesman Philip Reeker made the following statement concerning the Israeli Army's entry into the Palestinian-controlled areas following the assassination of their Minister of Tourism. He said, "Israeli Defense Forces should be withdrawn immediately from all Palestinian-controlled areas and no further such incursions should be made."

I wonder if it was meant to be that absolute. I wonder if the provocations like the assassination of a minister of their government—if that happened in our country, would we not pursue them out of our own boundaries?

Secretary POWELL. I am sure we would pursue, but I think we would try to make the pursuit in this case as quickly as possible and remove ourselves from those areas. One can always put yourself in the position of saying this is justified, and Mr. Sharon and I have talked about this almost daily. I know why he is doing it, and I am not sure exactly how I would feel if I were him, but probably just as strongly.

But what I also have said to him and said to Shimon Peres and others is that there is a day after, and a day after the day after. Ultimately your security will come behind the strong right arm of the Israeli Defense Forces, but it ultimately has to rest on peace between the two parties in the region. So while you are doing what you have to do in self-defense of your nation and of your ministers and of your people, we also have to keep in mind that ultimate security will come only when we can get back to a process of peace. So anything that while defending yourself is done in such a way that it makes it that much more difficult to get back to the path does not serve your interest at the end of the day. You have got to find the correct balance.

In all of these months now of responding that way, using force, as justified as it may be in some instances, security has not been restored. We do not have the kind of quiet that we need in order to move forward with the peace process.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Secretary, I do not doubt for a minute your motivation in this or that of the American government and that we will be steadfast in our alliance with Israel. But I am worried about sending a message that says when their citizens are murdered they cannot do what the United States is now doing, which is pursuing wherever the terrorists are to root them out by whatever means possible.

I want peace in the Middle East, but I think sometimes we forget what it is like to have a discotheque blown up and a lot of young people with it, or a Sbarro's pizzeria taken out in a town square by people who are in their country sometimes or on their borders and who are identified with Islamic Jihad, al-Qaeda, Hamas, and

Hezbollah. These are the people that would murder us just as quickly. You know that.

I want to say again publicly that I think we need to judge Israel by our own standards. I cannot even comprehend what it must be like to live in that country, a sovereign nation, a democratic nation, and be under the pressures they are of constant murder. I hope that we will be sensitive to that.

Thank you, sir.

Secretary POWELL. Yes, sir. The only other point I might add is that what makes the situation a little different, but at the same time makes it that much more complex, is that we are also asking each side to see the other side as a partner in the quest for peace and the absence of violence. So if you are also going to be a partner with the other side, as you respond to the deadly attacks that you receive you have to keep in part of your calculus the fact that this is somebody that you will have to be partner with, somebody you will have to work with at the end of the day to move forward. That makes it that much more complex.

Senator SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Wellstone.

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, we really appreciate you.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you.

Senator WELLSTONE. I have three questions. I am going to try and go through them quickly. Thanks for being here with us. The first is on humanitarian assistance. The second is on the military campaign. The second question is the one that I have been struggling with. The third, if I get a chance, is on Uzbekistan.

On the humanitarian assistance, we passed an amendment yesterday on the foreign ops bill that just said let us redouble our efforts. I do not need to give you the statistics. You know it all in terms of worst case scenario. A couple of points.

One is have you urged Pakistan to open up its borders in accordance with international law, because that is one of the issues right now. Maybe I will just lay them all out.

The second has to do with this whole notion, especially in the northern part of Afghanistan, where I think we see the greatest threat of starvation, whether or not—Refugee International—and it is something that I have been interested in as well—has talked about the notion of setting up humanitarian corridors in this zone where you could sort of, with the local chief on the ground and the military and humanitarian, some sort of coordination, where you could literally set up these humanitarian corridor zones and bring in the food, a truck convoy, which is the best way. As you know, the air drops are good, but less than 1 percent of the people.

I wondered whether you would support such an idea or whether we are considering something like that right now.

Secretary POWELL. On the first point, we have encouraged Pakistan to continue being as generous as they have over the years with respect to providing refuge for people what are desperately in need in trying to escape their circumstances. The Pakistanis are at the limit of their absorptive capability with over 2 million refugees, and there is also some danger of the kinds of people who are com-

ing across. So there have been some openings and closings over the last 6 weeks. We encourage them to do all they can.

With respect to the second part of your question, up north, we are hoping that the Northern Alliance will be successful, which will essentially give control of the north to an anti-Taliban faction, and that would make it easier to open access coming from the north, from Uzbekistan down into that part of Afghanistan. I have reason to believe we will be able to start barging things across the river. The bridge is a problem. The reports I had this morning was that things were improving in the north.

But this, as I said to the other members earlier, and I think might have been here—

Senator WELLSTONE. I was here.

Secretary POWELL [continuing]. It is tenuous situation, and that is why every morning I have got to look at it to see what happened the day before.

Senator WELLSTONE. Well, on Pakistan, I understand that also they would need our additional economic help. There is only so much. But on the other hand—

Secretary POWELL. Yes. Not just ours. The Japanese have kicked in \$40 million. There is a lot of money and there is a lot of food.

Senator WELLSTONE. But you have got thousands of desperate people right now sleeping in the open air, without food, without shelter, without water, who cannot cross the border. So it seems to me at the highest level we are going to have to urge them to let people in.

Then on the northern part, again I would just say that I hope it is not just contingent on what the Northern Alliance is able to do or not do.

Secretary POWELL. No, we are pushing anyway.

Senator WELLSTONE. I think the notion of these humanitarian response zones I think is one of the ways that we might be able to get the food in. I just would urge you to take a look at it. As I say, groups like Refugee International, which I think do real good work—Ken Bacon was talking about this the other day. I think they feel like this could make an enormous difference in the northern part of Afghanistan, where you have the greatest problem.

Secretary POWELL. I will raise it with the AID Director in the morning.

[The additional information to which Secretary Powell referred follows:]

We do not support the establishment of humanitarian corridors in Afghanistan. We are confident the coalition would honor such corridors and the Taliban would not—as was demonstrated by the recent diversion of World Food Program (WFP) food to military use in Khandahar. This would reduce coalition military flexibility while enhancing that of the Taliban. We continue to believe that the World Food Program, International Committee of the Red Cross and nongovernmental organization partners will be able, although not without difficulty, to transport and distribute large amounts of relief commodities, including food aid, into Afghanistan. We note that previous attempts to establish such corridors (Bosnia, Somalia, Sierra Leone) have a very mixed track record, even under the auspices of a protection force.

Senator WELLSTONE. I appreciate that.

The second question is different and this is a complete—at the risk of being melodramatic—this is a counterintuitive question

coming from me, someone like me. But there has been discussion about post-Taliban and the need to think about economic reconstruction and political reconstruction. My question is how do we get to post-Taliban.

Yesterday we had a number of different people. I think the chairman was saying: Listen, you know, tough people. We see the resiliency of the Taliban. My question is, tell me what I am missing here. Are we really going to be able to do this with air strikes? I mean, it seems to me we are not. I do not see how we can on the basis of what I am reading. I do not have your experience, your expertise. I am looking for your help.

If anything, we have done everything possible. You have been the best at saying we want to do everything we can to stay away from innocent civilians. But it seems like they are the ones that pay the price. The Taliban, bin Laden, the terrorists, I have this sense of foreboding that they are not the ones right now yet we are able to get.

My question is, is there any other way but on the ground, kill or be killed warfare? Is that where we are heading? Is that what really is going to be necessary? I did not hear Senator Biden's statement at the beginning, but I would like to ask that question, where this is going, what we need to do. I am not dissenting from it. I just want to know where you think we are going.

Secretary POWELL. I think the air campaign is an important element and it is shifting away from some of the air defense and infrastructure targets to targets that in my world of soldiering would have been called close air support targets, where they are actually going after Taliban units that are standing in the way of ground movement of Northern Alliance and other forces who are aligned against the Taliban.

One always hopes and I have always hoped that air power will do the job.

Senator WELLSTONE. I do, too.

Secretary POWELL. I hoped it in Desert Storm, we all hope it. But it may well be the case that it is air power in conjunction with ground movement by the Northern Alliance that will crack the back of the Taliban. So the air campaign—and here I would really have to yield more to my colleagues in the Pentagon to go into greater detail. But the air campaign now is shifting to provide close air support and battlefield air interdiction in support of those forces arrayed against the Taliban.

If those forces show aggressiveness, if they are prepared to move, if they have the supplies that they need—and I sense that they are getting what they need—then it seems to me between the two, air and their ground, the Taliban would have a tough time coping with that over time.

Senator WELLSTONE. Between our air strikes and Northern Alliance?

Secretary POWELL. That is right.

Senator WELLSTONE. That is what you are saying?

Secretary POWELL. Now, that is not to say that tomorrow morning we do not wake up and the Northern Alliance has not moved, but the air power did its job and the Taliban regime is heading out of Kandahar. We do not know. That is the interesting thing.

Senator WELLSTONE. That is your hope.

Secretary POWELL. It would certainly be my hope.

Senator WELLSTONE. I hope you are right. I hope you are right. I think I ran out of time, so I will just in 30 seconds say that the question—you do not have to answer; we can talk later. On Uzbekistan, we passed an amendment yesterday that just called for a reporting on our money and how it is spent with the security in that country. We need them. They are part of our coalition. My simple point—and you are very sensitive to this. My simple point is this is also a government that crushes people because they practice the Islamic faith, and we have made it clear that we are not at war with people who practice the Islamic faith.

So there is some kind of way in which we need to make this distinction of ally but not uncritical support of this government in the way in which it just crushes its own people. We can talk about it later.

Thank you for being here.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Chafee.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me add my praise for your continued distinguished service.

My question involves one of Osama bin Laden's hot button issues, one that he seems to use effectively: the presence of our military bases on the Arabian Peninsula. What is the status of those bases? When did we first put them in? How long were they contemplated to be there? Has all of this changed now?

Secretary POWELL. We really are hosted by a number of nations in the region at their bases. Some of those bases have been used by us for 50 years. Bahrain has been home to the American fleet for almost, close to 50 years if my memory serves me correctly.

Every single one of those facilities, our presence in every single one of those countries, is at the invitation of that country and relates to our mutual security interests. We have military forces in Kuwait. We have military forces in Oman and other nations in the region. They are there by invitation and they are there because in a previous time and place those nations were threatened by other Muslim nations. So we are there to defend them from aggressor nations who also happen to be Muslims. So there are Americans who are there helping them to protect their interests, and we should not allow Osama bin Laden to make that case.

We are not infidels or violators of anything. We are there and our young men and women are pretty good guests to have if you are going to have guests. They deport themselves very, very well and they are performing a magnificent job, and I think the countries that host them are very pleased to have them. I have had delegations recently from Bahrain and Qatar and other places, and they speak highly of our youngsters, and they are pleased to serve as their hosts.

Senator CHAFEE. Well, if I have some continued time left I would like to follow up on some points Senator Smith was making about NATO and the many eager candidates to join the alliance. Is there any effective role for the United Nations in this conflict?

Secretary POWELL. Oh, yes indeed. We discussed this earlier, that Mr. Brahimi, Ambassador Brahimi of Algeria, who is the Sec-

retary General's personal representative for Afghanistan and has had this role before, is going to be the key figure in helping to pull together what that new government looks like and what U.N. presence, administrative presence, might be required to get them up and running.

Senator CHAFEE. And they have had some experience with setting up provisional governments in East Timor and elsewhere.

Secretary POWELL. Yes.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary POWELL. Two examples I have in mind: East Timor and Cambodia.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Brownback.

I might add before Senator Brownback asks his questions, his contribution to facilitating the changes that we needed to take legislatively in Pakistan, as well as his knowledge and expertise about, as you referred to them, the Stan's, has been invaluable, and I think he has played a lead role in that on the Senate side in facilitating the request you made to me. Really, it is this Senator.

Secretary POWELL. I share that sentiment entirely, if I may, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the Senator for the role he has played.

Senator BROWNBACK. I thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the comments. I am delighted that we have been able to work so well so fast on some of these, what have been pretty intractable foreign policy issues for a number of years. But I think it just should be shown to the American public that when we have got a threat from abroad, this country unites, pulls together, and we get the job done and we are going to get the job done, which is what your State Department is doing, and I am really pleased with seeing that.

If I could first say that, a little contrary to my colleague from Minnesota, about the Uzbeks, the foreign minister you noted was just here and is in town and I think would meet with any members that would like to. Uzbekistan has I think been stand-up straight with us on taking on a very difficult situation, and are now getting a lot of pressure from some people in the neighborhood that they are in. I hope we work real closely and carefully with them—I know that you will—at the same time we press them forward on our set of issues we believe in, and we do not move off of democracy, human rights, religious freedom. Those are key things for us.

But I think there is clearly a way that we work with people and at the same time that our values get seeded with them over a period of time, and that we work carefully doing that. I would hope we would work over a long period of time with a number of these countries in Central Asia that I think are going to be critically important to us clearly in this campaign and on into the future. They are going to be in a central role.

So I just want to add that as a side comment. I do not know if you have any thoughts that are any different from that.

Secretary POWELL. I agree with you. We have had tremendous cooperation from the Uzbek government and the Foreign Minister and I speak regularly on the phone. They know that when you invite us in and you want us to have a friendly relationship with you, we bring our values, and we believe our values are not American, but they are universal. So we will always speak up for tolerance

and for human rights and individual liberty and practice of religion.

Senator BROWNBACK. I think it is important that we work with them, because that is a tough, tough region and we need friends in that area.

I want to ask you—this is a side issue of sorts, but it is connected. There have been some reports about bombings, air campaign bombings in Georgia that have been taking place in the past weeks, because of I guess allegations of Chechnyan support or allowing transit through Georgia to get into Chechnya, and supposed Russian bombings taking place in Georgia.

Now, I am curious if you know or could update us on these events and any U.S. responses, or if you could enlighten me further on what is taking place in that particular area?

Secretary POWELL. There are guerrillas, I shall call them, who the Russians view as a threatening presence in Georgia, who have also been in Abkhazia. We got reports of bombings over the last 2 or 3 weeks and we have taken this up with the Russians. They have not directly acknowledged that they conducted such bombings or that such bombings took place, although we are reasonably sure that somebody's fighter jets that have the capacity to reach that area within range of those jets conducted some bombing activities.

We have made it clear to the Russians that we think any action of this type on anybody's part is out of place. This is not the way to solve this problem. President Putin and President Bush discussed it in Shanghai last Sunday night.

Senator BROWNBACK. I am glad to hear that, that that is taking place.

I want to take up a comment that you had made in the opening statement that I have heard a lot of, and I have heard it again from Mr. Musa the other day, the head of the Arab League, about the watching of the Arab street and that there is only kind of so much that can be taken on because of the reaction that might take place in the Arab street. I really wonder if the issue here is a lack of other ways to express in the Arab street.

My fundamental point here is I think we have got to push everywhere in the world for democracy, human rights, ability to be able to freely express, religious freedom, that including in places in the Arab world as well. As we go forward in Afghanistan, hopefully post-Taliban shortly, that we are going to continue to push there and in the rest of the world for, look, in Afghanistan it is going to be democracy, including women having the right to vote and participating in the society—we passed a little amendment on that yesterday—that as we press forward on this campaign that we press a region of the world that I think at times we have been a little more timid on pressing just the basic things that we stand for.

That is going to be, I know it is going to be, a difficult issue for you in keeping the coalition together. But I think it is just paramount for us to do that.

Secretary POWELL. It is a tricky issue, but I think you are absolutely right, Senator, because many of these nations, the leadership does not represent the street. Democracies represent the street. You are here sitting behind that green table because you represent

the street, and the day you all stop representing the street you are out of here, more so with your colleagues on the other side. But nevertheless, unto dust thou shalt return the day you stop representing the street.

But when you do not have a free democratic system where the street is represented in the halls of the legislature and in the executive branches of those governments, then they have to be more concerned about the passions in the street. It is almost—it is not what you would expect. You would think if you do not have a democratic system you have greater authority. But in some ways you may have greater power, but it is not clear you have greater authority in the sense that you are operating with the authority of your people.

I have started to raise these issues and talk to some of our friends in the region and said, you know, in addition to sort of criticizing us from time to time and terrible editorials about us in your newspapers, better start taking a look in the mirror.

Senator BROWNBACK. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allen.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary-General—

Secretary POWELL. Hi, Governor.

Senator ALLEN [continuing]. Good to see you, and I want to publicly express all my gratitude on behalf of all the people in America for your very steady, principled, solid, experienced leadership for our interests. You are an embodiment of all the principles that are articulated in the Declaration of Independence, and there is no more articulate leader in our country than you, and thank you for your dedicated service to our cause and others in the world.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, Senator.

Senator ALLEN. One thing I have learned, I would say, Mr. Chairman, is I had all sorts of questions here. I even was going to say something to our French friends. By the time you get down here, every question has been answered. *Nos ami francais* are gone, so I cannot even say thank you to them for fighting the war against terrorism in French.

But let me follow up on some of the questions, or actually some of the sentiments by the chairman and Senator Helms, Dodd, Feingold, Gordon Smith, and Hagel; all covered some of the issues, and just checking right through them. If I were a lawyer on cross-examination, I could rest my case.

Let me, though, follow on Senator Hagel and Senator Gordon Smith's question as far as Yasser Arafat is concerned. It was reported that President Bush this week at least drafted, if not sent, a letter to Chairman Arafat calling on him to "make absolutely certain" that his forces arrest those responsible for the assassination of Israeli Minister Zeivi. Now, my questions are: Has the letter been sent? Has there been a response from the Palestinians to it? And this gets to the overall question, and we brought this up in a private meeting and I do not expect a lot of things that are private and sensitive to be stated here, but has there been a response from that letter if it has been sent?

Which gets to the overall question: If Chairman Arafat—we do want to have somebody to be able to deal with. If he is going to

be the authority of the Palestinians or the leader, it is important that he have control if we are going to be negotiating with somebody toward peaceful ends between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

Secretary POWELL. The letter was sent on Sunday from Shanghai. I think it was Sunday. It could have been Saturday. Forgive me, but either Saturday or Sunday we edited it and the President approved it and it was sent over the weekend.

I do not know if we have received a reply. It would go to the White House first, and I have not seen a reply. There may be one, but I cannot answer that part of your question.

Senator ALLEN. Do you know if there is any reply forthcoming as far as him turning over those who were involved in the assassination of this cabinet minister?

Secretary POWELL. He has said to my diplomats in the region, Counsel General Schlicker, that he is working on it. They have made some arrests. It is not clear that they have made all the arrests that could be made or should be made and whether those arrests are true arrests as you and I know them or just somebody held in some kind of home detention. That is a source of contention.

But the Chairman has been told by the President in that letter and by me personally that same evening by phone call and subsequently that this has got to have his full attention. We are not going to go forward, we cannot get back to where we were just 10 days ago, unless arrests are made in this murder and the organizations responsible for this are brought under control number broken up.

Senator ALLEN. That is a very good, strong, resolute statement. I hope they listen closely and comply.

On another area, I was reading your remarks. I know you edited it here, but in your at least prepared remarks, insofar as Pakistan and India is concerned and the desire and assurance to President Musharraf that our improved relationship was not just temporary, it was long term, which I think would be beneficial to us, but most importantly beneficial to the people of Pakistan, and not just have this a temporary alliance.

I very much commend you for going right in the middle of a hot spot, but seeming to smooth things over insofar as India and Pakistan are concerned.

One concern that many of us recognize is President Musharraf in I think his bravery, his courage, and the efforts of both India and Pakistan to be of assistance to us in this war on terrorism. However, there are a lot of these fanatics right on the ground there. We may have some somehow in this country, but nowhere near the numbers, obviously, that are right there in Pakistan and trying to get over their border.

What is your assessment, just for the public record, of the stability of the Musharraf government, because we see these protests on TV. We hear that they are exaggerated, and any incident could be exaggerated by TV. But what is your best assessment as to the stability and the continuity and the support from the people of Pakistan for the Musharraf government?

Secretary POWELL. My distinct impression is that he has thought through the consequences of his actions. He did that after I called him on the 13th of September and told him, you have to make a choice, sir. He thought it through, took courageous, bold action, thought through all of its consequences, and so far I think it has come out well for him.

He enjoys the support of all of his top leaders. He has been able to change some of those leaders to put more of his own people in place, and felt strong enough to do that and did it successfully. Polls show that a majority of the people in Pakistan support what he has done. A very large majority, much higher majority, 80 something percent, do not like our military action in Afghanistan.

Senator ALLEN. The majority do not?

Secretary POWELL. Something like 80 percent do not like what we are doing in Afghanistan, the military action. But they understand what he did to come down strongly against terrorism on the side of those fighting terrorism. But there is this dichotomy between what the government has done and their support of the government and their approval or lack of approval for our actions.

So that is one of the reasons that President Musharraf says almost at every one of his press conferences: I hope this military campaign is as short as possible. He also says: But the mission has to be accomplished.

But my judgment is that he is as secure as one can be when you do have threats in a country such as Pakistan against established rule and against your life. Something could go wrong. But he also seems to be taking action to deal with some of the extremist elements in his society.

What deeply impressed me about President Musharraf is as he talked about debt relief, I came back with it emblazoned across my forehead: not send me weapons, send me this, send me that; debt relief. My staff told me that he is going to call me in the morning to talk about—debt relief. What does he want to use that debt relief flexibility for? Poverty reduction programs, social programs, education programs, so he can put in place a public education system and start to break the hold of some of the madrasses.

So I think he is secure. He has got a pretty good idea of what he is about and he is moving forward aggressively. So I was pleased at that.

Let me also say a word about India because you touched on India. I visited India as well and we have received strong support from President Vajpayee and Foreign Minister Singh, my counterpart. They are anxious to do more. They are very anxious to be part of the humanitarian flow going into Afghanistan.

What I tried to assure both my Pakistani and Indian interlocutors is that it is not a zero sum game, it is not a hyphenated game, U.S.-India-Pakistan. It is U.S. and India, it is U.S. and Pakistan. It is not a zero sum game that one benefits at the disadvantage of the other. We can have solid relations with both. Both relations can go forward and we want both relationships to go forward in a positive manner and hopefully start to create conditions which will allow dialogue to resume between the two sides on the issue of Kashmir.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, we will just keep you a few more moments. On debt relief, Senator Lugar, who has really led in this whole area, but Senator Lugar and I have suggested that debt relief be used with regard to Russia so that they could direct more funds into their nonproliferation programs to divert dangerous materials or technology. Should we give the administration the authority to pursue that possibility?

Secretary POWELL. I do not know what particular authority the President might need, but I would certainly like to consider it. One of the major items of discussion between President Putin and President Bush this past Sunday was old Soviet era debt, debt relief. I also had this—if I may, sir, I also had the conversation with Foreign Minister Ivanov last Thursday night at dinner, same subject.

They have got to get out from under that burden, and they are very interested in using the relief they get to go after some of the Nunn-Lugar programs and chemical weapons elimination and those sorts of things. So I think there is merit in this.

I talked to Foreign Minister Ivanov earlier today about the next time we are going to get together and he said, “And I am bringing my economic ministers; we have got to talk about debt relief.”

The CHAIRMAN. Well, as I said, Senator Lugar is the lead on this. I am just along for the ride. But I do not think there is anything more important that we could possibly do than provide you with all the tools you need based on your inclination and their desire to deal with what is probably a cost of \$8 to \$9 billion to do away with their chemical weapons, probably somewhere on the order of \$30 billion by the Baker report over 8 years or 9 years to deal with nuclear weapons. If they are ready, I truly think there could be—I cannot think of any higher priority than being able to corral that.

Is Musharraf still committed to elections in October 2002?

Secretary POWELL. Yes. I asked him that directly and he is committed to elections next fall.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you are able—I mentioned it 2 days ago when we were all at the White House. I thought your initiative on new smarter sanctions with Iraq was absolutely right on target. I know you got sort of bandied about a little bit, not by the President but by folks in the Congress and others. You are dead right in my view. I hope you are able to—and I mentioned this before—work out a way in which in this new interest that Russia seems to have, it may be able to benefit us both and they may—with your ingenuity—there may be a way to prevent them from being sort of the kibosh on getting this done. I want you to know you would have some strong support up here for that effort.

The last point I will make is actually a question, a very brief question. I realize that Iran is a complicated situation, and I know I have tried my best; I do not think I have a clear read on where Khatemai and Khomeini and the relationship. I think I know, but it is very complicated. There seems to be a genuine desire on the part of those who were elected to search for new relationships with us and the West generally, and Khomeini seems to still have a veto power over that and not inclined to do that.

But I found it fascinating, and maybe I attach too much significance—I like your comment. Since nothing much happens relating to foreign policy without consensus in that country, consensus meaning Khomeini signing off if Khatemai moves, the almost—I do not know where it came out of—the request—I mean, excuse me, the commitment that Iran would help ferry out downed American pilots in Afghanistan, which they border obviously. Is that just a freestanding assertion or is that sort of an entree to a larger dialogue?

How do you read that?

Secretary POWELL. I do not think that that particular item is an entree to a larger dialogue. But they have said some other things that might give us an entree to slightly larger dialogue, and there are some other aspects of that I might discuss with you privately.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, at another time I would like to talk with you about it. We are keeping you very long. I yield to my colleague Senator Helms. I know you have been here over 2 hours already. We will not keep you much longer. Believe it or not, it has been more than 2 hours. So thank you. I know you are having fun, but—

Senator HELMS. There have been a lot of reports, Mr. Secretary, saying that there are links between the September 11th terrorist attacks and the recent anthrax attacks and Saddam Hussein. Is that just a manufactured report or is there accuracy to it?

Secretary POWELL. There are a lot of reports, but I do not think anybody can point to specific linkages, except why now are we having all of these anthrax attacks? That is the only linkage I see in my mind. But nobody can yet give you firm evidence that links the two.

Senator HELMS. There is a whole lot of stuff going on, I bet you so and so and so and so and so, and by the time the presses start to roll: It happened. We need a little tightening up of manufactured stories, I think.

Secretary POWELL. We had our first anthrax case in the State Department today.

Senator HELMS. Yes.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Wellstone.

Senator WELLSTONE. The chairman was gracious enough to ask if I wanted to ask any questions, and I just want to thank you.

Secretary POWELL. Thank you, Paul.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Secretary, I have just two points. I appreciate Senator Biden's mention about arms control and debt. As you prepare and the President prepares for the Crawford meeting, again and again the Russians have told you and they have told some of us that some of their trade with Iran as it deals with, as they characterize it, peaceful nuclear development is a business transaction, that they need the business. The volume traded there is very important, they would say, as you take a look at their revenues and their problems.

They rationalize some commercial transactions, as they perceive them, with Iraq in the same way, that for us to be critical of this is to deprive them of business. But at the same time, we are in a

war against terror and trying to maintain an intersection between the terrorists and weapons of mass destruction, and at the end of the day Iran and Iraq are very important in terms of those developments and what friends in Russia are prepared to do to help us with this.

So *sub rosa* sometimes Russian diplomats come behind the barn and suggest that if we are that concerned about it, we ought to be concerned about their debt; that in fact there are ways of lightening that load and the need to deal with these countries. You have been through this, but this is an important area while we are talking about debt reduction and weapons of mass destruction and what after Afghanistan, bin Laden and the Taliban and what have you.

The other point is that it could be, and this at least we read in the press, that at Crawford the President and President Putin will discuss reduction of nuclear arms, specifically weapons of mass destruction of the nuclear variety. All sorts of figures have been cast around of reductions from the 6,000 more or less level to 2,000, 1500, what have you.

Whatever it may be, you know that the single destruction of a nuclear weapon, the taking of the warhead off of the missile, the breakdown of that warhead, and the separation of the fissile material, and the storage of the material so that it does not come into play somewhere else, are very expensive. Now, we are all pushing across the table and saying 6,000 to 1500 without any relationship to the billions, the tens of billions of dollars, that are represented in that critically important negotiation for the world.

Now, at the end of the day, if we are not thoughtful about this, the Nunn-Lugar Act—or whatever it may be at that point—is going to become very large in the same way that the Chemical Weapons Convention, although signed by the Russians, is beyond their scope given the costs of their doing it. So I mention that because that is an element of this negotiation that I have not heard discussed, but I suspect you have and will. It fits, it seems to me, in what the chairman is saying today about at this point having a many-sided discussion of debt and revenue and United States assistance in whatever program it may be and some very significant fencing off of weapons of mass destruction in Iran and Iraq quite apart from security, for the materials that we are encouraging the Russians to create. I add this at the end of a long hearing because I think it is important.

Secretary POWELL. There is not a point that you made, Senator Lugar, that was not discussed with them over the last week.

Senator LUGAR. Good.

Secretary POWELL. They need the cash-flow from what they sell to Iran. We are looking at creative ways of constraining what they sell to Iran so that it will not be threatening to us and, as we say to them, threatening to you; you are a lot closer to them than we are. They said, "We know that, so do not lecture us so much about it." Well, we need to lecture you because you are selling some things that are not helpful.

With respect to Iraq, they not only need the cash-flow, but they have a big debt owed to them by Iraq and they are trying the protect that.

With respect to the reduction of strategic forces, of course we are in constant discussion with them on what those new levels might be. The President is committed to deep reductions. But I know as well as you do so well, Senator—you are perhaps the living expert on this subject—it is one thing to have only 3,000 strategic weapons in your force structure and to have 10,000 in your inventory because you have not been able to bust them up and get rid of them.

Senator LUGAR. That is right.

Secretary POWELL. We all have those quantities laying around. Maybe the missile is gone, maybe the body is gone, but this ugly core is there, and we have got to do something with it—reprocess it, turn it into fuel, figure out what to do with it, to store it in a safe way.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, anyone else?

[No response.]

The CHAIRMAN. Again, Mr. Secretary, we truly appreciate your willingness to be up here, your candor, and your leadership.

I would ask consent that the record remain open until the close of business tomorrow for questions or statements for the record, if that is possible.

Any concluding thing you would like to say?

Secretary POWELL. Yes, sir. I would like to conclude on one note. I have now been the Secretary for I guess 9 months and I cannot tell you how much it has meant to me to have the support of this committee, but more than that the actions you have taken to help us with fixing our building programs, recruiting more people for the Foreign Service, taking care of our families, giving us the operating money that we need, along with the other committees that oversee us, have meant a lot to the Department, meant a lot to the morale of the Department. The officers of the Department now know that people care about them up on the Hill.

As I said to you in my confirmation hearing, this is a major part of my agenda, my role, to be not just a foreign policy adviser, but to be the leader and the manager of the Department. We could not do it, I could not do it, without the kind of support we receive from this committee.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a man of your word. You followed through on your commitment. The least we can do is give you the tools.

We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:37 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD TO SECRETARY
COLIN L. POWELL BY THE COMMITTEE

RESPONSES OF SECRETARY COLIN L. POWELL TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE
RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

Question. The Agency for International Development as well as various private aid agencies are extremely worried about their ability to move an adequate amount of food into Afghanistan before winter sets in. Given the dire need in that country, and the fact that both India and Pakistan have declared substantial surpluses of some commodities, will the U.S. purchase food in the region for delivery inside Af-

ghanistan as part of our aid effort? Will the United States provide money for private aid agencies to purchase food locally?

Answer. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has already purchased approximately 15,000 metric tons of food (wheat) in the region, valued at \$6 million for delivery inside Afghanistan. A significant portion of USAID's food assistance is procured and delivered through the World Food Program. In addition, USAID is providing private voluntary organizations (PVOs) with funds to purchase food locally, particularly complementary commodities such as pulses (lentils) and oil in the amount of 12,658 metric tons, valued at over \$5,840,000. The PVOs currently engaged in this relief effort include Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development; CARE, Inc.; International Rescue Committee; and Save the Children USA.

Question. How much of the \$320 million that President Bush has pledged has actually been provided to aid agencies to date?

Answer. Currently \$167 million of the \$320 million announced by President Bush has been apportioned to USAID and the Department of State. Of the \$167 million, \$75 million has been apportioned to the Department of State's Bureau for Population, Refugees and Migration for refugee assistance (\$25 million of for Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance and \$50 million for Migration and Refugee Assistance), \$72 million to USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Response for P.L. 480 Title II food assistance, and \$20 million to USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Response for International Disaster Assistance. The remaining \$153 million has been notified to Congress, but has not yet been apportioned.

For the current crisis to date, \$45,266,323 of International Disaster Assistance, \$58,437,500 of P.L. 480 Title II resources, and \$32,600,000 of refugee assistance (\$30,000,000 of Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance and \$2,600,000 of Migration and Refugee Assistance) has been obligated for aid organizations working in the Afghanistan region.

Question. By now it's obvious that we made a grave mistake in disengaging in Afghanistan. By abandoning the country, we certainly helped sow the seeds for the current situation, or at least allowed them to be sowed. What types of assistance will we need to provide in the region? How long will we need to stay involved in aid efforts there? What is it going to cost to adequately fund development efforts there? How much will you have to increase the Agency for International Development's 2003 budget to adequately undertake these activities?

Answer. With virtually all institutions destroyed, the recovery and reconstruction of Afghanistan will require a concerted multi-donor effort over several years. USAID has identified the following as priority areas for the first 2-3 years of a recovery period:

- **Livelihoods and Income Generations.**—This effort would support community public works programs that generate employment (and hence income) as well as put in place critical community infrastructure schools, water systems, health facilities, etc. This effort would also support functional literacy and skills training programs which would include awareness raising of current dangers (e.g., land mines, health issues) as well as literacy programs and skills training to enhance health and family livelihoods and promote access to employment. A special emphasis would be placed on women.

- **Basic Education.**—Basic education programs would support community-based education, with specific attention to girls. These programs would provide a vital tool for promoting psychosocial well-being after and during trauma.

- **Improve Household Food Security and Promote Agriculture.**—Using local and international, nongovernmental, organizational, and other community organizations, programs would: distribute seed and fertilizer packages together with tools; rehabilitate and construct critical irrigation facilities and rural feeder roads; and distribute breeding stocks of goats, sheep and other livestock lost during the recent drought. Programs also would help reestablish local markets, facilitating movement of agricultural inputs and outputs. Food-for-work programs would be used where appropriate.

- **Meet Basic Health Needs.**—Using existing relief NGOs, these programs would deliver a package of essential primary health care services at the community level. Services would likely include child survival interventions such as immunizations, vitamin A supplementation, prevention and treatment of diarrheal disease, treatment of acute respiratory infection and continued infant and young child feeding. Maternal health, treatment and prevention of infectious diseases and basic water and sanitation infrastructure also would be included.

- **Information Dissemination.**—Increase access by vulnerable populations to relevant information via radio and alternative media so that assistance efforts are

transparent. Efforts would support the development of credible and timely information on assistance programs particularly targeted for refugees and other vulnerable groups. Participants would work with international and local partners to produce and broadcast relevant information in local languages, disseminate up to 30,000 radios and, batteries, and explore alternative media.

Question. Has the government of Uzbekistan agreed to allow the LTN to stage relief efforts from Uzbekistan? What kinds of activities have they agreed to allow the UN to carry out? Will the Uzbek government allow ground delivery of humanitarian goods into Afghanistan?

Answer. The government of Uzbekistan has promised United Nations Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs Kenzo Oshima that it would permit humanitarian assistance to cross on barges into Afghanistan. The government has allowed UN agencies such as UNICEF, UNHCR, and the World Food Program to import relief supplies and warehouse them in Termez, on the Uzbek border with Afghanistan. The Uzbek government is concerned about the security of humanitarian shipments and wants assurance that supplies will not fall into Taliban hands.

Link Between Iraq and September 11 Attacks

Question. There have been numerous press stories about a possible link between Iraq and the September 11 attacks. Has the Administration established a link between Iraq and any of the recent terrorist incidents in the United States?

Answer. At this point, we do not have intelligence that demonstrates that Iraq actively was involved in the assaults on 11 September or the subsequent anthrax attacks. The intelligence community is aggressively pursuing all intelligence leads related to the attacks, including clandestine and press reporting.

Question. Is there a possibility now—given the warming relationship with Russia—to gain Moscow’s support for so-called “smart sanctions?”

Answer. We are continuing to pursue a new approach at the UN that lifts economic sanctions on purely civilian goods for the benefit of the Iraqi people and refocuses controls on militarily useful materials. The UNSC made progress earlier this year. We are urging Russia to join the Security Council consensus in support of this new approach, and to support passage of a US-UK sponsored resolution implementing it before November 30.

The September 11 attacks against the United States have altered the political context of U.S.-Russian relations. We are working together with Russia in a broad-based coalition to combat and eradicate terrorist organizations, and to put maximum pressure on their state sponsors. Close cooperation with Russia against a common enemy might have wider, positive implications for the bilateral relationship, facilitating discussions on other important issues. In light of the improved relationship with Russia since the events of September 11, we hope that Russia will be convinced, as were other members of the P-5, to change the status quo on Iraq. We are discussing Iraq with Russia at the highest levels. It is important that Russia work to restore Council unity and not succumb to Baghdad’s attempts to manipulate the Council.

Question. What are the possibilities of revitalizing a multilateral coalition to confront Iraq and reverse the inroads it has made in recent years?

Answer. There is broad support among UNSC member states and others for a new multilateral approach on Iraq that lifts economic sanctions on purely civilian goods and focuses controls on preventing the Iraqi regime from obtaining the means and materials to re-constitute WMD and rebuild its military.

Most UNSC member states and others see this new approach as an effective and acceptable means of controlling Iraq’s threat to the region, particularly in light of Iraq’s continued refusal since December 1998 to allow resumption of UN weapons inspections.

Most UNSC members also believe that this approach will help demonstrate that the Iraqi regime, not UN controls, is responsible for the humanitarian conditions of the Iraqi people.

With the notable exception of Russia, UNSC member states broadly support the UK-sponsored draft resolution that would implement this new approach. We are continuing to work with Russia in an effort to reach consensus on a resolution to implement the new approach.

Question. Because of the various stories about different attitudes within the Administration over how to handle Iraq, there is some confusion about our intentions. Could you clarify how the Administration intends to approach the Iraq issue in the coming months?

Answer. We continue to pursue consensus on a UNSC resolution implementing a new multilateral approach to Iraq that would lift economic sanctions on purely civilian goods and focus controls on preventing the Iraqi regime from obtaining the means and materials to reconstitute WMD and rebuild its military. There is substantial agreement on this new approach among UNSC members, including P-5 members China, France, the UK, and the U.S. Our efforts are now focused on reaching agreement with Russia on a resolution to begin implementing this approach.

We also continue to monitor the no-fly zones to deter the Iraqi regime from repressing the populations of northern and southern Iraq and from threatening its neighbors.

We are reviewing and further developing our policy on regime change. As we do so, we continue to work with the Iraqi opposition for a better future for the people of Iraq.

Former CIA Director's Trips on Iraq

Question. What can you tell us about press reports of former CIA director Jim Woolsey's trips to the United Kingdom to look for evidence linking Iraq to the terrorist attacks in the United States?

Answer. We refer you to Mr. Woolsey or the Department of Defense for that information.

RESPONSES OF SECRETARY COLIN L. POWELL TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BARBARA BOXER

Question. Do you believe that our coalition members, especially Pakistan, share your vision of a successor regime that is broad-based and reflective of all the people of Afghanistan?

Answer. We have stressed to all coalition members that all legitimate Afghan groups, including the Northern Alliance, Rome Group, and Southern Pastuns, must play a role in a broad-based post-Taliban government. This government must represent the interests of all Afghans, including women and girls and minorities, and observe international norms of behavior, particularly human rights. All coalition members, including Pakistan, have told us they agree with this fundamental position. President Musharraf has endorsed this goal publicly.

Question. Are you satisfied with the current pace of discussions on a post-Taliban Afghanistan?

Answer. We and our coalition members are insisting that any future Afghan government must be multiethnic and representative of genders and religions. It must respect human rights, particularly affecting women and girls, end terrorism and follow internationally accepted norms of behavior. Discussions about how to bring this about will be complicated and time-consuming. We are, however, convinced that all members of the coalition desire this outcome and are proceeding with a sense of commitment to that end.

Question. What role do you envision women playing in the reconstruction of Afghanistan?

Answer. The U.S. recognizes the key role women have to play in the political and economic recovery of a future Afghanistan. Afghan exile women have been involved in the Rome Group discussions. The Taliban disrupted a tradition in which women contributed to the economic, cultural, and political fabric of their country in a wide variety of roles. Even so, Afghan women have continued to play an important role in their society through informal groups. Moreover, in spite of Taliban pressures, a number of Afghan resistance groups have actively assisted women both in Afghanistan and in refugee camps. We appreciate your (Senator Boxer) and Senator Brownback's support in efforts to restore to the women of Afghanistan their dignity and make it possible for them to determine their destiny as well as contribute to their society.

Question. Have you spoken to Ambassador Brahimi, Kofi Annan's special representative for Afghanistan, on the need to include women in the planning process for a reconstructed Afghanistan? It seems to me that one of the first things that will need to be done is to resettle millions of Afghan refugees. And since such a large percentage of Afghan refugees are women, shouldn't women have a role in deciding how that resettlement is to take place?

Answer. We are working closely with UN Special Representative Brahimi on the UN's efforts regarding Afghanistan. We agree that this matter deserves prominent attention in our ongoing dialogue with the UN on the future of Afghanistan.

As with refugee populations worldwide, over 80 percent of the Afghan refugees are women and children. Afghan women are very prominent in Afghan NGOs in Pakistan and in UN planning for refugee returns. Mr. Brahimi met with a group of Afghan women during his recent trip to the region, to discuss their views for the future of their country and incorporate those views in his negotiations. We support his efforts to ensure that women play a prominent role in Afghanistan's reconstruction and will continue to press this issue with our interlocutors. The Department of State funds NGO projects in education and health for Afghan women and girls.

Question. Mr. Secretary, during yesterday's hearing before the House International Relations Committee, the issue of setting a standard by which an act is defined as terrorism was raised. Some have argued, for example, that a suicide bombing that kills innocent civilians eating lunch at an Israeli pizzeria is a terrorist act no different than Israeli military strikes designed to eliminate known and dangerous terrorists. In my opinion, even if the military strike involves unintentional collateral damage, these two acts are not comparable and only the first should be labeled terrorism. Do you agree?

Answer. I agree with you that the two examples you cite are very different. If your first example refers to the August 9, 2001 bombing of the Sbarro restaurant in downtown Jerusalem, President Bush, in response to the attack, stated "Palestinian Authority Chairman Arafat must condemn this horrific terrorist attack, act now to arrest and bring to justice those responsible, and take immediate, sustained action to prevent future terrorist attacks."

At the same time, we have generally sought to avoid endless debates internationally about the definition of the word "terrorism" because of the way the issue becomes politicized. As I stated to the House on October 24, the problem is, we've got to find a way to move forward and not just continue to have discussions as to what is terrorism and what isn't terrorism. It's a vicious cycle.

Where the U.S. needs to use a specific definition for domestic purposes, U.S. law contains several different definitions appropriate to the particular contexts. For example, "terrorism" is defined for purposes of preparing the *Patterns of Global Terrorism Report* pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656f as "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience," while a "Federal crime of terrorism" is defined for, *inter alia*, purposes of assigning primary investigative responsibility under 18 U.S.C. 2332b as "an offense that (A) is calculated to influence or affect the conduct of government by intimidation or coercion or to retaliate against government conduct; and (B) is a violation of [one of a list of terrorist-related offenses]."

Question. Why is it so difficult for the world to agree on a common definition and standard for terrorism? What can be done?

Answer. The international community has agreed on specific acts of terrorism that are prohibited, e.g., the bombing of a public building is considered to be a terrorist act when the intention of the bombing is to cause death or serious injury or extensive destruction of such a public building that results in major economic loss. There are 12 international anti-terrorism conventions that address specific acts of terrorism, including terrorist bombings, financing of terrorism, attacks on diplomats, hijackings and so forth.

Agreement on what is or is not included in a general definition of terrorism is more elusive. For example, some countries believe the activities of national liberation movements ("the peoples' struggle against foreign occupation") should be exempt from the definition of terrorism because they believe such activities are justified and therefore not terrorist acts. The U.S. does not agree with that rationale. Countries also view the activities of armed forces differently. The U.S. and like-minded countries believe that the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict and the state military forces in the performance of their official duties should be exempt from the definition of terrorism, since such activities are governed by other provisions of international law. Some other countries believe that the activities of armed forces that engage in so-called "state terrorism" should be considered terrorist acts. The conflicting views reflect deep political divisions in areas of the world such as the Middle East. It is unlikely that such issues will be fully resolved in the near term.

The U.S. believes, however, that resolving the overall definition question is not essential to a comprehensive international legal framework for addressing terrorism. The 12 international terrorism conventions (and the possible addition of 2 more currently under negotiation) provide the international legal basis to require

parties to these treaties to extradite or prosecute accused terrorists for specified acts of terrorism.

RESPONSES OF SECRETARY COLIN L. POWELL TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV

Question. What steps has Japan been taking to play a meaningful role in the international coalition against terrorism?

Answer. Following the September 11 attacks, Prime Minister Koizumi and other leading Japanese figures quickly responded with strong statements of support. Japan generously donated \$10 million to support the rescue operations in New York and Washington and to aid U.S. firemen, police and rescue workers.

On September 19, Koizumi announced a seven-point plan for contributing to the counterterrorism campaign and quickly introduce legislation that would enable Japan's participation in the coalition efforts. The new legislation, enacted by the Diet at the end of October, paves the way for Japan to provide non-combat rear-area support to coalition forces, which might include transportation, communications, search and rescue, and similar forms of assistance. In addition, the new legislation allows Japan's Self Defense Forces to protect U.S. forces and facilities in Japan. The Japanese are now working on the details of the Self Defense Forces' contribution to the international coalition.

Tokyo is also providing considerable humanitarian economic assistance and refugee relief to affected countries in the region. Arriving in six C-130s, Self Defense Force elements provided refugee relief supplies to Pakistan. Japan is also providing Pakistan with roughly \$40 million, and offered Pakistan debt rescheduling assistance of about \$550 million. In late October, Japan lifted the sanctions it imposed when Pakistan conducted nuclear testing, and Tokyo is now considering additional economic assistance for Pakistan. Japan has pledged \$120 million to the UN, \$6 million to UNHCR, and \$2 million to Tajikistan, all for Afghan refugees. The government of Japan has moved to freeze terrorists' assets in Japan linked to the Taliban. Tokyo also offered to host an international conference on Afghan peace and reconstruction.

We find these contributions to the counterterrorism campaign very valuable, and we look forward to close cooperation with Japan as we go forward. The United States greatly appreciates Prime Minister Koizumi's bold political leadership in overcoming considerable political, legal and social obstacles in support of the counterterrorism campaign.

Australia and the War against Terrorism

Question. Is Australia a major partner in the war against terrorism?

Answer. Yes. In the wake of the September 11 attacks—in which at least three Australians were killed—the Australian Government invoked the ANZUS Treaty, Australian pilots (on exchange details to the U.S. military) helped defend U.S. airspace, and 1,500 Australian military personnel began deployment in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. A steadfast ally of long standing, Australia has further enhanced our already close cooperation in intelligence-sharing, financial controls, and global diplomacy. We are deeply grateful for Australia's support.

Question. While Indonesia has long been a good friend of the United States, its role as the world's most populous Muslim society could mean that close Indonesian cooperation in the war against terrorism, bin Laden and his supporters could be politically difficult for President Megawati's government. What steps, if any, is the United States taking—or what further steps could the United States take—to strengthen our ties to the Indonesian Government and the Indonesian people?

Answer. The new United States ambassador to Indonesia has been extremely active since his arrival in Jakarta in mid October. He has sought out members of the Indonesian administration at all levels, members of parliament, and media and business contacts, to convey the United States' strong support for a stable, united, democratic, free market-oriented and prosperous Indonesia that shares our commitment to counterterrorism.

The Department of State is working with Congress to secure at least \$130 million in bilateral assistance for Indonesia in fiscal year 2002, with a special focus on assisting Indonesia's efforts with legal and judicial reform.

The three United States trade finance agencies—the Export Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the United States Trade and Development Agency—have developed a joint trade and finance initiative to help promote economic development in Indonesia. The three agencies will undertake to provide up

to a combined \$400 million, two-year program to promote trade and investment within Indonesia, especially in the Indonesian oil and gas sector.

The United States will send experts to Indonesia to examine concrete ways to strengthen bilateral cooperation on counterterrorism, in particular on capacity and institution building. This would include technical assistance to increase Indonesian capacity for freeze terrorist financial assets. In addition, the United States intends to expand cooperation with Indonesia to combat other transnational crimes, including piracy, money laundering, trafficking in persons, narcotics and smuggling of small arms.

Question. On November 1, there will be a transfer of political power in Burundi—a transition that has led to tribal bloodshed several times in the last century. At a time when U.S. energies are focussed on Afghanistan and war against terrorism, what steps has the U.S. taken to ensure that the international community will prevent another round of bloodshed in Burundi?

Answer. The United States, in close consultation with the international community, is a strong supporter of the Burundi peace process, which is designed to reach a political solution to the civil conflict that has plagued Burundi since 1993. We support Nelson Mandela's facilitation of the peace process both diplomatically and financially and continue to consult closely with our European and African allies on ways to ensure the implementation of the August 2000 peace agreement. We supported UNSC Resolution 1375 endorsing the deployment of South African troops to Burundi to act as a protection force for returning opposition leaders participating in the transitional government inaugurated on November 1.

RESPONSES OF SECRETARY COLIN L. POWELL TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

Terrorist Financing

Question. On the question of cracking down on the financing of terrorist organizations, has Saudi Arabia adopted new banking guidelines or regulations? Have they taken steps to at least scrutinize the operations of some of the large charities that have allegedly funneled money to terrorist organizations?

Answer. Saudi Arabia has taken a number of steps to turn off the flow of money to individuals or entities suspected of terrorist ties. The Vice Finance Minister and Deputy Governor of the Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency (SAMA) traveled to Washington on October 4 to consult with Treasury and State Department officials on this issue. On October 15, the Saudi Government blocked the bank accounts of 39 individuals designated by the U.S. as engaging in terrorist activities. We note that following the Treasury Department designations, SAMA issued instructions to its banks to search its records for such accounts and report them to the government. They continue to monitor bank accounts for terrorist links, and remain in contact with us on this matter. The Saudi Press Agency announced on November 5 that Saudi Arabia's cabinet decided to sign the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

Question. Have there been any efforts to post information relating to the United States Reward Program for terrorism information in the refugee camps in Pakistan? And would this even be helpful, or would it be too destabilizing?

Answer. The latest *Rewards for Justice Program* advertising campaign is scheduled to begin in November. It will initially target all domestic audiences and then in late December will move to focus on Muslim American communities throughout the United States. In early 2002, we will begin an internationally focused effort to reach overseas communities, with specific emphasis on communities with a large Muslim population or connectivity.

This program is receiving unprecedented attention and support. The leveraging of multiple media, such as print, the Internet, posters, Public Service announcements, mass media programming, paraphernalia (e.g., matchbooks, bumper stickers, posters, lapel pins) and radio spots will convey our message to a diverse, global audience.

Through cooperation with the Ad Council and its member advertising agencies, we have revamped the program. Using multiple languages and dialects, our intent is not only to reach the widest audience possible in a consistent and effective manner; but to specifically encourage members of Islamic communities to join in combating terrorism.

The proper utilization of *Rewards for Justice* advertising materials is dependent on multiple variables, some of which themselves are in a constant state of change. In certain environments, such as Pakistan, the program must rely heavily on the

counsel of those on the ground as to the dividends and consequences of such deployments. While various media outlets throughout Pakistan have been used to advertise the program, there have been no such efforts directed at the refugee camps located there. The embassy acknowledges inherent difficulties in targeting that population, but continues to examine the potential.

The Department remains committed to the principles and the advancement of the program, and is aggressively pursuing its application.

