

S. HRG. 107-692

**AMERICA'S GLOBAL DIALOG: SHARING AMERICAN
VALUES AND THE WAY AHEAD FOR PUBLIC
DIPLOMACY**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

—————
JUNE 11, 2002
—————

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

81-880 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2002

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

ANTONY J. BLINKEN, *Staff Director*
PATRICIA A. MCNERNEY, *Republican Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Beers, Hon. Charlotte, Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, Department of State, Washington, DC	7
Prepared statement	11
Responses to additional questions for the record	61
Biden, Hon. Joseph R., Jr., U.S. Senator from Delaware, prepared statement ..	4
Feingold, Hon. Russell D., U.S. Senator from Wisconsin, prepared statement ..	64
Gingrich, Hon. Newt, former Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives; senior fellow, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, DC	33
Prepared statement	36
Ginsberg, Hon. Marc, former Ambassador to Morocco; CEO and managing director, Northstar Equity Group, Washington, DC	39
Prepared statement	42
Hoffman, David, president, Internews, Arcata, CA	45
Prepared statement	48
Keith, Amb. Kenton W., chair, Alliance for International Education and Cultural Exchange and senior vice president, Meridian International Center, statement submitted for the record	73
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, prepared statement and a series of letters in support of the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002	65
Pattiz, Hon. Norman J., Governor, Broadcasting Board of Governors, Washington, DC	13
Prepared statement	16
Surroi, Veton, chairman, KOHA Media Group, Pristina, Kosovo	50
Prepared statement	53

AMERICA'S GLOBAL DIALOG: SHARING AMERICAN VALUES AND THE WAY AHEAD FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 2002

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:55 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (chairman of the committee), presiding.

Present: Senators Biden, Dodd, Boxer, Bill Nelson, Lugar, Hagel, Chafee and Brownback.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come to order. As I just explained to our first panel and I will say to the audience, we apologize for getting started late. The Foreign Relations Committee had a private meeting with Prime Minister Sharon and it ran a little late, but in fact what we are about to speak to today quite frankly will have some serious impact on how well we do on many various issues we discussed with Prime Minister Sharon today.

As we consider public diplomacy in the 21st century, we are very mindful that our voice competes amidst the cacophony of voices shaping global opinion in a way that has never occurred before. Today, with the Internet, satellite, radio and TV networks providing instantaneous and often unfiltered and selectively unfiltered information, public diplomacy is more important and more difficult than it has ever been before, in my view. No matter how powerful our military, we will not be able to achieve all of our foreign policy objectives if we lose the war of ideas. In public diplomacy we must use our most powerful tool, truth. Truth, credibility and openness.

As the legendary journalist and former USIA Director Edward R. Murrow said, and I quote, "truth is the best propaganda, and lies the worst." I cannot emphasize that enough. What we are about here today, what we have been about, and what the Secretary has been about, is not about trying to shape an incorrect image of our views or ideas and our people, but the truth, openness, and credibility which will flow from the former truth and openness.

We are going to have to reach out to people in their own language and in their own terms, and we must foster the free flow of ideas, even if it is sometimes critical for the United States of America. We do not expect anyone to like us, or everyone to like us, I should say, but there is no good reason for us to be so misrepresented and misunderstood. We are one of the most advanced centers of communication in the world. We should be more successful

when we reach out. We should be better able to get the facts out, and if we do a better job, those who question our motives and reinterpret the facts will have a much tougher time getting traction in public opinion in other parts of the world. Today, I hope to explore what we can do to explain ourselves better and promote understanding, and I hope we will learn what more we can do, and how we should organize to do it.

All we want is a real chance for the facts to come before the people of the world, particularly, I would say at this moment, the Muslim world, 1.2 billion people, and let them make up their own mind. I am not asking to be loved. I am not asking to be embraced. I am just asking that we have a fair chance to be understood.

There are countless examples of where we do this well. I know the State Department's Web site, for example, offers content in Chinese, Arabic, Spanish, French, Russian, in addition to English. It gets more than 4 million hits a month, I am told. After 9/11, the United States and our allies set up coalition information centers in London, Islamabad, and Washington to coordinate messages, combat misinformation, and to stay ahead of the 24-hour global news cycle.

USAID worked with NGOs like Open Society Institute to support the development of independent media organizations in the former Yugoslavia in the Milosevic regime, which I am now happy to say he is in jail and being tried. The now-famous Radio B-2 in Belgrade played a critical role in forming the opposition to and the eventual ouster of and arrest of Milosevic. The U.S. Government's assistance to the American NGOs search for common ground helped create multi-ethnic versions of Sesame Street that has promoted tolerance between the children of Macedonia and Cyprus.

Despite these successful programs and others I could mention, the hard work of people like Under Secretary Beers and her predecessor, Evelyn Lieberman, America's public diplomacy still falls short of where it needs to be. Four years ago, this committee led the way in devising a merger of the former U.S. Information Agency into the Department of State. The goal of this reorganization was to integrate the policymakers and public diplomacy specialists. The merger of two different cultures has taken time, and is not yet complete.

Public diplomacy considerations are still not, in my view, fully incorporated into the public formulation process. There is still not adequate interagency coordination, although it is much better, and we still do not have a national information strategy providing the long-term vision of where the American public diplomacy needs to be, and we are still doing public diplomacy on the cheap, with funding cuts half what it was in 1994 and today. As I always say, if you want to know what we value, follow the money. Take a look at the budget.

Today's hearing will look at what the State Department and other agencies are doing and should be doing to promote our public diplomacy agenda. We consider developments in U.S. international broadcasting, particularly the Middle East Radio Network, the brainchild of one of our witnesses today, and the Broadcasting Board of Governors. It is an FM and AM digital satellite network that spans the Arabic-speaking world, targeting young audiences

with innovative programming. Early indications are that it is going swimmingly well and impressively gaining adherence and customers who want to listen.

We have two people before us, by the way, who in their private lives have demonstrated they know how to get people to listen. They know how to make it work, and Norm Pattiz has made a moderately good living at knowing how to do that.

Should this radio model be replicated elsewhere, is one of the questions we want to talk about today. Should we establish a companion U.S. satellite television network?

We will also examine what the United States can do to encourage the development of indigenous independent media where it does not exist today. As we have learned, for better or worse, people tend to trust local sources of news and information more than they do foreign sources. Without a free, fair, and open flow of information in these societies, propaganda and misinformation are able to flourish. It is in our interests to have professional journalism abroad promoting the internal dialog that serves their interests as well. Public diplomacy is not just about what we say. It is about promoting an environment in which multiple voices, including our own, can be heard.

We will hear today from two panels of witnesses to advise us on these issues. Our first panel includes Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy, Charlotte Beers, and in full disclosure my personal friend Norm Pattiz, representing the Broadcasting Board of Governors. Under Secretary Beers has served as CEO for two of the world's largest advertising agencies, J. Walter Thompson, and Ogilvy and Mather. Norm Pattiz is the founder and chairman of Westwood One, America's largest radio network company, and some other interests as well.

Our second panel includes Ambassador Marc Ginsberg, a former Ambassador to Morocco and now CEO and managing director of Northstar Equity Group. We will be joined by a man who, to use the old cliché, needs no introduction in this town, the former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, and we are happy to have the Speaker here. Speaker Gingrich is now the CEO of Gingrich Group, an Atlanta-based communications and management consulting firm, and serves as senior fellow of the American Enterprise Institute, and I would like him disseminating information abroad and not in Delaware for a long time. I wish him well. I would like to have him go full-time on dealing with other countries.

But welcome, Mr. Speaker. We love you in Delaware, but they love you too much in Delaware.

David Hoffman, the president of Internews Network, a global nonprofit organization that supports open media worldwide, will be our next witness, and he will be followed by a man for whom I have great respect and I have met numerous times during our efforts in the Balkans, Veton Surroi, chairman of KOHA Media Group in Kosovo and a leading advocate for democracy and independent media in Kosovo, and a man who I could go on for a long time to talk about. Had we listened to his advice, in my view, in 1994, we would have made progress even faster in the region.

I would also now like to invite Senator Lugar to make any opening comments he has, and then we will proceed with the witnesses. Again, I say welcome to all the witnesses.

[The prepared statement of Senator Biden follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

As we consider public diplomacy in the 21st century, we are mindful that our voice competes amidst the cacophony of voices shaping global opinion.

Today, with the Internet, satellite radio and TV networks providing instantaneous and often unfiltered information, public diplomacy is more important and more difficult than ever before.

No matter how powerful our military, we will not be able to achieve all our foreign policy objectives if we lose the war of ideas.

In public diplomacy, we must use our most powerful tools: Truth, credibility, and openness. We must reach out to people in their own language and in their own terms. And we must foster the free flow of ideas, even if it's critical of the United States.

We don't expect everyone to like us, but there's no good reason for us to be so misrepresented and misunderstood.

We're one of the most advanced centers of communications in the world. We should be more successful when we reach out. We should be better able to get the facts out. If we do a better job, those who question our motives or misrepresent the facts will have a much tougher time getting traction with public opinion.

Today I hope we will explore what we can do to explain ourselves better and promote understanding. And I hope we'll learn what more we can do, and how we should organize to do it.

All we want is a real chance for the facts to come before the people of the world. And let them make up their minds.

There are countless examples of where we do this well. I know the State Department's Web site offers content in Chinese, Arabic, Spanish, French and Russian in addition to English. It gets more than four million hits a month.

After 9-11, the United States and our allies set up Coalition Information Centers in London, Islamabad, and Washington to coordinate messages, combat misinformation, and stay ahead of the 24 hour global news cycle.

USAID worked with NGOs like the Open Society Institute to support the development of independent media organizations in the former Yugoslavia under the Milosevic regime. The now famous Radio B-92 in Belgrade played a critical role in fomenting the opposition to, and the eventual ouster of, Milosevic.

With U.S. government assistance, the American NGO Search for Common Ground helped create multi-ethnic versions of Sesame Street that have promoted tolerance among children in Macedonia and Cyprus.

Despite these successful programs and the hard work of people like Under Secretary Beers, and her predecessor Evelyn Lieberman, American public diplomacy falls far short of where it needs to be.

Four years ago, this committee led the way in devising the merger of the former U.S. Information Agency into the Department of State. The goal of this reorganization was to integrate the policy makers and public diplomacy specialists. The merger of two different cultures has taken time, and is not complete.

Public diplomacy considerations are still not fully incorporated into the policy formulation process. There is still no adequate interagency coordination.

We still don't have a national information strategy providing a long-term vision of where American public diplomacy needs to be. And, we're still doing public diplomacy on the cheap, with funding cut in half between 1994 and today. As I always say, follow the money.

Today's hearing will look at what the State Department and other agencies ARE doing and SHOULD be doing to promote our public diplomacy agenda.

We'll consider developments in U.S. international broadcasting, particularly the Middle East Radio Network, the brainchild of Norm Pattiz and the Broadcasting Board of Governors. It's an FM, AM, and digital satellite network that spans the Arabic-speaking world targeting a young audience with innovative programming. Early indications are that it's going swimmingly, and gaining an impressively large audience in the region. Should this radio model be replicated elsewhere? Should we establish a companion U.S. satellite television network?

We'll also examine what the United States can do to encourage the development of indigenous, independent media where it does not exist today.

As we've learned, for better or worse, people tend to trust local sources of news and information more than foreign sources.

Without a free, fair, and open flow of information within these societies, propaganda and misinformation flourish.

It's in our interest to have professional journalism abroad promoting a healthy internal dialogue that serves their interest.

Public diplomacy is not just about what we say, it's about promoting an environment in which multiple voices, including our own, can be heard.

We will hear today from two panels of witnesses to advise us on these issues. Our first panel includes Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy Charlotte Beers and my friend Norm Pattiz, representing the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

Under Secretary Beers has served as the CEO of two of the world's largest advertising agencies—J. Walter Thompson and Ogilvy and Mather. Norm Pattiz is the founder and chairman of Westwood One, America's largest radio network company.

Our second panel will include Ambassador Marc Ginsberg, the former U.S. Ambassador to Morocco and now the CEO and managing director of the Northstar Equity Group.

He will be joined by a man who, to use the old cliché, needs no introduction in this town, the former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich. Speaker Gingrich is now the CEO of the Gingrich Group, an Atlanta-based communications and management consulting firm, and serves as a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute.

David Hoffman, the president of Internews Network, a global non-profit organization that supports open media worldwide will be our next witness. He will be followed by Veton Surroi, chairman of the KOHA Media Group in Kosovo, and a leading advocate for democracy and independent media in Kosovo.

Senator BOXER. Mr. Chairman, could I ask if it would be possible to have 60 seconds to speak, because of our delay. I have an 11:30 appointment. I just want to make one point, if I could just speak for a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. After Senator Lugar.

Senator BOXER. Of course.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your calling the hearing, and your very strong and comprehensive statement, which really covers the territory so well. As all of us will observe, the war on terrorism has brought the importance and the value of effective public diplomacy to the fore. I am not the only American who is dismayed at the level of disenchantment and in some cases outright hatred voiced by many in the world toward the United States.

Recently, there has been much discussion of the so-called Arab Street, strong opposition to American policies toward terrorism and the Middle East peace process. However, it would appear this is simply the tip of the iceberg. Clearly, many in the Middle East oppose American policies, but we now read the people of the Philippines on occasion are distrustful of American counterterrorism trainers and advisors sent there to assist in tracking the Abu Sayyef terrorist group.

In Indonesia, opposition from the local population continues to confound attempts to improve security cooperation. Elsewhere, Europeans believe the United States is retreating from the international scene and entering an isolationist cocoon. No matter where we turn, the people of the world are either not well-informed about American policies and intentions, or recede to the anti-American messages that are more powerful or effective than our own.

These revelations must serve as a wake-up call to our government. Our policies may be well-intentioned, but still find little receptivity with local populations. The United States must radically

improve its public diplomacy efforts. We must explain and broadcast American views and values much more effectively. Responsibility rests with both the executive and legislative branches of government. We have permitted these critical foreign policy tools to languish and to decay, and as a government we must take more time, pay more attention, and apply more resources to fostering our public diplomacy.

The first step must be a revitalization of the organization, the people, the tools, and the content of our public diplomacy. Obviously, there is no single answer to the challenge we face. It is more likely that the problems are systemic. We must question and analyze the basic tenets that form the foundation of our policies in this area. Our goal must be not simply to identify and implement short-term fixes, but to address the root causes of the inadequacies and shortcomings in our policies and our outreach programs.

A number of different proposals have been put forward to address the public diplomacy challenges at the State Department. One of the most interesting suggestions calls for reorganizing the public diplomacy apparatus by placing resources, budgets, personnel, and staff under the direct control of Under Secretary Beers. I would be interested in hearing her views on this, as well as her thoughts on funding public diplomacy. I am hopeful that Ms. Beers and other witnesses will provide the committee with useful recommendations with which to engage the administration in formulating an effective strategy.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend we use today's hearing as the basis for the construction of a bill, of legislation to revitalize American public diplomacy. I know many members of this committee have been giving a lot of thought to this issue, and I propose it is time to get to work.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I could not agree with you more, Senator.

Senator Boxer.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so much for your courtesy. I wanted to thank Charlotte Beers for keeping me so well-informed on her efforts, because you promised to do that in a hearing, and you are sending me things like this, and it matters to me and I thank you.

I also wanted to welcome one of my star constituents who I am forced to share with the rest of the country, Norm Pattiz, and to say that his vision for this Middle East Radio was right on target. One of your colleagues on the Board of Governors said the following, "broadcasting services such as Middle East Radio Network are the best high-yield, low-cost weapon in our arsenal. They are the most cost-effective way of reaching the outside world."

This is something that our chairman and ranking member I know believe, and in closing I just wanted to read a couple of e-mails that went to your station from the people who we are trying to impact. One says, "Hi, I am from Abu Dhabi, UAE. Actually I listen to your channel every day because I am crazy about music, both Arabic and English, and I really appreciate your efforts to make us happy all day."

And another says, "hello people, I am a Palestinian who lives between Amman and Kuwait. I can here Sawa in Amman and in Kuwait as well. All I want to say is, I am so proud of you guys, and

very happy to hear this station. You can hear it everywhere, especially in Amman in the shopping malls and in the coffee shops. All the guys' and girls,' mothers and fathers, are very amused by Sawa. Keep up the good work, guys."

And then here is what I wanted to make sure you heard. "P.S., I have a question. What is the nationality of this station, and who is the owner," and I think what that says is, the way you are putting forward the information makes sense.

Another says, "your music is good, the news is not biased. I think it is not biased," and then I love this, "I want to ask you to play me two songs, Don't Let Me Get Me, by Pink, and an Arabic song called Gogali, and it is by Guitara, and I hope you play both."

Anyway, I think that this shows, Mr. Chairman, that the wonderful results we are having, and not that it is a panacea, but in a very tough world and a tough challenge, it is something we must do, and I commend both of you. Thank you, and I commend my chairman and the ranking member for caring about this and letting me speak. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very commendable.

Madam Secretary, the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLOTTE BEERS, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. BEERS. Chairman Biden, distinguished members—

The CHAIRMAN. I hate to ask you to do this. What is going to happen is, these microphones—as the Senator from South Carolina says, "these machines are quite old." We are going to one day modernize the Senate—but you have to hold it very close to your mouth, I apologize, so people in the back can hear you. I am sorry.

Ms. BEERS. Well then, I had better start with my illustrious address again. Chairman Biden and distinguished members of the committee, it is a great honor to be in this room. This is exactly where I was sworn in on October 11, and it does not exactly seem like a few days ago, but the time has sped by. I put in my statement for the record a good report on how I think we have done in the current response and the immediacy that was required of us all to answer the war on terrorism. What I want to do in the short time that I have with you here is, in fact, take you to longer-term priorities that I hope we can all address.

As President Bush says, this will be a long war. I believe we have to enter the turbulent and faster-moving information revolution aggressively to build a larger presence, and I would call it, from my background in the advertising and marketing world, a larger share of voice. We have to continue to strengthen and defend that business which we do well, which is our ability to speak with government officials and elites, but at the same time we really must enlarge our communication with the mainstream of young adults, significantly in the Middle East and South and Southeast Asia, and even those young adults outside of cities. We have to meet this expanded audience as, in fact, you said, Chairman Biden, on their own terms and in their own channels of distribution.

So what about those who are even younger and under 20? I think we must develop plans, resources, and teams to seek the help of

the huge multinational companies and also the foreign students from U.S. universities to activate them to talk about our common values and to demonstrate the democratization in some form and answer the final questions, what is in it for me, where can I go, where can I get a job?

We had a number of discussions with these kinds of constituencies, and the willingness is there. These commitments will require a change in skill structure and allocation of resources in public diplomacy. We have to go beyond polling, as it is called here, to include diagnostic research that evaluates not just what they think, but why, so that we can use this research to lead us to improved programs. We have already hired an outside consultant, and it is changing a lot about the way we ask these questions, and we are just fielding a major study with a more sophisticated view of what we are going to do with the data.

We also want to significantly expand our training and public diplomacy officers, not only in depth and scope of training, which frankly has been thin, but to also include the most modern marketing and communication skills, because we are going to ask these officers to operate in a very different kind of universe.

Both Secretary Powell and I are addressing the public diplomacy structure in this our third year of consolidation. Our inquiry will examine how we can maximize communication to more people, encourage innovation, and also accountability within the public diplomacy family as well as the status at the table of policy development.

So where do we get the programs for this better-trained and bigger public diplomacy team who is now going to be asked to expand their reach to even larger audiences? Well, I want you to know that we have one program that provides nothing less than a complete transformation. Let me illustrate. We just had a brave woman, a Saudi novelist and journalist, who dared the rejection and anxiety that surrounded her when she said she was coming to the United States on an exchange visit. Listen to what she said when she returned to Saudi Arabia:

“Everyone says Westerners are bad and mean, but it is not true. People here are telling a bunch of lies about the West. You know, the people I met are nice. They are friendly, they smile. Nobody stares at you or follows you around. They do not waste money. They do not leave food around. They respect limits. Their customs are nice.

“In America, men and women cooperate together to make their lives better. They help each other. They are organized, and they can plan for their future. They like to have real dialogs on many subjects. The women are strong. Older people are active and engaged. In this house in which I lived there were three generations there, and they have been close to their neighbors for years. Why do we get told these stories about how the family is broken in the West?”

Believe me, we have countless stories of these transformations, so here is the question: How can we magnify the 25,000 exchanges we do a year, which is what our resources allow, into something 10 times that? That is the question. Some of the ways that we can do this we have been working on now as pilot studies. We can acti-

vate the 700,000 exchange visitors we have had over the years. You know, we do not even have a data bank as good as a local car dealer. We do not know where these people are in some cases, and we have not been able to follow-up on them.

We have got an alumni data bank in the works now, and what we hope is, for those who are willing to join us and participate in this, they will be able to be more successful in creating a more balanced picture of the United States by simply talking about their experience. We are designing something wonderful called, An American Room, that will use virtual reality to depict and try to approximate the experience of being in America.

We might have the Gettysburg Address when you hit a button. We might be able to see a scene from Oklahoma. We will have computers linked to data banks. We will be able to reproduce a street in a typical American city, and the viewer standing there can tap another button and find someone like them in the United States, and the wonder of this is the design team we have and the unlimited potential of technology.

And here is the exciting thing. We hope to place these rooms in universities, in libraries, and malls, and traveling even by bus to smaller towns, and we have done enough exploring with potential universities and libraries in the Middle East and so on to know they are interested, and we expect this kind of thing to act as a catalyst for more open dialog. The secret to communication is not what you say, but what they can hear, and it is very important for us to put it on those terms. We know we can greatly and productively increase visits from journalists, newspaper writers, and producers, because now we follow them, and we can prove that when they go home they publish from a totally different perspective.

We need to establish a regional media center to train Muslim journalists and reporters in order to help them get a better perspective, better equipment, and more direct access to U.S. officials and people. We can even turn the proven practice of teaching English into a story of values and beliefs with the use of pictures and music. We can ask our third parties who are already authentic in the universe of the Middle East and Southeast and who wish to participate to help carry out our messages, like the Muslim-Americans that we have just been working with and have talked to over a great period of time. They have just formed a group called CAMU, and they are going to put speaker groups in their countries and here and make exchanges and conferences and forums.

We can even offer to aid the leading satellite television stations, NBC Lebanese, Al Jazeera, and Future, who say they are very keen for new programming and assure us that they are open to new material. Hollywood, PBS, and Discovery have offered to help us acquire such programs.

We can, in fact, create completely new programs, like an Arabic magazine for young adults, and Internet programs that include not just the chat room but the training and the equipment, which I think is probably the most efficient way to make sure there is a two-way conversation, because one of the burning questions out there in the Middle East and Southeast Asia is, can you hear us, so we cannot afford to be in a one-way dialog.

You know, we already have a number of proofs against the frequently repeated distortion that we are a materialistic and greedy society. It is called USAID programs, and it bothers me immensely that these stories are virtually unsung, because there is no mandate in the U.S. programs to talk about what we have done, who benefits, and how these stories unfold. I think we have many uncelebrated stories of victory in the democratic process where we have transformed families, we have made jobs, we have created an enterprise, with the help of the people in many countries around the world. These stories are not out there. If they were, the reputation and image we have, I think, would be different.

Even at this moment when it is really quite popular to dislike the United States, we have found in some studies that we have more in common. We have common values between the Middle East and Southeast Asia and the United States in four main areas, and they are significant. One is, we both rank in the top six faith, generosity and giving and taking care of others, and love of family.

An interesting insight in that is that we have more in common with these groups of people than, say, our partners in the European Union. Even those who rail against us one minute will immediately turn and admit they would love to study American science and technology, so to me the picture is actually promising, but we do need to get about the business of preparing, testing, and fielding these new programs. They are necessarily long term, and they must be consistently supported to bear fruit, and we cannot neglect our dialog with the rest of the world in order to shore up what has been way too much silence between us and these communities, and that is why this moment with you is so crucial to ask you to support importantly these longer term priorities as we move every day to prove to you that they have merit.

Among our three strategic goals which I detailed in my written remarks are representing America's values and beliefs, demonstrating clearly opportunities that can result from the forms of democratization that each of these countries can take on, and the third is education to the young. If you ask me to prioritize these, I would say there is no contest. It has to be education to the young. Ultimately it is the key, to educate these huge majority populations of young men and women can save them from fanatical interpretations of this beautiful religion of Islam and give them access to science, technology, books, and basically a new world view, and that is a lot to ask.

Every experience we have tell us they will not settle for limitations, biases, or hatred, and I have learned one other thing as I have spent this time in public diplomacy. The young will lead us.

Last Saturday, I heard an eloquent address from Ehud Barak about his journey as Prime Minister of Israel. He referred to a signature moment when his great friend fighting by his side 30 years ago was shot by an Egyptian soldier. A young graduate student in the audience from Egypt, a woman, addressed this question to the former Prime Minister. My two friends were seeking to marry and they went to their two parents, and they were told they could not marry because they had a feud between these two families 30 years ago, and therefore they recommended and refused permission to marry.

The couple decided to go against this counsel. They did marry. They are very happy. They have two small children, and they just bought a very small new home. Her question is, "why can't we, rather than destroy homes, build them?"

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Beers follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLOTTE BEERS, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR
DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Chairman Biden and distinguished members of the committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. As you are well aware, today is the nine-month anniversary of September 11th, a day that opened all our eyes to the horrific consequences of hatred that some groups have for our country; a hatred bred in ignorance, misperception and misrepresentation. There are many lessons that we are still learning from that day, and certainly one of the most important is that we can and should do more to educate, and influence the attitudes of, foreign audiences toward our country. No longer is it acceptable to let others define America, our beliefs, tenets, and values. It is in our collective national security interest that we do a better job defining ourselves to the world. This is our mission in the post-September 11th world, and it is a mission that must succeed.

In late February, Gallup released a poll of almost 10,000 people in nine predominantly Muslim countries and found that, by a margin of two to one, residents of these nations had an unfavorable opinion of the U.S. Some of the specific results of the poll were not surprising in places like Iran, but in Kuwait for instance only 28 percent of those residents polled had a favorable opinion of the U.S. This in a country that was liberated by the U.S. and our allies only a decade ago. In Morocco the favorable number was only 22 percent, and in Saudi Arabia, one of our strongest allies in the region, only 18 percent expressed a favorable opinion of the U.S.

These numbers are roughly consistent with other external and internal polling of the region. They illuminate the challenge we have before us, a challenge to communicate our policies and values to the world more effectively. In some regions, such as Muslim majority areas in the Middle East and South Asia for example, the challenge is obviously greater. In these places it is imperative that we reach out, inform, educate, and persuade populations that we are a society that is based on certain shared values, values that resonate within the Muslim world, values such as peace, acceptance, faith, and love of family.

To do this, we must continue our traditional public diplomacy programs, such as international information activities and educational and cultural exchanges, as well as international broadcasting. However, we need to focus these activities on broader and younger populations, while simultaneously enhancing them to reach our desired audiences more rapidly and effectively. Since September 11th, and since my confirmation in October, we have striven to do just that. This is evident in such initiatives as *The Network of Terrorism*, a publication that has become the most widely disseminated public diplomacy document ever produced by the U.S. Government. The publication features dramatic visuals, including a map showing the 81 countries that lost citizens in the World Trade Center. Since its release last November, *Network* has been translated into 36 languages, and we've published over 1.3 million copies. We had *Network* distributed—as an insert in the Arabic edition of *Newsweek*, and major excerpts appeared in other Arab and world publications. Since publication, we have maintained a constantly updated Internet version as well.

In addition to the *Network* publication, we have had success with our Television Co-operatives, in which we sponsor the visits of foreign production teams to the U.S. There have been 21 television programs since September 11th dealing with the Islamic community in America, as well as the campaign against terrorism.

Our exhibit of the stunning photographs of Joel Meyerowitz, capturing the human and material dimensions of Ground Zero, has now opened in 32 different countries and will be presented in an additional ten countries by the end of the year, reaching audiences in the hundreds of thousands.

Our web sites dealing with the Middle East have consistently topped Internet search engines since 9/11, and, thanks to our multilingual advertisements, our Rewards for Justice program has received some 30,000 pieces of information since the attacks. We have produced *This is Islam in America*, a publication that was distributed to 500 Middle Eastern Imams at an April conference, as well as *Islam in America*, which was distributed through our American Corners network throughout Russia, and through our embassies in Almaty, Ashgabat, Baku, Bishkek, Dushanbe, and Tashkent.

These initiatives highlight some of our successes, but there is clearly room for us to improve, to do more, much more. Right now, the Middle East and the greater Islamic world are awash with new media and new ideas and ideologies. We must compete on a crowded playing field for the attention of these audiences. I will defer to Governor Norm Pattiz to talk about the success of Radio Sawa, but it is evident that we have work to do to make our television services effective and relevant. Television is the medium of today and the future, as is evident in the growth and influence of Middle East television satellite and regular television broadcasting. Existing channels are hungry for programming, and we need to direct resources to production, acquisition, and distribution of compelling, quality programs. I am hesitant to endorse the concept of a greatly expanded direct broadcasting capacity until a great deal more research on how best to approach this market has been done. This is particularly true given the experience of BBC's expensive experiment in Arabic TV broadcasting.

There is room for dialogue and exchange, but the onus is on us to make our voice heard. There is common ground on which we can build the foundation for this dialogue. Let me illustrate this through the story of a young Arab woman. She is a composite of Arab women I met recently. I was overseas at an Arab capital, and this woman started telling me of the anger and frustration that she and others feel about our Middle East policy. She is a professor, but not at the American University, whose name she feels would taint her. Her anger was so great that, initially, she expressed doubt that Bin Laden was the ringleader of the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks. As we spent more time together, she began to ask me about what she understood to be the bad treatment of Muslims in the U.S. I was able to tell her that there are between three and six million Muslims in this country, where they are free to worship fully in over 1,200 mosques, and where their children can attend Muslim schools. I told her about the Nobel Prize winner who is Muslim, the soccer player, our basketball star whose father is an Imam, the schoolteachers, and even President Bush's new Director of the National Institutes of Health. As I did this, a door began to open between us. Eventually, she admitted that, while she believed Bin Laden had masterminded the attacks of September 11th, she could not defend her conviction to her colleagues. By the end of our conversation, she had asked whether her university could add a U.S. studies program and even whether she could travel to the U.S. with a group of teachers to study science and technology.

There is also the story of a Fulbright alumnus who is leader of Muhammadiyah, Indonesia's second-largest Islamic organization, with 30-40 million members. He recently told the *Jakarta Post* that his educational experience in the U.S. had caused him to abandon the idea of establishing an Islamic state in Indonesia. He cited his degree in Islamic Studies from the University of Chicago, as a tool that helped him gain a more accurate understanding of religious teachings. He also asserted that "fewer and fewer Muslims now want to establish an Islamic state."

This is the kind of "share of mind" toward which we are working. Shared ideas and values are our building blocks to better understanding, better relationships, and good will with the Islamic world. To help focus our public diplomacy efforts and sharpen our ability to address the challenge before us, we have developed three strategic themes under which our activities and efforts will be shaped. Under President Bush and Secretary Powell's leadership, we are pursuing the following broad areas in our public diplomacy efforts:

- The first theme is shared values. In many countries, especially in Muslim majority states, people carry a distorted and negative view of U.S. values. They believe that we are a faithless and decadent country. To counter these false impressions, we are initially focusing on freedom of religion and tolerance as reflected in the experience of Muslims in America. We have already created a web site and are developing video products and speakers' programs to disseminate this message overseas.
- The second theme is the opportunity for Democratization. It is my belief that democracy is the best path toward lasting peace and prosperity. Where good governance and open opportunity exist, inspiring stories of entrepreneurial and free market successes abound. Many U.S. government and private sector programs already address this objective, and we need to better highlight their efforts. We must also encourage those who seek more open societies, economic opportunity through open-markets, and the chance to achieve prosperity in the unique context of their own cultural and historical experience.
- The third theme is Education, through an initiative called "Partnership for Learning." One of the universal values is that we all love our children and want a better future for them. We also know that a lack of social and economic oppor-

tunity is one of the key factors driving the recruitment of terrorists. U.S. educational and other assistance programs already underway are working to provide children around the world with the tools needed for effective participation in modern life. This focus will allow us to create new partnerships with the private sector, here and abroad, dramatically increasing the resources devoted to the education of children in countries where these options are limited.

These three themes create the backbone under which our public diplomacy programs and activities are taking shape thanks to the creative and dedicated efforts of the public diplomacy professionals in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the Bureau of Public Affairs, and the Office of International Information Programs, as well as our regional and function bureaus and our officers in the field.

We are also working to engage the private sector, which is our natural ally in this fight to inform and influence the hearts and minds of the people of the world. Those corporations with a large international presence, in many instances, have better outreach to certain countries and population segments than we do. We want to work with them to create partnerships that serve our mutual interests. For its part, the private sector stands at the ready as never before to aid our Public Diplomacy efforts. We must continue to actively garner its support for our overall strategies, harness its creative collective will, and ask it to organize for action.

Now, more than ever, the spotlight is on public diplomacy, on our ability and aptitude in communicating with the people of the world. I thank the committee for its continued support of public diplomacy, and for allowing me to testify before you today. I am happy to answer any of your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary.
Mr. Pattiz.

**STATEMENT OF HON. NORMAN J. PATTIZ, GOVERNOR,
BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS, WASHINGTON, DC**

Mr. PATTIZ. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am Norm Pattiz of the Broadcasting Board of Governors. On behalf of the BBG I want to thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to talk about U.S. International Broadcasting, and specifically our new Middle East Radio Network [MERN], which is fast becoming a key part of U.S. public diplomacy efforts in this very, very turbulent region.

I also want to thank you for giving us the resources to accomplish our mission, which is quite simply to promote freedom and democracy through the free flow of accurate, reliable, and credible news and information about America and the world to audiences overseas. I am pleased to appear with Under Secretary Charlotte Beers who, along with Deputy Secretary Richard Armitage and others in the State Department have been so supportive of MERN.

I would also like to introduce my fellow Governor, Tom Korologos, who is in the audience. Tom has been a primary supporter of the MERN project, making more than one trip to Cyprus to talk with his friends, such as the President, to make sure we got a very important transmission facility in Cyprus to help us reach the region.

When I am not working for the BBG, I am chairman of Westwood One, America's largest radio network. We own, manage, or distribute the NBC Radio Network, CBS Radio Network, Fox Radio News, and we also supply over 7,500 U.S. radio stations with not only news but sports, talk, information programming, and just about anything else you can think of.

When I was appointed to the BBG in November 2000 I was the only radio broadcaster on the Board. Chairman Marc Nathanson asked me to serve as the cochair of the Language Review Committee, which manages the congressionally mandated process of de-

termining on an annual basis how effectively our resources are being deployed across the over 60 languages we broadcast in world-wide.

I quickly noticed our efforts in the Middle East were almost totally ineffective. We were broadcasting 7 hours a day in the Arabic language in a one-size-fits-all approach to the entire region, for 7 hours a day, as I mentioned before, on short wave, which almost no one listens to, and out of a very weak medium wave signal out of Rhodes. The fact was that over 98 percent of the audience in the region were not listening to the Voice of America.

After reporting this back to the Board, I was asked to serve as the chairman of the Middle East Committee. Shortly thereafter—I think it was in February 2000, well before the events of 9/11—I visited the region to determine what possibilities existed to provide a 21st century broadcast operation to the region. During the trip, I learned a number of things. First of all, I learned that there is, in fact, a media war going on in the region, and the weapons of that war are incitement to violence, disinformation, hate radio, government censorship, and journalistic self-censorship, and sadly the United States did not have a horse in this race.

On the plus side, many of the moderate Arab governments were willing to offer AM and FM frequencies and digital satellite frequencies which would be necessary to create a state-of-the-art broadcasting system. I felt that, by using proven American broadcasting techniques that have been effective wherever they have been used throughout the world, the opportunity existed to create a service that would attract the largest possible audience and ultimately deliver that audience to our message of public diplomacy.

What techniques am I talking about? Using radio in the way it is most effective in today's media environment. Radio is a medium of formats—music, news, sports, talk, et cetera—designed to reach a particular audience 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with a consistent style that connects with our listeners.

In the case of MERN, which we call Radio Sawa, the Arabic word for “together,” the format we have chosen is targeted at listeners 30 and under, representing well over 60 percent of the region's population. Sawa is music-driven, with 5 and 10-minute newscasts twice every hour, 24 hours day.

But rather than describing to you in words what Sawa is, let me play for you an English-language condensed version of what a ½-hour of our Arabic programming sounds like. It runs about 3½ minutes, so you will not hear any full music tracks, and you will not hear any full newscasts, but it will give you a quick idea of what this programming sounds like.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you play that, I want to point out that I was so impressed with this disk that I made sure I requested that Norm make it available to every Member of the U.S. Senate, every Member of the House, and I hope, if any staff is listening, if you have gotten it, make sure your boss just takes 5 minutes to listen to it, play it for your boss, because I am telling you, it is—well, you will hear.

Mr. PATTIZ. Well, this, as I say, is a condensed version of the 12-minute version that you are talking about, so we are trying to give

you an example of what it sounds like within the parameters of the time that I have to speak, so if you would play that, please.

[A CD was played.]

Mr. PATTIZ. What you just heard is a combination of proven commercial know-how and modern broadcasting techniques, heavily researched, so we know before we ever play our first song or broadcast our first feature or news program who our audience is, what they like to hear, what type of news presentation features and production values appeal to them. We also take into consideration what is already available in the marketplace, and what has the best chance of delivering the largest possible target audience to hear our message. We call it “marrying the mission to the market,” and it is working.

We are now broadcasting on FM stations in Amman, reaching Jordan, the West Bank, and Jerusalem, in FM in Kuwait, Abu Dhabi and Dubai, we are on medium wave or AM out of Kuwait covering Iraq, as well as in Rhodes and, soon, Cyprus, which will cover Egypt, Lebanon, and Syria, plus FM is coming online within the next couple of weeks in Bahrain and Qatar. We are on three-digital audio satellite transmissions similar to our own DirecTV, with audio channels including Nilesat, Arabsat, and Eutelsat Hotbird.

As you know by the impact of Al Jazeera and other TV services, there are millions of satellite dishes throughout the region, and now our message can be received on them. This is just the beginning. We will be expanding our reach on FMs and AMs in the coming months, but the anecdotal information that we are receiving on the impact of Sawa since its March 23 launch has been nothing less than amazing. Let me give you some examples from our own embassies and bureaus throughout the region.

From our bureau chief in Amman, who was formerly the director of our Arabic Service, the VOA Arabic Service: “It is time for me to say it. MERN leadership has been able to accomplish in the span of a few months what two generations of VOA broadcasters have failed to accomplish in more than 50 years. All indications are that Radio Sawa is the most popular FM station in Jordan. Congratulations. I am proud to be a member of the MERN team.” And our Ambassador in Jordan proclaimed; “MERN is an instant hit among Jordan’s young.”

But it is not just insiders who are taking notice. Joshua Muravchik of the American Enterprise Institute writes that MERN is, “good news, because it promises to repair many of the defects of our current operation.” And the New Republic’s Lawrence Kaplan calls Radio Sawa “a sober and effective public diplomacy initiative.”

From our listeners, some of which you heard when Senator Boxer read a couple of those e-mails, we have received literally thousands of overwhelmingly positive e-mails, some of which are in packets that we have prepared for you. Dan Rather told us he heard Radio Sawa in an outdoor cafe in Amman. Tom Brokaw’s producer told us that Tom listened to Sawa on his trip to the region.

We are planning on doing full-out extensive audience research and measurement before we move into our state-of-the-art broadcast center in Dubai Media City. Our network will then be broad-

casting in five targeted programming streams directed at specific areas within the region in the colloquial dialects.

Mr. Chairman, when you and others on the committee asked, after the events of 9/11, what are we doing to combat hatred and anti-Americanism in the Middle East, we said, we are going to launch a unique new network, unlike anything else you have heard in U.S. international broadcasting, designed to attract the largest possible audience, and this is it. The Middle East Radio Network is like a wedding cake to which we are constantly adding layers.

Today, we are broadcasting music and news twice an hour, in 5 and 15-minute blocks, 24-hours-a-day, every day we are providing coverage of major events like President Bush's speech on April 4 on the Middle East from start to finish in Arabic, plus complete coverage of Secretary of State Powell's recent trip to the region with the kind of immediacy that was rarely possible to us in the past.

When President Bush, in his October 2001 speech to the Nation after the tragic events of 9/11, asked, in so many words, why do they hate us, I believe one answer is because they do not know us. All they hear about America and Americans is what comes from sources that are invested in not presenting a truthful picture of the United States to the world. Radio Sawa is the first step in presenting our policies, our people, accurately from our own lips. Soon, we will be broadcasting programs on policy, editorials, questions of the day, and reviews and critiques of Arab press reports. We will try to pinpoint and refute misinformation of state-controlled media, and down the line we are looking at more interactive programming on health, science, education, and other topical issues.

So when the taxpayers ask, what is the United States doing to reach the Middle East and hopefully decrease regional tensions, we can say, building a Middle East Radio Network. MERN is a prototype of the international broadcasting of the future and, as a cornerstone of public diplomacy, U.S. international broadcasting and MERN are a formidable means of getting America's message across to the Islamic world and elsewhere.

I very much appreciate your time and would be happy to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pattiz follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. NORMAN J. PATTIZ, GOVERNOR, BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I'm Norm Pattiz of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG).

On behalf of the BBG, I want to thank you very much for having me here to talk about U.S. international broadcasting and specifically our new Middle East Radio Network, which is fast becoming a key part of the U.S. public diplomacy effort in this turbulent region. I also want to thank you for giving us the resources to accomplish our mission, which is, quite simply, to promote freedom and democracy through the dissemination of accurate, reliable and credible news and information about America and the world to audiences overseas.

When I'm not working for the BBG, I'm the Chairman of Westwood One, America's largest radio network. Westwood One owns, manages or distributes the NBC Radio Network, CBS Radio Network, CNN Radio News and Fox Radio News. We supply over 7,500 U.S. radio stations with not only news, but sports, entertainment, talk radio and informational programming.

When I was appointed to the BBG in November of 2000, I was the only radio broadcaster on the Board. Chairman Marc Nathanson asked me to serve as the Co-Chair of the Language Service Review Committee, which manages the Congression-

ally mandated process of determining, on an annual basis, how effectively our resources are being deployed across the over 60 languages that we broadcast worldwide. I quickly noticed that our efforts in the Middle East were almost totally ineffective. We were broadcasting seven hours a day of Arabic language programming in a one-size-fits-all approach to the entire region on shortwave and a very weak medium wave signal from Rhodes. Over 98 percent of the audience of the region had never listened to the Voice of America.

After reporting this back to the Board, I was asked to serve as the Chairman of the Middle East Committee. Shortly thereafter I visited the region to determine what possibilities existed for building a 21st Century Arabic language broadcast operation. During the trip I learned a number of things. First of all, there's a media war going on and the weapons of that war include disinformation, incitement to violence, hate radio, Government censorship and journalistic self-censorship, and the United States didn't have a horse in this race.

On the plus side, many moderate Arab governments were willing to offer FM and AM frequencies and digital audio transmission, which would be necessary to create a state-of-the-art distribution system. I felt that by using proven American broadcasting techniques that have been successful all over the world, the opportunity existed to create a radio service that would attract the largest possible audience and, ultimately, deliver that audience for our public diplomacy mission. What techniques am I talking about? Using radio the way it is most effective in today's media environment. Radio today is a medium of formats—music, news, sports, talk, etc.—designed to reach a particular audience 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with a consistent style that connects with its listeners. In the case of MERN, which we call Radio Sawa—the Arabic word for “together”—the format we've chosen is targeted at listeners 30 and under, representing well over 60 percent of the region's population, which is music-driven with 5 and 10 minute newscasts every hour, 24 hours a day.

Radio Sawa is an example of combining proven commercial knowhow and modern broadcasting techniques, heavily researched so we know, well before we ever play our first song or broadcast our first feature or news program, who our audience is; what they like to hear; what type of news presentations, features and production values appeal to them. We also take into consideration what is already available in the marketplace and what has the best chance of delivering the largest possible target audience to hear our message. We call this marrying the mission to the market, and it's working.

We are now broadcasting on FM stations in Amman, reaching Jordan, the West Bank and Jerusalem, and FMs in Kuwait, Abu Dhabi and Dubai. We're on Medium Wave out of Kuwait, covering Iraq, Rhodes and soon Cyprus to Egypt, Lebanon and Syria. We are on 3 digital audio satellite transmissions, similar to our own DirecTV with audio channels, including Nilesat, Arabsat and Eutelsat. As you know by the impact of Al Jazeera and other satellite TV services, there are millions of satellite dishes throughout the region and now our message can be received on them.

This is just the beginning. We will be expanding our reach on FMs and AMs in the coming months, but the anecdotal information that we are receiving on the impact of Radio Sawa, since it's March 23rd launch, has been nothing less than amazing. Let me give you some examples from some of our own Embassies and Bureaus in the region:

From our Bureau Chief in Amman:

It is time for me to say it: The MERN leadership has been able to accomplish in a span of a few months what two generations of VOA Arabic broadcasters have failed to accomplish in more than fifty years. All indications show that Radio Sawa is the most popular FM station in Jordan. Congratulations . . . I am proud to be part of the MERN team.

Best regards.

Mahmoud Zawawi

And our Ambassador in Jordan proclaimed MERN an “instant hit among Jordan's young.” But it's not just insiders who are taking notice. Joshua Muravchik of the American Enterprise Institute writes that MERN is, “good news,” because it “promises to repair many of the defects of our current operation.” And the *New Republic's* Lawrence Kaplan calls Radio Sawa a “sober and effective public diplomacy initiative.”

From our listeners we have received literally thousands of overwhelmingly positive e-mails, some of which are in the packets that we have prepared for you. Dan Rather told us he heard Radio Sawa in an outdoor cafe in Amman. Tom Brokaw's producer told us that Tom listened to Sawa on his trip to the region.

We are planning on doing full-out extensive audience research and measurement before we move into our state-of-the-art broadcast center in Dubai Media Center. Our network will be broadcast in five targeted programming streams in local dialects, directed at specific areas in the region.

Mr. Chairman, when you and others on the Committee asked, after the events of 9/11, what are you going to do to combat hatred and anti-Americanism in the Middle East, we said we were going to launch a unique, new radio network, unlike anything you've heard from U.S. international broadcasting, designed to attract the largest possible audience—and this is it. The Middle East Radio Network is like a wedding cake to which we are constantly adding layers. Today we are broadcasting music with news twice an hour, in 5 and 10 minute blocks, 24 hours a day, every day, plus coverage of major events like President Bush's April 4th speech on the Middle East from start to finish, in Arabic, plus complete coverage of Secretary of State Powell's recent trip to the region, with a kind of immediacy rarely possible in the past.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, when President Bush, in his October 2001 speech to the Nation, after the tragic events of 9/11, asked in so many words why do they hate us, I believe the answer is because they don't know us. All they hear about America and Americans comes from sources that are invested in not presenting a truthful picture of the United States—and the world. Radio Sawa is the first step, presenting our people and policies accurately from our own lips.

In the not too distant future, we'll begin broadcasting policy programs, editorials, questions of the day and reviews and critiques of Arab press reports. We'll try to pinpoint—and refute—misinformation in the state-controlled media. And down the line, we're looking at more interactive programs that feature health, science, education and other topical issues.

So when taxpayers ask what is the United States doing to reach people in the Middle East, and to, hopefully, decrease regional tensions, we can say: Building a Middle East Radio Network. The BBG's FY 2003 budget request includes funding for the second year costs of the network.

We appreciate the support we've received from Congress in getting the Middle East Radio Network up and running, and in funding surge broadcasts in times of crisis. We look forward to working closely with you in the future as we, through our broadcasts, talk directly to people around the world about who America is, and for what it stands.

MERN is a prototype of the international broadcasting of the future. And as a cornerstone of public diplomacy, U. S. international broadcasting—and MERN—are formidable means of getting America's message to the Islamic world and elsewhere.

I appreciate your time and I'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. I am delighted that the press got to hear that very truncated example of the format of Sawa, and I recall when I met with you privately about this you, paraphrasing, basically made the point, you have got to get them to like listening to the station. You have got to make it popular if they are going to listen to the news, and I am assuming that this is going to do something more than promote Britney Spears' records in Amman.

One of the things that did surprise me, and I am embarrassed to say this, but I suspect I am not unique among Americans, or even American Senators, and that is how popular rock stars are, including indigenous rock stars, in the countries that we are trying to have our voice heard, and you gave me an example.

I wish you would repeat it, because I do not want to get it wrong. Even before you got Sawa up and running there was an Egyptian, I believe you said, and maybe a Jordanian rock star that were performing in Los Angeles. They were on tour, and you indicated to me you had the idea of being able to go send your folks over to interview them and then replay what they had to say about America in their words back in Egypt and in Jordan. Would you mind repeating that very truncated version again of that story for the folks here?

Mr. PATTIZ. Sure, absolutely. There were two Arab artists who were touring the United States, Hakkim and Khaled, and we not only interviewed them and the Arabic-speaking people in the audience who were at the performance in Los Angeles, we recorded the entire concert, so that we will be able to take that concert that was performed in Los Angeles and broadcast it back to the region with comments from Hakkim and Khaled and many of the people who attended the concert about their impressions of America—in the case of the artist, what it is like to tour America, what the difference in the audiences between Los Angeles and New York might be like—to really create, if you will, a cultural exchange on the radio.

And of course, knowing the importance of music artists to a music-driven format, music is a tool to attract an audience. We are very, very conscious of what our mission is, but the music attracts the 30-and-under, and specifically 25-and-under audience that we are really going after. So what we are doing right now in the region in our bureaus is having music personalities and stars doing liners and promos—you are listening to radio Sawa, this is whomever—to really connect with our audience. Because the first thing we have to do, of course, as you said before, Senator, we have got to get them to listen to us, and we have got to get them to like us, and on this level I think we are succeeding.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the things you had indicated to me is that you were not surprised, but that others were surprised at—your interviewer asked these Egyptian and Jordanian rock stars what their impressions of America were, and they did what Secretary Beers had said in another context, is that they were saying things like, I was told they were not going to like us, and people would look at us funny, and that people didn't like Muslims, and you know, I went to a mosque and there are people here, et cetera. Am I accurately portraying—

Mr. PATTIZ. Absolutely, because I think it is really important to be able to use stars from the region to talk about their positive experiences about the United States and America and Americans and broadcast those back into the region. It is a very important tool.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I will ask one last question and yield here. I have so many, but others do as well. One of the things that is being discussed, and is being discussed among us, Senator Lugar and others have a piece of legislation on this, I have a piece, the House has passed a piece of legislation relating to public diplomacy, and one of the things we are going to get into fairly quickly will be in effect my words, not either of yours, the next stage, what do we do with that other medium, television, and do we attempt to compete there, and I may be mistaken, but based on your written testimony I think there may be a slight difference in your views about that. I do not know that for certain.

Now, Madam Secretary, in your statement you say, and I quote, "television is the medium of today and the future, as is evident in the growth and influence of Middle East television satellites and regular television broadcasting. Existing channels are hungry for programming, and we need to direct resources to production, acquisition, and distribution of compelling quality programs. I am hesitant to endorse the concept of a greatly expanded direct broad-

casting capacity without a great deal more research on how best to approach it as this market has done. This is particularly true given the experience of the BBC's expensive experiment with Arabic TV broadcasting."

And Norm, you had indicated to me, and I cannot find the statement now, but you had indicated to me personally that you thought this held a great deal of promise, and that it is a place we should be moving, as I understood you, more rapidly than it appears, Madam Secretary, you think we should. Can you explain—and that will be my last question—explain more about the experience of the BBC and how you think we should proceed, and then you, Mr. Pattiz, and then I will yield to Senator Lugar.

Ms. BEERS. Well, I think that the message from the attempt of BBC to do a successful Arabic television channel is simply that it is very difficult to pull off well, and even VOA's television efforts have sometimes been less than productive, so it is a big boy's game, and we already have very aggressive and a widespread satellite television in very good band positions with the four top Arab networks. However, I do agree that television is extremely intrusive, and a very important and growing, actually, medium in this crucial part of the world.

I also agree with the initiatives, the 9/11 initiatives that talk about spreading the word and getting it out. The model on the MERN is very impressive. I mean, Norm has followed all of the sophisticated techniques we use in marketing and modern communication to make this launch of MERN a significant success, but for me it comes down to allocation of resources and I am really concerned about all of the work we do in the State Department that has to do with long term transformation exchanges as well as getting the word out and getting the word back in, and so I refer to those programs with which we have had great success, and I just want to be sure that we can support these and magnify them.

So to me, it is the tension—no one here is surprised about the budget and how we allocate resources.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is a logical concern, because if you look back—and I will not bore the committee with it now, but if you look back at the total amount of money we spent on public diplomacy 15 years ago, it is more than we are spending now.

Ms. BEERS. And we have many more countries and fewer people, and the dilution of resources is a shocking issue.

The CHAIRMAN. I for one parenthetically think we are going to have to significantly increase the resources we devote to this. I think we have our priorities wrong, but at any rate, Norm, would you respond to the television piece?

Mr. PATTIZ. Yes, I would be happy to. First, let me say that if it turns out to be the will of the Congress or the administration and all the powers that be that the Broadcasting Board of Governors initiate a satellite Arabic language television station in the region, I can assure you that it will be a first class operation. Radio and television do different things. MERN is designed to focus on a target audience that really is not the primary television listener, the 25-and-under adult, basically probably between 15 and 25, and engage them in a way that reaches them where they live on the radio. As I said, radio is a medium of formats.

Television is a medium of programs. Radio says a lot about who its listeners are. I dare say if I stepped into any one of your vehicles and took a look at the settings on the radio, the buttons that you have preset, that I could tell a lot about who you are just by taking a look at those settings. It is like walking into somebody's house and looking at the magazines that are on the coffee table. If there is a magazine about tennis, you can be pretty sure that is probably one of their key interests. That is what radio is.

Television is completely different. People are not loyal to a television network or a television station. They watch programs, and they turn the dial all the time, which gives us the opportunity to be more hard-hitting in our approach. If we wind up saying things that are hard-hitting on a television program it is probably not going to turn the audience off from watching that channel or keep them from going back to programming that they like to watch, and quite coincidentally going back to the controversial programming as well.

The BBC example is a good example of a situation that did not work. But let me tell you why it did not work, which I think bodes well for the way we would do it. The reason that it did not work was, it was a co-venture with Orbit, a satellite company that is basically a Saudi company, where the BBC was providing programming and Orbit was putting up the money and the distribution. Well, for an operation like the BBC, who needs to have its own editorial integrity, that kind of a situation I think was doomed to failure, because they started putting programming on that service which was objectionable to the Saudi Government and the service went away.

What we are talking about doing is putting up our own satellite channel so that what we put on that satellite channel we program from start to finish, whether it is 18 hours a day, or 24 hours a day. What we really do in television right now is, we are a syndication company. We produce a program, and then we go to local providers and ask them to carry that program.

Well, believe me, the hard-hitting stuff is never going to see the light of day on local media. They are not going to carry it. And we can't control the other things that they put on the air. We have the example of the Secretary of State having his comments aired on Al Jazeera, immediately followed by people who tear apart everything he just said.

We need to control what the programming is before the program and after the program. In television there is a concept called audience flow. Even though television is a medium of programs that are not necessarily the same from hour to hour, television tries to appeal to a particular audience and then carry that audience through to the next program.

For instance, you start on the morning show—and believe me, this is right off the top of my head—if we were going to do something, it might be likely that we start with a morning show, followed by a CNN or Fox type news programming period going into the midday, where you might want to go to more entertainment-oriented programming that was more family oriented, because there are kids and mothers and people around in that time period, moving back into in the late afternoon and early evening with more

hard-hitting traditional news type programming, and following up with entertainment programming after that.

Let me just say this, in conclusion—

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right. This is very important. Do not worry about your time.

Mr. PATTIZ. If we were going to do a project like this, if we were given the go-ahead to do a project like this, rest assured that it would be completely researched the same way we did MERN, extensively researched, so we knew who we were talking to and what our chances for success were program by program. We would put together a blue ribbon panel of advisors, many of whom I have informally talked with about this already, including the heads of major communications companies and movie studios who I believe would be very helpful, at least in terms of the entertainment programming in providing programming for us in a way that would show their patriotism. Let me also say that in the House bill I think there is \$135 million in that bill for new broadcasting initiatives, about \$65 million of which is for an Arabic satellite TV channel.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you very much. There is a vote on. I am going to yield to you, Senator Lugar, now, as I should anyway, and I am going to go vote, and maybe we can continue to keep this going. Thank you.

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

Mr. Pattiz, I think the statement that you just made, your description, really, of the skill of American broadcasters and television broadcasters is tremendously important. I hope it is not inappropriate, I would suggest that C-SPAN cover this and make life easier for us so that there is a constituency in our own country that understands the genius of American broadcasting and how things happen, how they are put together, and why the plan you have suggested has I think every hope of being a much better one than past efforts.

My first question, and I will try to encapsulate all of them so that both of you can comment on them. I am just intrigued by how much development there has been in the methodology of polling, or of marketing surveys or whatever you want to call them in these countries.

Clearly, if you are able to gain data, it is important it is used to make certain that the radio or the television efforts are successful. The acquisition of data and information to guide our efforts is extremely important. An understanding of the attitudes and perceptions the world has toward our country, our values, our policies is extremely important. The purpose of our public diplomacy must be to make certain not only that we have listenership and in fact people are paying some attention, but in the course of time that we are engaging ideas.

Now, likewise, the other side of the coin is what kind of public diplomacy responsibility we have to bring some support of independent media that arise, indigenous media from these countries, that is important, too. In addition to our ambitious, sometimes even aggressive efforts in public diplomacy, we must also be mindful that the freedom of expression must really come from the heart of these countries, and that is a more delicate operation.

Now, the National Endowment for Democracy supports independent media with modest grants to various entities. That was true throughout the cold war in Eastern Europe and Southeast Asia, but these have been very, very modest and are often in danger of obliteration by congressional lack of appropriation. I am curious as to how we can coordinate both of these situations. That is, to find out really what people are thinking so that we are successful in our broadcasting and overall objectives and how we can help develop independent media in those countries.

And finally, who will be in charge of it? Does this come with Under Secretary Beers, or with the Broadcasting Board of Governors or with the State Department, USAID? In other words, I am not certain I have been able to trace what I think is sometimes described as a fragmented authority. Can you respond to any of that? I would like to hear from both of you, if I might.

Mr. PATTIZ. Let me respond to the last question first. In terms of who would be in charge, I think this is clearly a job for the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and I think one of the primary reasons that the Broadcasting Board of Governors exists and is effective is because Congress in its wisdom created the Broadcasting Board of Governors to serve as a firewall between the independence of its journalists and the pressures that would come from outside influences, maybe places like this, or the State Department, or the administration, what-have-you. If we do not have credibility, we are lost, especially in a region where you have to do a real Kabuki dance to get the information across and get them to listen.

I always loved what Secretary Beers said when she said, "it is not what you say, it is what they hear." So if we were to go out and do something, and this were to be under the purview of a government agency other than the BBG, I would be concerned about being able to protect the independence of our journalists.

On the research question, there are places where we can do very sophisticated research and there are places where we can do nothing more than anecdotal research. In the places where we can do sophisticated research, which is a large part of the Middle East, we utilize Western research companies. In our case, we go out and find companies that do research for radio and television, the kinds of things we are interested in putting on the air. They put together the methodology and subcontract with local research entities in the region who actually go out and conduct the surveys.

Does it tell us anything about local attitudes? Absolutely, it does. The first question we asked in our research for Radio Sawa was, "Would you listen to a radio station that was brought to you by the United States of America?" Forty percent of the people we interviewed said no, but that means 60 percent said yes, and my personal feeling was that of that 40 percent who said no, probably half of them were going to listen to it anyway but did not want to say it to an interviewer.

So we also know that, although there is a clear lack of support for U.S. policies in the Middle East, American values of democracy and freedom of choice and self-expression definitely resonate with the Arab street, so that kind of information is very much available.

I can go on and talk about the indigenous media if you like, but maybe Charlotte would like to comment.

Senator LUGAR. Let me ask quickly, do we have enough people involved in this who understand the languages, the idioms, and what-have-you? You mentioned you have five dialects on one of your radio programs, but the thing we heard today, does this appear in many languages so that essentially people would understand what you had to say?

Mr. PATTIZ. Absolutely. The service, Radio Sawa, is an Arabic service, but there is the Arabic that is spoken in the gulf, there is the Arabic that is spoken in Iraq, there is the Arabic that is spoken in Egypt, which is a more classical style. One of the reasons why we want to have five directed programming streams is, since radio is such a personal medium and relates so directly to the listening audience, it is very important that they are listening to someone who is speaking to them in their own language with their own idioms.

We have a very talented news director who we have hired, a gentleman by the name of Mouafac Harb, who was formerly the Washington bureau chief for Al Hayat, managed the Lebanese radio and television network, and was the Middle East correspondent for Newsweek. He is very talented, is an Arab-American, who understands the dialects, and we have been able to surround him with a team of professionals who understand exactly what you are talking about.

Senator LUGAR. Secretary Beers.

Ms. BEERS. I think your question about research is very insightful, because I just noticed a new poll recently that said how much Muslim youth like America, in complete contrast to what we have been hearing, so how you ask the question is, in fact, an art form. We just prepared some messages that are like minidocumentaries on Muslim life in America as a way of opening the door to a dialog on faith. If we went out and said, look how faithful we are, we would not have any listeners, so we talk about this amazing story of Muslim life in our country as a way of opening the door.

These documentaries will run in Middle East television satellite stations, and we have a media program ready to go. Importantly, though, we use those messages as a stimulus to do consumer research, which is not typically done in any of our organizations. That is why Norm and I like to share the research we get in, and one of the things we learned is how to talk about it. For example, in every case they came back and said, show us pictures of our people in the company of other Americans. Well, we did not have that in the visuals. It is a very important indicator of self-esteem. Am I part of the group? Are you accepting me?

So every time we do these pieces of research we come back with a data bank we are collecting on what causes the attitude? Can you get past the policy issues into long-term attitudes? We just feel that a news study in all the Muslim countries, it is much more ambitious in terms of asking about attitudes and feelings. If we cannot pull out the feelings we really cannot properly address the programs.

The interesting thing was, people predicted that they would not like to see all of these overt messages from the United States and the general response back was, tell me more, and then we learned we have to do this research from Indonesia, where we started some

of the studies in Jakarta. In each case we learned how much emphasis to put on faith. We are doing a soccer player, we are doing a TV documentary on the Egyptian Nobel Prize-winner, we are doing Iman and his family, and we have all of these fantastic cross-populations in the United States.

The same thing in a way is what we find about independent media. I find when the media becomes freer and more independent we are much closer to being able to describe the process of law, the rule of law, the democracy. We just saw something amazing happen in Kosovo, which is just beginning to have a lot of media that is free to experiment. They did their own series on rule of law and democratic process, but that can be deadly dull.

In fact, they brought in local actors, they produced something like a soap opera within the embassy and their people and the local actors, so that you could not only see and hear what the process is about, but because of the independent media—this was a small television station. Its success was so clear that the big, state-owned media people bought the program, so it is not just independent media, it is training them, giving them program content, and teaching them how to do something that attracts the audience.

The last thing was about who is in charge. I think the structure we now have at the State Department is clearly responsible for any and every articulation of editorial policy, and as a member of the board of BBG I get to wear both those hats, and it is very constructive. I think our collaboration is first-rate. I know we have all worked on it, importantly, but for example, Radio Sawa now has its next obstacle path, which I think I am very comfortable with the approach in this of producing editorials and more U.S. advocacy in such a way that these audiences can hear it, as opposed to turn away in distrust and cynicism.

Senator LUGAR. Let me intervene at this point, because I am advised there is a minute-and-a-half left in the first vote, and Senator Dodd and I will want to vote and return. We are going to have another vote immediately following this one, so the chairman has asked that I temporarily recess the hearing.

Senator DODD. Before you do that, and I will recess it for you, but I just wanted to commend both of you here for this effort. I hope people hear what you had to say. I talked to Charlotte I think a couple of months ago when the former Ambassador from Pakistan called me with the suggestion of doing this, and that is inviting some of the very people who are most talented in producing and putting together programming, to invite them, and it is not new. You go back and look at the era of Franklin Roosevelt, what he did with Bill Paley and CBS in Latin America, what he did with the Disney companies.

There are plenty of historical examples historically where people understood symbols in programming to be able to have some influence on the younger generation, so it is very exciting to have you here. I regret I cannot come back after this to hear more of the testimony, but I thank both of you, and really I like the idea of putting up our own satellite. I have got to tell you, I think that is the only way you are going to guarantee that we have some real influence in penetrating these markets. In the absence of doing that, I

think it is going to be very difficult in a lot of ways. The money goes down the drain.

So I like that concept you are working on, and the invitation of independent production companies even in this country to be able to have access to these markets is a way also of having some influence, and so with that, we thank both of you, and I apologize again. We will stand in recess until the chairman comes back.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come back to order. I thank the panel and the other witnesses for their patience. As Senator Hagel just said, we just had a minor vote on raising the debt limit so we would not default for the first time since Hamilton on the debt. It was a very painful exercise to watch some of my colleagues do this. I am already in the tank anyway, so I have been voting responsibly for 30 years, but not popularly on that issue, but at any rate, so we may have a chance to get you more money because we may actually pay our debts.

But all kidding aside, Senator Hagel.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I am grateful, as we all are, for your time this morning and preparation, and most of all what you do for our country, especially at this historic, challenging time in the world. I wanted to go back to a couple of points that you each made, and Norm, I would start with you. We have had some opportunities to visit previously about what you are doing, and I have not had an opportunity to hear the update which you have provided this morning, which is most encouraging, and it is about what you had framed and defined when we last met as to what your objectives were and your intentions, and so I congratulate you and your colleagues, and even though you have a heavy burden to carry, and Tom Korologos, nonetheless you have managed to do well, so please extend our congratulations to your colleagues, your team for the job they have done.

And Secretary Beers, we will talk in just a minute here, but I wanted to ask one question of you, Norm. In your conversations with us this morning, you recited your observations after the trip that you took and you documented that, and you talked about the media war that was going on. Would you define in a little more detail the competition that is out there? What are we facing here?

You mentioned it in general terms, but define it a little more clearly. What is it that we are up against as far as—we understand Secretary Beers approach, some of this as well, but the kind of resources and the technologies and the sophistication of the other side of this that you are having to deal with, not just the underlying philosophy, but the assets on the other side?

Mr. PATTIZ. Sure. I have to say I just recently returned from a trip to the region, where I spent a good deal of time in the gulf in places like Doha and Manama in Bahrain, and also in Dubai, and I had never spent that kind of time in the region. I had only been in Doha before that, and I was very much impressed with what I saw. Doha is, of course, the home of Al Jazeera. Al Jazeera is the Arab satellite station that is most well-known by Americans, most likely because of the joint agreements that it has had with CNN and others over here.

But Al Jazeera is not the most-listened-to satellite TV service or media outlet in the region. There are significantly larger outlets, and what you have throughout the region is very sophisticated technology. When I went to Abu Dhabi and saw that, it is like Emerald City. I mean, it is like a brand-new city. People who think that is like walking through Amman or Cairo, forget it. The things they have, and the new media center and high technology centers they are building in those regions are incredible. We are going to locate our Middle East Broadcast Center in the Media City in Dubai, and there are a whole lot of other international broadcasters that are doing the same thing.

So they have the resources, and they definitely have the support of their governments, because in the case of a place like Qatar, for instance, Al Jazeera has really put them on the map. Without Al Jazeera most people would not know how to pronounce it, how to spell it, anything about it.

Al Jazeera, positioned itself as the Arab CNN. It is not. It is kind of, CNN meets Jerry Springer. You know, they have news presentation which is CNN-style, and then they have talk shows that are inflammatory and inciteful and what have you, and that is not unique. That kind of programming exists throughout the region.

The CHAIRMAN. It exists here in the United States.

Mr. PATIZ. But that is somebody else's problem right now, and I do not want to talk about that, because some of that might be mine.

But anyway, to be serious, there are tremendous resources available, and there are multiple media channels available, and when you get down to it, there are some radio stations, some of them that are licensed and some of them that are not licensed, clandestine radio stations that literally preach hate 24 hours a day, and part of that has to do with us and what we stand for and what we believe in.

So it is an incredibly challenging area, but I have to say that we received very good cooperation from some of the moderate Arab governments. I believe that it was a fairly—well, it was a pretty easy way to show support after 9/11 for our war on terrorism for some of our Arab friends, when some other activities we might have requested would have been a little more difficult.

Senator HAGEL. Thanks, Norm.

Ms. BEERS. I want to comment on that before we leave it. These organizations are always at the State Department looking for interviews and creating a dialog, and Chris Ross, my deputy and I, meet with them, and they are undergoing the same kind of budget crunch and profit issues that many organizations will go through, especially television, and I think their number one problem coming up is going to be programming. Like, the audience participation and interest in Al Jazeera drops dramatically every time they lose a bin Laden tape.

You also have to remember, some of their programming is actually helpful to us. For example, that last tape, which we did not honor with a lot of response and dialog, included the confession of one of the 19 hijackers. It had a profound effect on the media newspaper journalists in that area, because they no longer attempted any more to say that this was not bin Laden and al-Qaeda, which

they actually could hitch onto for a while, and so we have got to deal with the fact that they can be uneven in their coverage and sometimes positive.

And the other thing that is left out of this discussion is what could happen if we help support independent news facilities at the time that the government might show an opening or a welcoming to that, as we just discussed for Kosovo and the power of that independent medium, and those are variables in the mix.

Mr. PATTIZ. If I can give you one concrete example, since our tech is sitting over there, what I would like to do, and this is very quick. I do not even think it is 30 seconds of material. Let me play you a lead-in to one of our newscasts in Arabic, and then I will translate what comes right after that in English so that you can hear the kind of information we are putting out. Story is about an Arabic newspaper that is reacting to Radio Sawa. Can you just hit that?

[A CD was played.]

Mr. PATTIZ. Now, I listen to this every day, and there are a number of stories that are going on, but I want to read you one of the things it is reporting on, because it comes out of the Arab press, as a matter of fact. It says, the danger of—

The CHAIRMAN. Are you reading to us what we just heard in Arabic?

Mr. PATTIZ. I'm reading to you a commentary in the indigenous press about that broadcast. "The danger, of course, is not in the music, it is in the news that usually begins with a moderate, neutral tone that shifts gradually toward the terminology that serves the United States' interest in the area."

Radio Sawa's Web site refers to a long-term U.S. interest. Long-term means slow osmosis of terminology from one generation to another. This technology does not serve our national interest, and does not reflect our views of things. In the midst of the Church of Nativity crisis, I used to hear phrases on Radio Sawa referring to armed Palestinians trapped inside the church. This is not correct. In truth, Israelis were the ones who were armed on the outside, where the ones on the inside were unarmed.

Radio Sawa uses phrases like, parties to the Middle East conflict. This is a very dangerous phrase that transforms the Zionist occupation of Palestinian lands to a broader conflict between two neighboring countries and, by default, denies the Arab cause and right to retain the holy shrines important to Muslims.

This is the kind of stuff that goes on in the indigenous press that we attempt to debunk in news reports that we put on the air pointing out the inaccuracies of many of those things, and I think that relates directly to your question.

Senator HAGEL. It does, and I appreciate it, and it is helpful to give us, as I said earlier, some definition of what generally you were referring to.

Secretary Beers, may I ask you a question? Before I do, let me express my gratitude to you and to your team as well for the work you are doing. You said something to the effect, and I guess you asked it in a rhetorical question type way, what about those under 20. I think that is the essence of everything we are about, or should be about.

The military option is but one part of this war, an important one, but only one part of it. Where you are focused and concentrated is absolutely critical for the future of this country, the future of the world, and I do not think I overstate that, and I am a strong supporter of what you are doing here.

Something else you talked about, common denominator values, love of family and faith, we need to do a far better job of connecting that, and that is what you of course are doing, and Norm and others, and we will work, as the chairman said here, to provide the kind of resources you need, but you should know that you have a lot of support up here, and that we need to go much further and deeper and wider than we ever have here.

We are losing a war across the globe that we need not lose, we should not lose it, and I think of Iran and the great debate we are having in some of these areas among my colleagues up here. I mean, here is a country of 70 million people where most of those people were born after 1979. Now, why would we needlessly push away an entire generation by a foolish policy, and that is why we look to you and the educational gap and the cultural and information gap that you are trying to fill, and through what Norm is doing and his team, it works.

So I make that statement because I suspect occasionally you both wonder if anybody is paying attention. We are paying attention, and we are grateful for what you are doing.

Now, let me ask a question. You mentioned in your testimony, Madam Secretary, the point about working with the private sector, and by the way, I think we are all pleased that we are finally being able to bring together the talent from the private sector and the governmental sector, the State Department, other professionals who have been at this, along with some creative touch that the private sector brings, not that the government does not, but it is a waste of resources when we do not do that, and this is a very good example of how we are doing that, and we are doing it very well and in the interests of this country.

But your point about—you say we are also working to engage the private sector. Could you give us some examples how you are doing that?

Ms. BEERS. Yes. I think that what is important is that none of this effort at the moment is funded in terms of people ask, well, if they are going to do it, why do we have to have any funding. Because of the sheer machinery of making contacts, building teams, organizing dialog, making sure that the affinity for the embassy and for the work that happens in the field is in sync, and it is complex, but the good news is, I am often asked to give speeches, and I choose those that have a large number of CEO's in the room. I grew up with a lot of these people, and the basic response back is, guide us, we will do this, and as you spend more time with the multinational heads they tell you about the number of invitations or requests they have, so part of what we have to do is coordinate our efforts, which I think you have asked us about in the past.

The other thing we have to do is guide them somewhat by giving them the kind of information you have been asking us about, which is, why do they feel this way, and also what are the universal values that we can safely discuss. For instance, somebody used the

word, freedom, but that is one of the loaded words in terms of communicating with the Middle East and the Muslim population, so we have to tap into our sophistication in our bureaus, and then guide the outside world, the CEO and the multinationals.

But what is encouraging is, I had a meeting with, the head of Johnson & Johnson who said, we have 4,000 people in the Middle East. What shall we ask them to do? And Procter & Gamble and Unilever and these companies make a point of hiring locals, and they talk all the time about how their locals would ask to take part.

Now, it is delicate, because you cannot send them out as missionaries, or ask them to be speakers on the road, but you can equip them with, say, a wonderful discourse on the music of the United States. You can show them—we can provide them with materials and cultural insights, and speakers if they choose to activate them, but the point is, they are the ones that have the resources to take on the huge job of the very young, and that has a lot to do with education and curriculum, and the things the State Department and many other agencies are working on, but they have employees and depth, and great understanding and daily dialog, and I think we have to harness those assets.

Senator HAGEL. Well, thank you again. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I have many more questions of both of you. This has been, and I am sure will continue to be, one of the best hearings we have had in a long while. I think the point that Senator Hagel makes, particularly to you, Secretary Beers, you have a lot of friends up here. You are going to have the problem of us trying to give you more resources, and maybe your outfit will not say, we should give you those resources.

Ms. BEERS. I have noticed that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. But all kidding aside, and we have great respect for you, you come from the private sector, and you come from a high-powered portion of the private sector, and it has been an asset, and we appreciate it.

I also want the record to show that you oversee a lot more than just what we have talked about here today. There are many other aspects of your responsibility, including a quarter-billion a year in direct appropriations for the Exchange Bureau, including another \$150 million for the SEED Act and a lot of other things we are spending money on that I want to ask you about, but I am going to submit the questions to you in writing.

I am not doing this cavalierly. I would very much like some detailed answers to these questions, because part of the legislation, for example, that Senator Lugar has with Senator Kennedy, and I support the notion, is this issue of, do we vastly increase our exchange programs with this area of the world? We necessarily and successfully for 50 years made a significant investment in Eastern Europe and Russia, and Europe generally, and I would argue it paid off.

Dick and Chuck and I travel the world in our responsibilities. Dick and I have been chairman or the subcommittee chairman of Europe for years and years. I bet you 70 percent of the people who are heads of state now, or people in positions of significant author-

ity are people who have been educated here in the United States of America.

Ms. BEERS. One hundred fifty percent of the Worldwide Coalition were all exchange students, and the number is much higher if you just take down their second-level people, but one of the things that was fascinating was the Freedom Support Act, and the fact that I can go there and look at the capacity of the public diplomacy when it was in a high support system, and the results are very impressive, and you can walk into a town in a new emerging democracy and find an information center, a library, a dialog going.

The CHAIRMAN. There was a fellow named John Ritch who used to be assistant staff director up here. I get credit for having written the so-called SEED Act, which was followed by the Freedom Support Act. It was John Ritch's idea, and that was the biggest thing Dick and I fought for those centers, just having the physical capability of somebody being able to walk in.

It is kind of like what is happening now in every major corporation. They are building chat rooms—for example, there is ING, which is a large banking system. I met with them in Delaware yesterday. They are building these chat rooms. The chat rooms are not really chat rooms. What they do is, they have coffee shops with the high-speed computers there where you can do banking online with them and other things while you are sitting there having a cup of coffee.

Well, these are very important things, and I just want you to know, we know, and the public should know, your portfolio far extends beyond what we are talking about now, and I have a series of questions, about a dozen, that relate to that aspect of your portfolio. I do not want you to think because we are not getting to them, it is not because they have an equal interest and consequence here.

I would also point out, and I do not say this cavalierly, and I do not say this because he is a personal friend, but Tom Korologos has been involved in this for a long, long time, and had we the time I would ask Tom to come up, but we have a long list of witnesses to go here. Tom is one of the leading Republicans in this town, and has been for years and years. This is not a partisan thing.

My former AA of 25 years and Tom, a guy named Ted Kauffman and Tom have been friends for years. They both serve on the Board. This is something that spans, and everyone should know this, that spans the ideological divide, as we will sure see in a moment with Speaker Gingrich, who is incredibly articulate on this subject.

So I just want you to know that I think it matters a lot. We have a tendency to say, this is a historic hearing, and this is—you know, we are self-important, but the truth is, I think this is one of the most important hearings that we have had in a long time here, and I want to particularly thank you, Norm, for doing what we have a tendency in government not to do very well.

I always say to my staff, you have got to tell a story. You have got to tell a story to the people back home. You cannot just give them all the facts. You have got to tell a true story, and I know you and I met for a long time over lunch, and you kind of looked at me quizzically when I said, come and tell a story, play the disk,

connect the dots, a phrase that is becoming very popular here, but what you did today to anybody listening to this is, they now picture it. They now understand what they mean.

I do not have to say now to everybody as I push this, you know, when you fly across the country and you put on the head set and you listen to preprogrammed music, well, that is a guy named Pattiz, and what does he do? He does things like, play the music you like, and interview the artist, and the artists tell their story, and you get into this whole thing. I said, that is programming. That is what these guys and women are doing now on a much broader scale, and people would look at me and say, I think I got it.

But by playing that 3½ minute CD, you cut through here—in my view you cut through a layer of confusion, a fog that now, when I go home and say, look, I want to spend more money on this—I introduced a bill that would have given you guys, and you helped write it, about \$¼ billion dollars in terms of being able to—form hard asset, and another \$¼ billion a year to make it run.

The President was enamored with it, and I guess at the last minute he concluded that maybe we should go slower, and I am not being critical. But the point is, we have got to make the public understand. This is a two-way communication. We have got to explain to our folks back home why we are asking their very hard-earned tax dollars to be spent on a radio station or a television station or an exchange program with 1.2 billion, hopefully, eventually, now much less, just focusing on the Arab portion of the Muslim world.

So I cannot thank you enough, and we are going to be calling you back. Obviously, Charlotte, you will be back a lot. You are a critical component here, but we are going to ask you and the Board to come back. I have questions to you as well, in writing, on the relationship—and it is not meant to be pejorative, but the relationship between the Board as Senator Helms and I and Senator Lugar and others envisioned it when we did this reorganization and the State Department. How is that working? But really and truly, what do we do to make it better or worse? How can we help?

The last point I want to make, I want the record to show that notwithstanding what my 21-year-old daughter might think, I do not want to go down as a footnote in the history of this committee as being the first chairman to bring rock and roll to the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope I will be known for something beyond that, but I cannot think of a time I walked out, one of the people outside said, I have never heard rock and roll or Britney Spears played in the Foreign Relations Committee room, so I think it is a first.

We appreciate it very much. We look forward to having you back. Thank you for great work, and we are going to be trying to see if we can—that old bad joke, we are from the Federal Government, we are here to help. We are going to try to see that you have the assets and resources that you need. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. PATIZ. Thank you.

Ms. BEERS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next panel is the former Ambassador to Morocco, and executive director and CEO of Northstar Equity Group, Hon. Marc Ginsberg, the former Speaker of the House, Newt Ging-

rich, Mr. David Hoffman, president of Internews from Arcata, California, and Veton Surroi, a very distinguished journalist from Pristina, Kosovo, so we would ask all of those to come forward if they can make it up here, and thank them for their patience.

Welcome. It is good to see you Mr. Surroi. Last time I met with you we were in a different circumstance.

Let me suggest, notwithstanding the fact that a former Ambassador is of higher rank, where I come from no one outranks the Speaker of the House of Representatives, so we are going to start, with all due respect to the rest of the panel, with former Speaker Gingrich. Mr. Speaker.

**STATEMENT OF HON. NEWT GINGRICH, FORMER SPEAKER,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; SENIOR FELLOW, AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, DC**

Mr. GINGRICH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and Senator Lugar for holding a hearing on what I think is in some ways one of the two or three most important topics about America's role in the world and America's survival. I think this is really important. I thought the first two panelists you had were tremendous, and did a very good job in explaining the initial steps that the Bush administration has taken, and I commend you for encouraging further steps.

If I could try to summarize fairly quickly, as you well know we live in an information age, and from television to the Internet to radio and other mechanisms of public information, are actually decisive in shaping public opinion and informing the public, and as societies grow freer, the impact of public opinion grows more important. I think traditional state to state diplomacy was the key to the agrarian and industrial ages, but it is clearly inadequate in the information age.

If we in the United States cannot communicate with the people of countries we care about, we cannot sustain government-to-government relations. When a people turn decisively against America, their government will be increasingly at risk if it does not acknowledge the views of their people. Thus, for example, in the 1981-1982 fight in Europe over matching the Soviet Union by fielding mobile missiles, there had to be a very strong public information campaign that sustained the diplomatic initiatives at the government level.

When we are faced with an organized, ruthless minority that is gaining ground through dishonest propaganda and through violence, we have to both meet its security challenge and its information challenge. In the late 1940s, a significant American education and information campaign in France, Italy, Greece, and other countries played a major role in the survival of freedom and the defeat of Communist tyranny.

When we win militarily, we also have to be prepared to win culturally, educationally, informationally, and economically. People everywhere want to be safe, healthy, prosperous, and free. To the degree they see America as their ally in that quest, they will be strongly in favor of allying with America. We have to have fulfillment campaigns in Afghanistan and other countries after we defeat the extremist wing of Islam.

One of my strongest messages in the Pentagon has been, forget exit strategies. They do not exist. They are nonsense. They are not going to happen. Instead, think about fulfillment strategies that enable governments like that headed by Mr. Karzai to create safety, which is the precursor to health, prosperity, and freedom, but I recognize that we care about all four.

Let me also emphasize, we have been successful at doing this. Germany, Italy and Japan after World War II became profoundly different countries. South Korea after the Korean war was nurtured for many, many years by the United States from an authoritarian and to a dramatically open and democratic society. If we apply the same techniques and the same investment of capital, values, and education we can succeed again today.

This requires a five-pronged continuing American effort against extremist Islam, against those Islamic dictators who would acquire weapons of mass destruction, against disorder and barbarism, and genocide, and in favor of health, safety, prosperity, and freedom for all people, and I want to emphasize I think it is a mistake to not be clear that there is an extremist fanatic faction of Islam which is prepared to impose tyranny on its own people and is prepared to kill others, and unless you are willing to confront this and win this argument, it is very hard to distinguished all of the decent, honorable, hard-working people in Islam, many millions of whom, 6 million of whom now live in America, and live full lives pursuing freedom and happiness within a religious framework which also recognizes the rights of others.

I think there are five stages. First, that where necessary the United States and its allies have to be the guarantor of physical safety against the terrorists, the murderers, and the committers of genocide. This is particularly a challenge, I think, in the Israeli-Palestinian situation, but it is a challenge anywhere, that you have a totalitarian regime or a terrorist movement that will kill those who seek moderation and who seek freedom.

Second, having established safety, the United States and its allies have to implement strategies of wealth creation based on private property rights, the rule of law, and a rewarded work ethic. That is, if you go to work, you end up being rewarded for it. Information age technological infrastructure, for example, mobile phones and the Internet, modern systems of health and health care, and the culture of freedom and self-government.

I want to emphasize, this is only partially a resource issue. I hope this committee will look carefully at how AID is structured, will look carefully at the World Bank and at the IMF. The fact is, if you took all the money spent over the last 40 years on the poor parts of the world, you have to raise the profound question of why it has not worked, and whether that is a question of strategies as much as it is a question of resources. I think most of the failures of development in the last four decades have been failures to exploit the ideas which underpin wealth creation, and that is largely a function of public diplomacy, or public information operations.

Third, when we are confronted with a coherent ideological opponent such as Nazism, fascism, Japanese militarism, communism, or the extremist fanaticism wing of Islam, it is necessary to develop a countervailing intellectual communications effort on behalf of

freedom, modernity, and individual rights. Young people growing up have to be given the choice between hatred, violence, and tyranny, and the alternative of peace, opportunity, and freedom. Only a systematic educational and public information campaign can really give them a choice. In our current conflict, the madrasas of extremism have to be replaced with schools that educate young men and women into productive modern lives that are the basis of prosperity and integration into the modern world.

Fourth, in order to sustain these first three efforts, there has to be a strategic public information campaign that explains to our own people, our allies in Europe and around the world, the non-fanatic, nonextremist elements in Islam, and others, of our efforts, our sincerity, and our idealistic goals. This campaign has to be run within a framework acceptable to the White House, but the White House cannot run it.

The single key figure, probably Secretary Beers in the State Department, should be empowered to coordinate all American public information operations on a daily basis, coordinating with the White House. To the degree possible, our allies in nongovernmental institutions, including celebrities, should be recruited and included and involved in a broad public information strategy and campaign.

I might note, for example, that Disney invented both a Brazilian character and a Mexican character during the Second World War who were very popular. These were cartoon characters interacting with Mickey, proving that Mickey Mouse, the American, could work with local folks. While that may seem simple, it was a very powerful and very subtle kind of cultural outreach that used celebrity status.

Finally, the White House has to lead the daily and public information effort, because the President is so decisively the primary communicator of the American system. The White House should shape and direct the first four stages, but it should implement only the fifth stage.

And let me commend you for this hearing, because we are frankly unprepared to engage in the scale of a public information campaign and the sophistication that it needs to be to create safety in the 21st century. I commend on the other side of the building Chairman Henry Hyde for his important leadership in introducing and passing out of committee the Freedom Promotion Act of 2002. I know you have a similar initiative, which I want to commend you and hope that in the short legislative schedule left, that it will be able to move through the Senate and move ultimately into law.

Let me just close with this thought. The ultimate scale of resources needed to defeat the extremist fanatic wing of Islam will resemble the resources we used to defeat communism. The combination of educational efforts, communications campaigns, covert activities, economic assistance, and aggressive efforts to communicate our view of reality were the underpinnings for the nearly 50-year containment of Soviet communism.

Creating a stable, safe world requires a public information capability and a public diplomacy capability far beyond anything we have to date. I just want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, you were much closer to right in the scale of resourcing we are going to need, and folks ought to go back and look in constant dollars at what we in-

vested to save Europe in the forties and fifties and recognize that, if we are serious about helping those people, the overwhelming majority in the Islamic world who want to have a better future, that we have to be prepared to make the same scale of commitment, starting in Afghanistan, but extending across the Islamic world. If we do, we will succeed. If we do not, I do not care how many terrorists we kill, the conditions will simply create new waves of terrorism.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Gingrich follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF NEWT GINGRICH, FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thank you, Mr. Chairman (Senator Biden), and thank you, Mr. Chairman (Senator Helms) for the opportunity to appear before you today.

As we are all aware, we live in an information age. Television, the Internet, radio and other mechanisms of public information are decisive in shaping public opinion and informing the public.

As societies grow freer the impact of public opinion grows more important. Where state-to-state diplomacy was appropriate to the agrarian and industrial ages, it is clearly inadequate in the information age. If we cannot communicate with the people of countries we care about, we cannot sustain government-to-government relations. When a people turn decisively against us their government will be at increasing risk if it does not acknowledge their people's views. Thus, the 1981-82 fight in Europe over matching the Soviet Union by fielding mobile missiles required a strong public information campaign to sustain the diplomatic initiatives.

When we are faced with an organized ruthless minority that is gaining ground through dishonest propaganda and through violence, we have to both meet its security challenge and its information challenge. In the late 1940s a significant American education and information campaign in France, Italy, Greece and other countries played a major role in the survival of freedom and the defeat of communist tyranny.

When we win militarily we also have to be prepared to win culturally, educationally, informationally and economically. People everywhere want to be safe, healthy, prosperous, and free. To the degree they see America as their ally in that quest, they will be strongly in favor of allying with America. We have to have fulfillment campaigns in Afghanistan and other countries after we defeat the extremist wing of Islam. Instead of exit strategies we have to create fulfillment strategies that enable governments like that headed by Mr. Karzai to create safety, health, prosperity and freedom for its citizens.

We have been successful in the past and in Germany, Italy and Japan after World War II, South Korea after the Korean War. If we apply the same techniques and the same investment of capital, values and education we can succeed again today.

This requires a five pronged continuing American effort against the extremist fanatical wing of Islam against those Islamic dictators who would acquire weapons of mass destruction, against disorder and barbarism and genocide and in favor of safety, health, prosperity, and freedom for all people.

a. Where necessary, the United States and its allies have to be the guarantor of its physical safety against the terrorists, the murderers, and the committers of genocide.

b. Having established safety, the United States and its allies must implement strategies of wealth creation based on private property rights, the rule of law, and a rewarded work ethic, information age technological infrastructure, (e.g. mobile phones and the internet) modern systems of health and healthcare and the culture of freedom and self-government. This is only partially a resource issue. Most of the failures of development in the last four decades have been failures to export the ideas which underpin wealth creation and that is largely a function of public diplomacy or public information operations.

c. When confronted with a coherent ideological opponent such as Nazism, Fascism, Japanese Militarism, Communism or the extremist fanaticism of Islam it is necessary to develop a countervailing intellectual communications effort on behalf of freedom, modernity and individual rights. Young people growing up have to be given the choice between hatred, violence and tyranny and the alternative of peace, opportunity, and freedom. Only a systematic educational and public information campaign can truly give them a choice. In our current con-

flict, the madrasas of extremism have to be replaced with schools that educate young men and women into productive modern lives that are the basis of prosperity and integration into the modern world.

d. In order to sustain these first three efforts there has to be a strategic public information campaign that explains to our own people, our allies in Europe and around the world, the non-fanatic non-extremist elements in Islamic world and others of our efforts, our sincerity and our idealistic goals. This campaign has to be run within a framework acceptable to the White House but the White House cannot run it. A single key figure, probably in the State Department, should be empowered to coordinate all American public information operations on a daily basis with the White House. To the degree possible our allies, in non-governmental organizations, including celebrities, should be recruited and included and involved in a broad public information strategy and campaign.

e. The White House has to lead the daily public information effort because the President is so decisively the primary communicator of the American system. The White House should shape and direct the first four stages but it should implement only the fifth stage.

The United States is today unprepared to engage in a public information campaign on the scale needed to create safety in the 21st century. I commend Chairman Henry Hyde for his important leadership in introducing and passing out of Committee the Freedom Promotion Act of 2002. This important initiative provides for a significant increase in our efforts of public diplomacy. While more must be done this act is an essential first step and I urge the Senate to join in passing something along those lines.

The ultimate scale of resources needed to defeat the extremist fanatic wing of Islam will resemble the resources we used to defeat Communism. The combination of educational efforts, communications campaigns, covert activities, economic assistance and aggressive efforts to communicate our view of reality were the underpinnings for the nearly 50-year containment of Soviet Communism.

Creating a stable safe world requires a public information capability and a public diplomacy capability far beyond anything we have developed to date. The new emerging information-age has new requirements for tactical information on a daily basis and complex requirements for the Internet, cell phones, satellite television, radio and long-term educational efforts. These activities can often be implemented by non-governmental organizations but the resourcing and the general strategies and systems implementation require government leadership.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Speaker, our usual practice is to go down and have everyone speak, but Senator Lugar is going to have to leave. Let me just say one thing to you. First of all, I literally—and I am not going to make any humorous comment about this—truly agree with everything you have said, especially your phrase, fulfillment strategy.

If I can make an analogy, and I hope you will not be offended by it, Senator Helms in the courageous step he took to help us thread the needle of support for the United Nations by dealing with our debt at the United Nations, had a dramatic impact on the attitude and potential utility to us of the United Nations, not in merely that it paid the debt, but that by Senator Helms standing up, he essentially de-demonized the notion that we would participate at all in the United Nations. It was a gigantic, gigantic step, and I would have been prepared to yield even more just to get him to do that, and he did not need my convincing.

You are the single most articulate voice on the right, in my view. I mean that sincerely, my word, and the fact that you would use the words, fulfillment strategy, I think is the single most significant contribution you can make, because as you know, I think the President shares your view, but there are many on the right and left who view it only in terms of exit strategy.

They are not willing to—I had a debate with my very close friend, a Democrat, and one senior Republican at the White House

on Bosnia, and the point that had to be raised was, I said, what would we have done if you guys had prevailed in 1955 or 1960 or Senator Mansfield had prevailed in 1961 or 1962 or 1963, and withdrawn American troops from Europe. This is a long-haul deal. Your stature, your significance, your ability to articulate is, I think, maybe one of the greatest contributions you can make at this moment, because until we move, in my view, to this notion of a fulfillment strategy, we are going to be in real trouble.

So I want you to know this forum is available to you any time you want it. I mean this sincerely. You and I have been, not in a personal sense but in a political sense at odds with one another on many things over our careers, but I have great respect for you. I am not being solicitous. I have great respect for you, and I think the contribution you are making on this subject is even more consequential than the contribution that Senator Helms made relative to the United Nations, and I just wanted to say that while Senator Lugar was here, and I apologize to the rest of the panel for interrupting.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me just say—and as you know, I have to leave, but I want to say to both of you, I know how many years both of you have spent criss-crossing the world and criss-crossing the House and Senate trying to explain the world you have seen. We are at one of the great turning points equal to the period 1947 to 1952, when we finally came to grips with our role in the world. September 11—and I cannot overstate the importance of the President's own process, I think, of thinking this through.

September 11 said to the American people, either we are going to learn to lead the world toward safety, prosperity, health, and freedom, or the world will in the end tear us down because it will not be able to stand the jealousy of thinking that only Americans have those things. That has to be a cultural, educational communications strategy with a military component, not the reverse, and one of the first big tests has to be in Afghanistan and, if I might, to just take advantage of your very generous and, frankly, very humbling comments, Senator Biden, I am very touched that you would say what you did.

I believe if we could take the African initiative and rethink it as a sub-Saharan initiative, and take Africa seriously enough to not accept pouring money into the failed bureaucracies, but from the ground up to design a genuine strategy—and I would love to come back and chat with the two of you and Senator Helms, and maybe at some point ask that we might have a hearing on this topic conceptually, I think doing the right things in the Islamic world and the right things in sub-Saharan Africa, change who we are in the world, changes the world's understanding of us, and gives our grandchildren a much safer and freer planet to live on, and I think that is the goal. At least now that I have two grandchildren I am more worried about their future than mine. That is the kind of world I would like to live in.

So I would like to extend, if I might as a private citizen, come and visit with you all and then maybe to later consider that prospect.

The CHAIRMAN. I guarantee you, within the next couple of days we will set up a time. I am anxious to do that. I know Senator Lugar has to leave, and I apologize.

Mr. Ambassador, the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARC C. GINSBERG, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO MOROCCO; CEO AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, NORTHSTAR EQUITY GROUP, WASHINGTON, DC

Ambassador GINSBERG. Mr. Chairman, Senator Lugar, it is a great honor to be here. My testimony, which I will summarize, is focusing more on the ground war rather than on the air war.

Following September 11, I undertook as a private citizen several initiatives to help both the U.S. Government and the private sector focus additional effort and resources to recalibrate and improve our public diplomacy initiatives in the Middle East. Mr. Chairman, I was raised in the Middle East and have worked extensively in the region, and I had the privilege of serving our country as Ambassador to Morocco, and travel still extensively around this country and the region to explain the history of Islam and the fight that we are up against, to Americans as well as to others, but to rebuild our power to persuade and to win that important war of diplomacy, and public diplomacy in the war on terrorism, the United States has got to understand why the Middle East sees us so differently than how we see ourselves, and determine what resources we must mobilize to turn the tide of anti-Americanism against us.

We can begin by opening up lines of communication that have until now been off-limits and out-of-bounds by our diplomats. In an article I offered in the Washington Post in October, I proposed the creation of a new public-private sector United States Middle East Policy Engagement Commission to promote two-way dialog and to bring together under one roof the Nation's leading Middle East experts.

This initiative, Mr. Chairman, led to the formation of an ad hoc group of Middle East experts I helped convene to explore how the private sector could support America's public diplomacy initiatives in the region and to assess what needed to be done to engage the private sector in this effort. This steering committee has been working throughout the spring to focus on three specific short-term objectives, a media exchange program, the development of a dialog Web site, and a plan to enlist and support entertainers respected and admired in the Arab world.

I also serve on the Council on Foreign Relations Public Diplomacy Task Force under the chairmanship of Pete Peterson. This task force, which includes over 60 experts, has devoted many months of time and effort to develop a comprehensive blueprint for improving U.S. public diplomacy, indeed, Mr. Chairman, to revolutionize our public diplomacy functions. This report, which will be issued shortly, will unveil many important recommendations for reorganizing the public diplomacy functions within the U.S. Government under a new Presidential directive.

It is clear to those like myself who have worked extensively in the United States and abroad that the State Department, the White House, and our embassies all need to be working more closely together to fix a system that is simply not working well enough

to win the war of public diplomacy in the Middle East and beyond. Despite the integration of the USIA into the Department of State, public diplomacy and policy formulation are almost two ships passing in the night. The council's report will address these issues, and I am confident, Mr. Chairman, you will find it an extremely important contribution to your efforts to improve America's public diplomacy programs.

I listened very carefully to what Norm had to say about television media efforts that he and others are planning to do. I was recently asked to serve on the board of directors of a new private sector initiative known as Al-Haqiqa, otherwise, in English, "the truth," an effort to develop a new U.S.-private sector satellite television station and program content for the Arab world.

Al-Haqiqa is currently planning, as its initial objective, to develop American-style Arabic language news-oriented programming to be broadcast on existing Arabic cable and satellite systems in the Middle East. This effort has the bipartisan support of a very distinguished group of American leaders, and is chaired by former President George Bush. I hope Congress will encourage the media program development efforts of this enterprise, and for the government to proceed quickly to make a final determination whether the U.S. Government or the private sector will launch its own Middle East satellite or cable broadcasting initiative, a decision that cannot afford to be postponed much longer.

Mr. Chairman, during my tour of duty in Morocco, I tried to undertake several unprecedented public diplomacy initiatives, because I understood, even at the height of the Middle East peace process, at the very moment when we began realizing that there was hope for peace in the Middle East, we were under verbal assault from overly opinionated journalists and religious demagogues. They were aided by Islamic extremists and their underground network throughout the region, and that is a fact that we still must take into account, because that network of hatred is still there.

Unfortunately, the more effective public diplomacy will only mitigate this hatred. We also have to look at the policy problems that we face in the region as well, but we surely can do a great deal to lessen the misunderstanding and to arm our friends in the region with the tools necessary to take on our enemies more effectively. Our embassy undertook a series of unprecedented public policy and diplomacy initiatives which I explained in my testimony.

The velocity and frequency of unanswered attacks against America from mosques to media have taken their toll, undoubtedly, as you know, on our image, yet our public diplomacy programs in the Middle East and our embassy resources allocated to public diplomacy are simply not up to the challenge. Mr. Chairman, whatever we do here in Washington, whether it is with radio as well as with Under Secretary Beers' office, we have got to understand that it is our diplomats and our people in the field who are on the front line in this ground war, and it is they who must be trained and equipped to redress the public diplomacy imbalance, and it is they who must be supported by battle-tested and highly mobile and mobilized public diplomacy apparatus.

The President can offer some of the leadership that is essential to ensure that public diplomacy is accorded its proper role in the

formulation of foreign policy, that the two have to go hand-in-hand. Public diplomacy has got to be, Mr. Chairman, in the take-offs and not just on the crash-landings. In this regard, there must be better public diplomacy coordination between Washington and its diplomats stationed abroad.

There exists a short-circuit, Mr. Chairman, in the illogical wiring diagram between the short-staffed Under Secretary of Public Diplomacy and her ability to direct U.S.-funded public diplomacy programs and to charge and to assess what is going on in the field. Bureau public affairs officers since the reorganization have no authority to task officers in the field and, in turn, officers in the field are largely being ignored.

Let me add, Mr. Chairman, that the components of an effective public diplomacy campaign must involve all the assets of the U.S. Government to muster and to persuade. We have a better story to tell than we realize. It involves not only policy communications, but reminding our audiences that we have done a great deal to help their countries in the region. Far too few Arabs understand the work of our Peace Corps or our foreign assistance programs, or the magnitude of American private generosity.

Second, our diplomats, starting with our Chief of Missions, have to reengineer our embassies, Mr. Chairman, and I recommended this in our Council on Foreign Relations report. I outlined a new mission program plan that would help or reengineer our embassies to deal more effectively with public diplomacy programs.

The Internet era's 24-7 news cycle will require an end to the 9-to-5 syndrome prevalent in our embassies, and our Diplomatic Corps must be motivated to reverse long-held beliefs about how they are to work and act with host country governments and opinion leaders.

This, Mr. Chairman, is not what diplomats have been trained to do. They are not trained to confront. They are not trained to engage in dialog with peoples and groups that are not necessarily part of the mainstream of diplomatic activity at the top echelons of society. They are not rewarded for making waves. They are not trained how to use media technologies and to experiment with new ideas, and many do not believe they can afford to be part of some political campaign centered on ideas, and as part of the Council on Foreign Relations Task Force I am sure that you will see that some of these issues have been addressed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, our budget for public diplomacy is inadequate, and our apparatus for training our diplomats has got to be improved. Most officers, as I said, have never received media training, and hesitate to appear on local radio and television shows, mostly because of deficiencies in foreign languages, and because of their inadequate training.

Throughout the Middle East, U.S. cultural centers have been closed, consulates have been ordered shut, there is no representation for public diplomacy, and if we have no fixed assets on the ground, Mr. Chairman, on the front line in this effort, how, may I ask, are we going to accomplish our objectives?

Mr. Chairman, as a private citizen, in closing I want to assure you that the private sector can lend a better hand to help train our diplomats. The range of support that can be mustered from public

affairs, public relations, communications, and media and advertising industries is staggering, and I look forward to working with the committee and with Under Secretary Beers and with Norm and the others to bring these resources to bear to make this a truly effective effort in the war on terrorism.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Ginsberg follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MARC CHARLES GINSBERG, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO MOROCCO

Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me to testify regarding the status of U.S. public diplomacy and its role in the War on Terrorism, particularly as it relates to our challenges in the Middle East. I want to commend you and the Committee for examining the new challenges facing U.S. public diplomacy programs—mindful that our public diplomacy strategy and the level of commitment to its success by the U.S. Government represent crucial weapons in our War on Terrorism.

Following September 11th, I volunteered to undertake several initiatives to help both the U.S. Government and the private sector focus additional effort and resources to recalibrate and improve our public diplomacy initiatives in the Middle East. I was raised in the Middle East and have worked extensively in the region. I have had the privilege of serving as U.S. Ambassador to Morocco and continue to address audiences throughout the Arab world as a former diplomat and as a businessman during frequent appearances on Al Jazeera, CNN International and Fox News Channel. I am deeply committed to the economic and social development of the Middle East as a strategic objective of U.S. foreign policy. And I am confident, even in the face of the propaganda onslaught against the U.S. throughout the Middle East, that we can turn the tide in the war of ideas, however challenging that may seem to us right now. But to rebuild our power to persuade and to win that important front in the War on Terrorism, the United States must first understand why the Middle East sees us so differently than how we see ourselves and determine resources must be mobilized to turn the tide of anti-Americanism against us. We can begin by opening up lines of communication that have until now been off limits and out of bounds by our diplomats.

In an article I authored in the *Washington Post* dated October 23, 2001, I proposed the creation of a new public/private sector U.S. Middle East Policy Engagement Commission to promote two-way dialogue and to bring together under one roof the nation's leading Middle East experts to serve as a resource for our public diplomacy in the Middle East. This initiative led to the formation of an ad hoc group of Middle East experts I helped convene with my co-chair Prof. Shibley Telhami, in December 2001, under the auspices of Search for Common Ground and the Woodrow Wilson Center for Strategic International Studies. We came together to explore how the private sector could support America's public diplomacy initiatives in the region and to assess what needed to be done to better engage the private sector in this effort.

A Steering Committee of this ad hoc group has been meeting throughout the Spring to develop several short term public diplomacy initiatives including: 1) a media exchange program; 2) the development of a "dialogue website"; and 3) a plan to enlist the support of entertainers respected and admired in the Arab world to participate in public diplomacy outreach. We hope to meet shortly with Under Secretary of State Charlotte Beers to share with her our recommendations and to offer our expertise to help our Government achieve its objectives in the war of ideas now being waged in the Middle East.

I also serve on the Council on Foreign Relations Public Diplomacy Task Force under the Chairmanship of Peter Peterson. This Task Force, which includes over 60 experts, has devoted months of time and effort to develop a comprehensive blueprint for improving U.S. public diplomacy—indeed to revolutionize our public diplomacy functions. The quality of the effort and the scope of the Council's Report will surely warrant the attention of this Committee, Congress and the Executive Branch as it considers reforms to America's public diplomacy functions and budget. The Report will unveil many important recommendations for reorganizing the public diplomacy functions within the U.S. Government under a new Presidential Directive. It is clear to those like myself who have worked in the State Department, the White House and at embassies abroad that there is urgent need to fix a system that is simply not working well enough to meet the challenges of a new war.

Despite the integration of USIA into the Department of State, public diplomacy and policy formulation are almost two ships passing in the night. The Council's Report directly addresses this challenge and explores new ways to improve the coordination of foreign policy formulation and public diplomacy functions in Washington and in our missions abroad. The Report will also propose a new way to budget public diplomacy programs, recommend new training programs and opinion research skills for public diplomacy professionals, and outline new programmatic initiatives that would greatly expand exchanges. It will also recommend the creation of a new entity to encourage universities, foundations and NGOs to make public diplomacy a central priority.

I am confident you and the Committee will find it an extraordinarily important contribution to your efforts to improve America's public diplomacy programs.

I also serve on the Board of Directors of a new private sector initiative known as Al-Haqiqa (the Truth)—an effort to develop a U.S. private sector satellite television station and program content for the Arab world, which has been launched by one of America's distinguished former diplomats Ambassador Richard Fairbanks, a Special Middle East Negotiator under President Reagan. Al-Haqiqa is currently planning as its initial objective to develop Americanstyle Arabic language news-oriented programming to be broadcast on existing Arabic cable and satellite systems in the Middle East. This effort has the bi-partisan support for a very distinguished group of American leaders and statesmen, including former President George Bush, James Baker, Sandy Berger, Lee Hamilton, George Shultz and Richard Allen, just to name a few. But any American effort to compete with Al Jazeera and other Arab media will require private sector resources and talent to develop content programming. I hope Congress will encourage the media program development efforts of Al-Haqiqa pending a final determination whether the U.S. Government itself intends to launch its own Middle East satellite or cable broadcasting initiative—a decision that cannot afford to be postponed much longer.

During my tour of duty in Morocco—a country which by all accounts is a truly great friend of America, I recall that at the most favorable junction in the Middle East Peace Process, America, its policies, and its leaders were nevertheless under verbal assault from overly opinionated journalists and religious haters, cynics and doubters. They found it spiritually and materially rewarding and politically correct to run roughshod over the truth about America. They were aided by the Islamic extremists and their underground network next door in Algeria whose government was waging an important struggle against Islamic extremism largely out of sight of America. Why the anger and disillusionment seemed to surface at such a moment of promise is subject to much debate. Certainly, our foreign policies both in the Middle East and around the world contributed to this resentment—a fact that must be taken into account if we are to develop adequate public diplomacy initiatives in the region. Unfortunately, more effective public diplomacy will not completely reverse the resentment and mistrust of America that have taken root in the Middle East without changes in our policies. But we surely can do a great deal to lessen the misunderstanding, and arm our friends in the region with the tools necessary to take on our enemies more effectively than we can do alone.

Indeed, under the rubric that “no good deed shall go unpunished” every fault facing the region is being laid at our doorstep even though we have done so much to greatly improve the lives of ordinary citizens from Casablanca to Cairo and beyond. Too many Islamic clerics have a favorite anti-American sermon—each one more diabolical and disturbing than the one preceding it. They do not make great bedtime reading. Too many journalists (many of whom are on the payrolls of governments which are recipients of American taxpayer assistance) lavish derision on our motives and our culture. We could do nothing right then and certainly that attitude has worsened in recent months. It was clear to me then as it is so clear to me now that something had to be done to take on this growing deluge of criticism and hatred.

Without any need for direction from Washington our embassy undertook a series of unprecedented public diplomacy initiatives to open up lines of communication with journalists, Islamic clerics and university faculty and students—in other words the opinion elites in the Middle East. These encounters were at times difficult and emotional. I recall once when I took *New York Times* columnist Tom Friedman into one of these sessions he told me afterwards that he felt he had just attended a 60s version of an Arab League meeting. I urged my colleagues in other posts to do the same and an informal network of ambassadorial exchanges soon commenced in order to begin sharing information about the challenges we were facing—not an easy task since most embassies are not on the receiving end of other embassy cable traffic back to Washington.

The velocity and frequency of unanswered attacks against America and Americans from mosques to media have taken their toll on our image in the region and has

helped fuel anger and resentment that is directly responsible for the success of Islamic extremism in the Middle East. If we are to turn the tide in the War on Terror, we ignore this cascade of hatred at our peril. Yet, our public diplomacy programs in the Middle East and our embassy resources allocated to public diplomacy are simply not up to the challenge ahead of us.

Whatever we do in Washington to reverse the tide we must understand that our diplomats are on the frontline in this war of words and it is they who need to be trained and equipped to redress the public diplomacy imbalance. And it is they who must be supported by a battle-tested and highly mobile and mobilized public diplomacy apparatus in the U.S. Government that is not consumed by traditional bureaucratic inertia and shopworn artificial distinctions between public diplomacy and hard-core policy formulation.

What can be done?

First, Presidential leadership is essential to ensure that public diplomacy is accorded its proper role in the policy formulation and implementation process—preferably within the White House under the National Security Council—that would establish a public diplomacy component as well as serve as a coordinating structure that links all of the policy and public diplomacy components of the government. A Presidential Determination should make clear that public diplomacy is a strategic component of U.S. foreign policy and that it represents a crucial component of our diplomats' duties and responsibilities that can no longer be marginalized. To be effective, public diplomacy must be in on the "take offs" and not just the "crash landings" and there must be a process in place to regularly assess its effectiveness and to shift priorities and resources as needed.

In this regard, there must be better public diplomacy coordination between Washington and its diplomats stationed abroad. For example, it is clear that there exists a shortcircuit in the illogical wiring diagram between the short-staffed Under Secretary of Public Diplomacy and its ability to direct U.S. funded public diplomacy programs and the public affairs officers operating in our posts abroad. Bureau public affairs officers have no authority to task public affairs officers in the field. In turn, officers in the field are being ignored because their reporting is not integrated into a process that can swiftly act on the advice they are sending in from the field. In fact, they do not even report to the Under Secretary of Public Affairs, but to the regional assistant secretaries. It makes absolutely no sense to see public diplomacy on the periphery of policy development—almost as an afterthought to those who think that mainstream policy formulation can somehow be undertaken without a plan to ensure its receptivity.

I had hoped that the integration of USIA into the Department of State would herald a closer relationship between public diplomacy and the development and execution of foreign policy. I am afraid that this has not been the case. We are going to have to redefine the role of U.S. public diplomacy such that it is an integral part of policy formulation from its very inception and launch—rather than an afterthought relegated to non-mainstream diplomats.

Mr. Chairman, let me add that the components of an effective public diplomacy campaign should involve all assets that the U.S. Government can muster to persuade and influence. We do have a great story to tell. It involves not only policy and communications, but reminding our targeted audiences of the efforts Americans have made to help their countries. Far too few Arabs know of the wonderful work of our Peace Corps operating in their countries. Far too few know how much foreign assistance has been given to help their nations. Far too few appreciate the magnitude of American private generosity through non-governmental organizations and charities that operate in their countries.

Second, U.S. diplomats, starting with Chiefs of Mission and the Deputy Chiefs of Mission must be mandated through each embassy's "Mission Program Plan" or "MPP" and promotion precepts to integrate public diplomacy functions into each MPP. The Internet era's "24/7" news cycle will require an end to the "9-5" syndrome prevalent at our embassies so that we can better and more rapidly respond to the media attacks on us. Until September 11, public diplomacy duties had been largely relegated to press attaches who are not fully integrated into the embassy's political operations. Our diplomatic corps must be motivated to reverse long held beliefs about how they are to work and act with host country governments and opinion leaders and penalized if they resist. They will have to be better sensitized to the fact that no matter how justified a particular foreign policy may be to us, without an effective complimentary public diplomacy program all of that hard policy work may ultimately fail.

This is not what diplomats are trained to do. They are not trained to confront and to open dialogue with peoples and groups that are not necessarily part of the mainstream of diplomatic activity or at the top echelons of society. They are not re-

warded for making waves with host governments or detractors. They are not trained how to use media technologies or to experiment with new ideas. They do not believe they can afford to be part of a “political campaign” centered on ideas. Yet, opening up channels of communication with our detractors is more important than ever before.

As part of my work for the Council on Foreign Relations Public Diplomacy Task Force I drafted a model Mission Program Plan for Public Diplomacy and I am hopeful that it will be integrated into the Council’s Report. This draft model would require each Ambassador to establish a mission Public Diplomacy Task Force, chaired by either the Ambassador or his Deputy Chief of Mission, which would be responsible for and coordinate all agency public diplomacy initiatives and spell out mandated public diplomacy functions for each embassy’s officer, including officers from other agencies. The MPP would also compel each embassy to provide the Department and the White House feedback and analysis on the effectiveness of public diplomacy programs. Additional budget resources will need to be increased to meet program objectives including funding for new media streaming fees to local media outlets, new website improvements and exchange and outreach initiatives. This will require Ambassadors to:

- Complete an assessment of what key policy and message elements need to be promoted to different audiences in a host country.
- Assess how best to mobilize Post resources to accomplish key public diplomacy objectives.
- Determine ways to measure the impact and capacity of his or her team to recalibrate public diplomacy initiatives.
- Identify, by priority order, key public opinion targets and determine whether Department or private sector resources are needed to reach these targets.
- Determine how the embassy can best help the White House facilitate public diplomacy considerations into policies that affect policy to the host country.

Third, our budget for public diplomacy is inadequate and our apparatus for training our diplomats in public diplomacy is virtually non-existent. Other than Public Affairs Officers, most officers have never received media training and often hesitate to appear on local radio and television shows, mostly because of local language deficiencies and inadequate training. Throughout the Middle East, U.S. cultural and cultural centers have been closed. Consulates have been ordered shut. There is no representation budget for public diplomacy. If we have fixed assets on the front line in this effort how, may I ask, are we going to accomplish our objectives?

Our private sector can lend a hand to help better train our diplomats at the newly named George Schultz Foreign Affairs Training Center. The range of support that could be mustered from the public affairs, public relations, communications, media and advertising industries is staggering and it has indeed been offered if we can help the U.S. Government accept these offers from the private sector. In this regard junior, mid-level and senior officers should be required to fulfill fundamental public diplomacy training as part of their promotion requirements and the private sector can help train our officers. That training could include a variety of disciplines such as public speaking; media and opinion analysis, how to use media for message delivery and how to integrate public diplomacy into policy functions.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, I believe that the War on Terror compels us to reexamine, replenish, and reform our public diplomacy functions both in Washington and in the field. I look forward to helping this Committee and the Congress in accomplishing this vital war objective. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hoffman.

**STATEMENT OF DAVID HOFFMAN, PRESIDENT, INTERNEWS,
ARCATA, CA**

Mr. HOFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am president of Internews, a nonprofit organization that supports open media. I think you will agree with me that media is one of the most important and powerful forces for social change in the world today, and I have been in the business for 20 years, and I have been astounded that we carry on so much of our foreign policy without paying attention to media, so I compliment the chairman for putting the attention on this very important issue.

Clearly, 9/11 has put this in front of us. We recognize that terrorism has been born in societies that have very closed media, and we are kind of astounded to see that there is such virulent anti-American propaganda happening on state-controlled media from governments that are our allies. The things we have been reading are in Tom Friedman's articles, quotes from Egyptian newspapers, or newspapers in which the editors are appointed by President Mubarak, and this is happening across the board, and we have to look at this.

We also are aware, as has been said today, that there is not an infrastructure of local media where moderate voices can answer some of the extremist Islamist propaganda that is coming across state-controlled media. The good news is that the great majority of Muslims around the world want a free media.

There is no better example for that, no better proof for that than Iran, where 80 percent of the people have voted in a relatively free election for a reformist President where the major issue is freedom of the press. Now, they have not been able to get that freedom of the press, but it is very clear that in an Islamist country like Iran the people demand that, and will eventually get that.

The concept of local media which Senator Lugar was referring to earlier when he was asking about indigenous local media, the concept of local broadcast media is a relatively new phenomenon, even in Western Europe. We began U.S. Government assistance for independent broadcast media in the former Soviet Union around 10 years ago. In that time we have spent approximately \$250 million, no small amount, on it, but it has been pretty much an untold story. It is one of the great success stories in American foreign aid. I will speak just for my own organization, Internews.

We have supported 2,000 independent broadcasters, mostly television, some radio. Broadcasts produced or coordinated by Internews reach over 300 million people. Most of those stations are on 24 hours a day. In those 10 years of broadcasting we have not received a single complaint from a U.S. Embassy or a U.S. Government agency that any of those stations are broadcasting anything that is considered anti-American. We have raised the standards—I think there has been general agreement that we have raised the journalistic standards of those independent broadcasters. It is effective, it is working, and it can work in the Muslim world as well, as we have proven recently in Indonesia, I think.

There are the great examples, of course, such as the overthrow of Milosevic and the role of B-92. Just recently one of the stations we have supported, Rustovi-2 in Georgia, broadcast revelations of corruption. After going through a training program on investigative journalism they took it very seriously and investigated the corruption of government officials. When they broadcast that the Ministry of the Interior sent militiamen to close down the station. They put the cameras on live. Thousands of people took the streets, and Shevardnadze was forced to dismiss his entire government.

There are many, many examples—as you will hear about Kosovo, there are many examples where independent media has played a critical role in the transformation of societies that were previously under dictatorships to democracy.

We live in a different world. We live in a world of proliferation of information that is coming from all sources, including from satellites and Internet. The boundaries that existed before are breached by this new technology every day. We have to be able to meet that.

We put a lot of attention on Al Jazeera, and it is natural that we would think that we should compete with Al Jazeera with Arabic language satellite television, but I do not believe that any amount of foreign broadcasting is going to change the sense of powerlessness and Western domination that Arabs today feel. The only thing that is going to change the feelings that they have is to change their societies, to help them democratize, to help them modernize, and the best way to do that is to support local media. It is far more cost-effective.

We are spending \$20 to \$25 million a year, and we are reaching 300 million people every single day. I think that is a compliment to the traditional foreign broadcasting strategies that we should look at very carefully.

Local broadcasting is always more credible than foreign broadcasting. Tom Friedman a couple of days ago wrote, he said that the Bush team wants to spend money on TV or advertisements to broadcast our message in Arabic to the Arab world. Frankly, there is no modern, progressive message we could broadcast in Arabic that would begin to compare and influence the one that would come from Egypt, and I would say to one that would come from any local country, so it is not a matter of choosing between these two. It is a matter of seeing them as complimentary.

But in pursuing our foreign broadcasting, let me recommend, if I can, that the greater the degree of editorial independence you can give broadcasters the more effective they are going to be. On the other hand, if they are fully editorially independent, then what you are really competing with is not Al Jazeera, you are competing with the other commercial American broadcasters that are already out there, and so the question is raised, to what degree is there really value added to that?

If they are not editorially independent, these foreign broadcasts lose credibility to the extent they are seen that way, and you should never underestimate your audience. The people we are trying to reach have spent their lifetime being propagandized. They are experts at it. They can tell a mile away what is propaganda and what is good news.

Finally, I would like to say that in a lot of these countries the State Department and our embassies have had a kind of benign neglect about independent media, and the media regimes in these countries. This is particularly true in Saudi Arabia, in Egypt, and a great deal more pressure needs to come from our State Department to demand that these countries institute media reform. It is coming. Pakistan just completely liberalized their broadcast media with private television and radio just a few months ago. There is pressure from the satellite companies for all these locals to open up their media because otherwise they are going to lose their audience, but we also need pressure from the State Department.

The President in Monterrey talked about conditionality and our foreign aid in general. I think there should be specific benchmarks

that should be listed by our State Department, by the Secretary, that would be conditions that countries would need to meet in order to get other forms of foreign assistance.

There are moderates out there who are not getting on the airwaves. We should support those moderate Muslim voices. They are out there. If we build it, they will come. If we help the Muslim world with the resources that we have given to, say, the former Soviet Union, we will find that the attitudes of the populations there will change very rapidly once the moderates there are empowered.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hoffman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID HOFFMAN, PRESIDENT, INTERNEWS

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: thank you for inviting me to testify on the issue of independent media and public diplomacy. The Chairman should be congratulated for consideration of US government support for independent media, which is a relatively new phenomenon in our foreign assistance portfolio.

Since September 11th, the United States Government has given increased attention to the broad question of public diplomacy and the role of information in shaping public opinion around the world. A clear articulation of American policies and values is central to the success of our overall foreign policy agenda. But as we seek to shape our message to foreign audiences, we should also keep in mind the critical role of indigenous independent media as a complement to our traditional public diplomacy strategies. Simply put, we need to look not only at what we say to other countries, but how other countries disseminate information locally and how that affects their views of America.

Media is the most powerful force for social and political change in the world today. Radio, television, print, and the Internet are information vehicles through which citizens from every country form their opinions of the world. And where these information vehicles are used to propagate misinformation, misperceptions and erroneous reporting overseas, our national security is endangered.

In many countries in the Middle East, the media remain state-controlled or heavily influenced by the government. In some cases the government-run media is consciously used as a safety valve to deflect anger and frustration that arises from domestic problems. In other cases, journalists are subjected to draconian media laws compounded by self-censorship fueled by fear and uncertainty about the arbitrary ways in which the laws could be applied.

Nevertheless, in several countries with predominantly young Muslim populations like Pakistan or Indonesia, where much of "the street" are still susceptible to negative and hostile propaganda directed against the United States, there are new and hopeful signs of media liberalization and privatization.

U.S. government sponsored overseas broadcasting and traditional public diplomacy, alone, will not reverse this growing anti-American sentiment and inflammatory opinion that pervades the Arab and Muslim world in particular. Although overseas broadcasting has the advantage of being able to control the message and is vital in closed societies that have no other access to Western news reporting, it is not a long-term solution to the endemic repression of independent sources of local media. Foreign broadcasts do not contribute to the building of democratic media institutions in these countries. As long as local media remains suppressed, democracy cannot grow. Local media is the oxygen of democracy.

The State Department should therefore make it a high priority to reform media law and policy in predominantly Muslim countries in order to open their societies to a diversity of opinion and models of fact-based journalism. For too long we have turned our heads and tolerated government repression of local media in many of these countries as long as their governments continued to meet our fossil fuel needs and support our foreign policy goals. But since September we have learned how dangerous it can be to ignore the information culture of "the street." The State Department should be encouraged to make the establishment and growth of free and independent media in countries with predominantly Muslim populations a priority for U.S. foreign policy and assistance strategies in the region. In line with the President's statement in Monterrey, Mexico about the conditionality of American aid tied to improvements in human rights and democracy, the Secretary of State should establish benchmarks for acceptable standards of freedom of expression and the rights of independent media.

To help countries achieve open media, we must provide legal advice and assistance, journalistic training in ethics and reporting, help to media owners and managers in the financing and management of independent media companies. We need to provide funding for equipment, production and programming that will help independent media outlets compete with state-run media. And we must provide this training, not directly from the U.S. government, but through qualified non-profit organizations that have proven track records and credibility in the region.

This last point is a sensitive issue but extremely important. America has always been the leader in the development of independent, nongovernmental media. Nongovernmental, commercial broadcasting is still a relatively new phenomenon in the world, even in Western Europe. But the world is rapidly recognizing the vitality and importance of nongovernmental electronic media. As we provide assistance to independent media in countries transitioning to democracy, we must be especially careful to respect the editorial independence of the recipients. This is the point at which traditional public diplomacy must give pause and have faith in the play of democracy and the free press, which have made our own country strong.

Providing resources and expertise to local independent media through qualified American non-profit media organizations has successfully addressed the dilemma of government assistance to non-governmental media. There is always some risk that independent media companies, which are recipients of US government assistance, will broadcast news reports that are hostile to America. But it is interesting to note that after a decade of support to more than two thousand independent broadcasters, Internews has received virtually no complaints from any US Embassies or government agencies about any anti-American reports on these channels. On the contrary, our training programs and support have been universally acclaimed to have raised professional standards and contributed to a far greater degree of objective, fact-based reporting from these stations.

It is an approach that has worked successfully in the past throughout the former Soviet Union, in Bosnia, Serbia, Kosovo, Indonesia and East Timor. When Congress, in its wisdom, began to give modest amounts of foreign aid to independent media in the former Soviet Union, the results were astonishing in the speed and effectiveness with which a multiplicity of voices emerged. At least 2000 independent broadcasters and 30,000 journalists and media professionals have benefited from U.S. sponsored training and technical assistance programs in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. U.S.-assisted independent media played a critical role in overthrowing the dictatorship of President Slobodan Milosivic in Yugoslavia, and recently in exposing corruption in the Republic of Georgia. In Indonesia, US funds supported the first radio program for women in a Muslim country where it quickly became the most popular show in the country. In all these cases, US support for indigenous local media succeeded in creating a culture of Western-style news reporting that goes beyond packaging America's story.

And the results of supporting open and independent media are concrete and measurable. According to the World Bank's "World Development Report 2002," countries with privately owned, local, independent media outlets had less corruption, more transparent economies, and higher indices of education and health. A free press facilitates multiparty elections, freedom of expression, transparency of both government and business, improved human rights, and better treatment for women and disenfranchised minorities.

None of this is to suggest that there is not a role and an important need for traditional public diplomacy, especially the cultural exchange programs, which give foreign nationals a first-hand experience of America, something no media program can ever match. Overseas broadcasting can be a lifeline to people who live in totally closed societies. U.S. governmental programs like Radio Sawa, which provides young people with Western and Arabic news and music through the Middle East Radio Network appear to be gaining audience and should continue.

But before spending vast sums of money on an expensive satellite television network for the Islamic world in order to beam our messages directly into these societies, we should question whether it is far more cost-effective to expend resources on developing local media. Given the limits on resources for overseas media, I would encourage us to focus on individual countries like Egypt, Pakistan and others where we can significantly alter the local media landscape through media assistance and training. It is unlikely that a U.S. government produced satellite channel can outperform American and European commercial news and entertainment media companies, which already are competing for these audiences. Rather than devote enormous resources to expensive technological satellite equipment, we should be examining media law and regulatory reform which are essential ingredients in the creation of an "enabling environment," in which independent media can compete fairly with state-run media.

In the end, limits on freedom of the media will hinder even the most vigorous and sustained public diplomacy campaign. Populations lacking access to free and open media and a plurality of news sources are susceptible to negative and hostile propaganda directed against the United States. Support for terrorism is greatest in countries where the public has little access to outside information or free and independent news media. Free and independent media will not automatically guarantee moderation, but it does open new space for moderate voices that can combat anti-Western propaganda.

And so it is in the national interests of the United States to support the growth of free and open media around the world as an extension of our public diplomacy work. In the final analysis support for free and vibrant local media are the best investment we can make in building a safe, secure and democratic world. I have no doubt that the extension of American values of pluralism, tolerance and freedom of expression will follow from this investment in local, independent open media.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Our last witness, who probably is the single most appropriate witness we could have after that, is Veton Surroi, who is one of those people we are talking about. Are we kidding ourselves, Veton? Are we playing a game here, or are we really able to impact positively and truthfully on what is going on around the world, and the attitude toward us? The floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF VETON SURROI, CHAIRMAN, KOHA MEDIA GROUP, PRISTINA, KOSOVO

Mr. SURROI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let us just judge from what happened 9 months ago on this date. While the United States was being attacked, I was sitting in my office saying in despair, what can I do, and so I wrote an editorial and I said, let us go out to the streets tomorrow at the same time as we used to do in the Milosevic times, and let us protest against this attack, and let us also express some solidarity about it. Well, on September 12 at 3 p.m. you had hundreds of thousands of Kosovars in all of our cities protesting against terrorism and expressing solidarity with America.

Now, of course, this happens not only because of an editorial, we all know that. It happens because Kosovo is probably the most pro-American place in Europe today and is obviously thankful for a very diligent U.S. policy to which you have personally contributed as well for many years, but it happens because in our society, media have a role of civil society, and media can mobilize positively—they can mobilize negatively, but certainly positively, and they can mobilize for the right cause.

Now, how did that happen? That credibility was built over years, because that is paper, and the other media outlets were built in times of repression, so the media actually became—the newspaper, the editorial became a symbol of resistance against an oppressive society, against Milosevic, and therefore its credibility was actually one of participating in liberation.

This is a contribution, certainly, which could not have existed, these conditions, without a concerted effort, a contribution from the international community, from the United States, from the European donors, and from private donors, and all of this, of course, with a clear view in having a self-sustained media after a period of time.

Now, for me, it is rather challenging to find some parallels, not because Kosovo is a majority Muslim background, because the

Kosovars are basically identified as Albanians in their majority, and not with their religious background, but it is challenging in a sense to find parallels between what we have gone through and what the Muslim societies in the Arab world are going through right now, and the question is actually first of all the extremism of an ideology.

Milosevic misused ethnicity and brought his people to that position, and the Taliban and al-Qaeda are misusing Islam and bringing their own people and the societies surrounding them to destruction, so we are dealing with the extreme forms, or manifestations of these totalitarian ideologies, which unfortunately have to be fought by force. But underneath those ideologies are a vast group of people and many regimes who are actually, to a certain extent, by being closed are contributing to the extremism.

So what we are talking about now, today, I think, is about opening of closed societies in the Muslim world. It is a more challenging task, I think, than simply broadcasting a message here and there about what the American position is. It is about opening those societies, opening those regimes, and it is not about opening a dictatorial regime. It is not about opening Iraq, because we cannot do it at this stage with these means, but it is about opening those societies where America has a leverage, about opening those societies that consider themselves American allies, but nevertheless do not allow freedom of expression the way we know, and I am glad to say we know it, we the Americans and the Kosovars do. What a day.

So it is about free reformed societies, and you ask, how do you act in those societies? Well, our experience is the following. First of all, you get effective dissemination of information, and certainly what we have heard today about the radio stations, and that Radio Sawa will help in many of these societies. Nevertheless, what is certainly more needed, and this has been our experience with VOA and BBC, is the more local input into these organizations, the better, the more local stringers, the better.

The second, and I think of utmost importance, is amplification of indigenous voices. You cannot have a successful campaign of opening societies if local papers, local stations do not do that, and it is certainly not about projecting this media and international network. It is the importance of the local newspaper that can do that.

Now, the local newspaper cannot do it unless it is also being supported in terms of newsprint, or in terms of a printing press, or in terms of setting up a distribution system. A local journalist is being confronted with an authoritarian system, and that authoritarian system controls airwaves, frequencies, printing presses, ways of import of news print. It also controls the ways of distribution of the newspapers. It is a rather ample fight, but once you start fighting it, you see the satisfaction of winning, actually, that war.

There is no other way in which these independent media can be developed in that region without direct support. It is not a question of only supporting it politically. It is a question of supporting it also financially. Certainly it is about, as you said, drawing up also forms of conditionality that will protect the journalist. There are many courageous people everywhere in every authoritarian society, but those courageous people will amplify, there will be more of them only if a powerful country like the United States actually

starts protecting, the journalist actually starts telling the closed regimes, or semi-closed regimes that they cannot go on arresting journalists.

Now, we have to be, of course, inventive in that support, and we have to use all the technologies. You have in many countries inventive people. Serbia was a good example. Radio B-92 was a very good example. The downfall of Milosevic could not have happened in that fashion if B-92, a very courageous station, had not continued, despite being closed, trying to broadcast on the Internet, trying to do it on the satellite and get news out.

The fourth and, I think, critical point that is being debated as I have seen it in parts of this society here in the United States is whether the support to the independent media will actually create more extremist voices in the region. Now, I think the debate is false in the sense of, if you support the media you will simply find many pro-American media in that region. I think you should not expect that.

The independent media in the Balkans in our region, in our crisis were sometimes critical. We are the most pro-American society in the region. We were critical of the U.S. policy on Bosnia, on inactivity on Bosnia. We were critical for what we saw were flaws in U.S. policy, but we nevertheless considered that only an open and critical media can also deliver on its credibility on the one hand, and on the other hand, only a critical and open debate—a critical and open debate is possible only with friends.

The CHAIRMAN. And the virtue of being correct, I would remind you.

Mr. SURROI. I do not think anybody should be afraid of support of a media that will be critical of the United States. It is not a question of whether it is critical or not critical. The real debate is between the existing media that created conspiracy theory that this whole thing of the United States is a Zionist, a Vatican and what-have-you conspiracy against Islam, which we used to hear from Milosevic all the time. That is not the point. The point is actually to bring them to a rational debate, and see what the pros and cons of each and every policy.

The end result actually ought to be, the ideal end result would be a paper in Amman or in Cairo or somewhere that publishes the pros and cons of America's position, that gets Senator Biden to write about this or that segment of the policy, and has an intellectual debate with somebody else on the other side who will say, well, we need—this or that problem.

And the fifth is the question of opening the debate within the society. The media in the Arab world I think in this pre-reform state of the Arab world will play an important role in creating a debating space in the society. When you do not have a functioning parliament the way the Western world knows it, when you do not have a public control over expenditures, when you do not have that space to debate about all of these things, you have the media actually to create the space to be a parliamentary force, and that is part of the deal.

The second is to create pluralism in the Arab society. Not all Arab societies are the same. Arab covers a very wide space as we know it.

The third is to create a debate between, in this case, in the Middle Eastern case, between the Arabs or the Palestinians and the Israelis. I think that the media will not resolve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, but without the media to open up the debate within the Palestinian society and within the Israeli society, and to reach a standard by which these societies can be critical to each other within each other's society, I do not see a way that it is going to be resolved either.

I think—and with this I will finish, Mr. Chairman. I think the end result of U.S. public diplomacy ought not to be the expectation that after an effort the Arab world, or particular parts of the Arab world will love you, but I think the immediate result that is needed is that hate speech in that part of the world is for the first time confronted with rational speech, and I think that ought to be the aim.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Surroi follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF VETON SURROI, CHAIRMAN, KOHA MEDIA GROUP

Members of the Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Nine months ago on this date I was sitting in my office in Prishtina, gathering information on what was going to be known as a new way of waging war against the United States, and indeed, war against democratic society as a whole. Being a Kosovar, coming from a society that has gone through a very long period of violence including a genocidal war, there was no need for detailed explanations of the shock, the pain, and the sense of loss that we were seeing directly on TV that day of September 11.

Also, being a Kosovar, coming from a society that has been liberated thanks to American leadership—an effort that for many years was waged by a bipartisan group of Members of Congress, especially Senators Biden and Lugar of this distinguished Committee—the September 11 attack against the United States was clearly understood as an attack against Kosova as well. On that day, I could not do much more than write an editorial, explaining to my fellow Kosovars why all of us should be out on the streets of our cities, the way we protested before against the Milosevic regime, now expressing our full solidarity with the American people and our condemnation of terrorism. On September 12th, hundreds of thousands of people all over Kosova were out on the streets with a simple message: “America we are with you.”

As chairman of an independent media group, comprised of a leading television station and the biggest newspaper in Kosova, I have experienced the power of the freely expressed word. So to me it was not surprising at all to see this gathering of the people of Kosova, assembled by their own will, without any governmental or party direction, on September 12th.

Civil society, with the independent media at its heart, played a crucial role in resistance against the Milosevic regime over the past decade. First the weekly *KOHA*, and then the daily newspaper *KOHA Ditore*, emerged as critical voices during the long years of oppression. These and other indigenous media voices, independent from the political parties, bridged the gap between the dark reality of those years and the democracy our people are now building. This vital role of the free media, of course, would not have been possible without the sustained political and material support of the United States, as well as European and private donor organizations, among which the most prominent was the Soros foundation. That support was not, and was not intended to be, endless: KOHA developed a policy of self-sustainability and was the first newspaper in the region to achieve that status only three months after the war. I believe that our independence and standards will allow us to play an important role in democracy and state-building in Kosova for decades to come.

In transitional countries, there is continuous conflict between the forces that want to expand the freedom of the individual and society, and the forces that want to deny that freedom. And this conflict is not only about authoritarian rule vs. democracy, as was the clear-cut case of Milosevic vs. all of us. This struggle also continues in many post-authoritarian societies that are trying to build democracy, where the authorities undermine the economic foundations of independent media so that official policies and messages can go unexamined and uncriticized.

In my homeland, we have gone through all phases of repression, terror, and conflict. Journalists and media were prime targets for the Milosevic regime, as they always are for such regimes around the world. But no matter what the cost, our journalists remained close to the center of Kosova's story. And we learned some lessons from this ordeal:

- There is no alternative to indigenous, independent journalism. A message from international broadcasters, however good it is, and even when delivered in the local language, still lacks full credibility within the society. A message from journalists within the society has much more credibility and respect.
- Set professional standards of journalism. Bad policies in a country also derive from bad journalism. Bad journalism is the best ally of the authoritarian mind set.
- Persevere in your work and get international support. Authoritarian rulers in this interconnected new world can still get away with imprisoning many people, but they think twice about imprisoning a journalist.
- If you persevere, you might get support, but if you don't get support it will be much harder to persevere. The more pressure the regime puts on you, the more international and indigenous support you will need.
- As you struggle to open up a closed society, be professionally critical not only towards the repressive regime, but also towards your own society. Credibility is raised not only through your critical attitude towards a "natural foe" (as in the Milosevic case) but also by a fair and critical attitude towards your collective self.
- An independent media needs to be independent in terms of infrastructure as well. Authoritarian regimes control independent media not only through open repression, but through the control of printing presses, availability of newsprint, radio and TV frequencies, broadcasting equipment, financial and legal repression, and other means.

In the post-conflict period, after liberation by NATO forces, we also learned important lessons:

- An independent media is crucial to building democratic institutions where there were none. An independent media is a precursor and precondition for those democratic institutions.
- The absence of authoritarian rule does not automatically bring freedom of the media. In the Kosovar case, a combination of weak democratic institutions and bad international policies have brought major new threats to the independent media. This is clearly evident in the case of Bosnia and Kosova, where the international administration's overwhelming support for a "public broadcasting" monopoly risks re-creating the state television dominance of the past, instead of creating the level playing field needed to assure the pluralism of healthy private and public broadcasting.

I do think that some lessons we learned in Kosova can be applied in the Middle East, Central and South Asia. However, my recommendations for U.S. media policy in the Muslim world are based not so much on Kosova's having a majority population with a Muslim religious background. Kosovar society is identified more by ethnicity than by religion. Our experience of transition from communism to democracy, and from oppression to statehood, is actually more relevant. We know how to operate within a repressive system and what kind of support is needed.

It is political Islam that has the clearest parallel to the adversary the the United States did so much to defeat in the Balkans. The Taliban/Al Qaeda, from my perspective, are no different than the Milosevic ideology. Milosevic used ethnicity to create a fascist movement the same way the Taliban used religion to create its own version of totalitarian rule. In the end, ethnic chauvinism and religious fundamentalism create the same result: destruction of their own society and surrounding societies. The extreme manifestations of these ideologies, as we have seen both in the case of Milosevic and the Taliban, are to be fought by force. And just as major U.S. and international support has been essential for the substantial effort to transform Balkan societies—before and after departure of authoritarian regimes—the same is true in those parts of the Muslim world where political Islam prevails or is a threat.

SOME SPECIFIC STEPS ARE NEEDED FOR THIS LONG-TERM STRUGGLE:

One: More effective dissemination of information. We who have lived in closed societies know the value of a radio transistor that receives VOA or BBC broadcasts in our mother tongue. And these broadcasts ought to be done as a concerted effort. Nevertheless, this is also the age of satellite dishes and the Internet: there is more

space and more competition for information. A transistor receiving an external broadcaster in Arabic is insufficient. The key is the indigenous talent that reports from the region and helps bring professional standards back home, providing unbiased information from within the society.

Two: Amplify indigenous voices. External broadcasting services and international commercial newscasts are not sufficient. The people of closed societies also need to get verification of those messages and information from indigenous media. The content of the message is important, but so is the form of it: once there are independent, indigenous journalists it is a sign of contradiction not only of the messages of authoritarian rule but of the very nature of that rule. Authoritarian rule is based on an image of invincibility. Independent media can contradict that. In every closed society there is a group of journalists who question that society. The key is to identify and support them with whatever can help amplify their voices.

Three: Direct support for independent media. The indigenous independent media are confronted with an official system, and that system has structures of print media, distribution of press, allocation of frequencies, transmission systems, etc. Establishing independent media means establishing competing systems. Wherever possible, this means establishing independent printing presses, Internet-based or terrestrial transmitters, alternative distribution organizations for media products. It also means competing with the authoritarian regime in terms of technology and information systems. In Kosova, the independent media could not have survived had there not been an independent printing press, alternative distribution of the newspapers, and independent Internet capacity. Similarly, the independent media in Serbia, which were crucial to the defeat of Milosevic, could not have done their job had there not been alternative ways of broadcasting Radio B92, for example, via the internet and satellite.

Four: Independent media and pluralism. Independent media voices by definition will be critical voices. But the concern that opening up the media in the Muslim world, and international support for this effort, will fuel anti-American criticism ignores the longterm and even medium-term strategic benefits. The independent journalism that could be supported today in the Muslim world may be critical of American policy in the Middle East. However, state-controlled media in many of these countries are already full of harsh criticism of U.S. policies. Independent media will be critical of everything around them, including the lack of reform and transparency at home. What the Muslim world certainly needs is a healthy debate—both within and between its different societies—and part of that debate will be about American policy. Nevertheless, it will be in a context in which those societies will analyze themselves, a vital function which has been mostly lacking until now.

The Balkans may serve as an example. We in Kosova, however pro-American, have had criticisms of some American policies now and then, especially in the initial stages of the Bosnian war. But the independent media helped build the culture of free expression into our society, creating the foundation for a healthy democracy. The independent media in Serbia criticized U.S. policies in the Balkans even more, but these media were a key part of the effort that pushed Milosevic out, and are now helping push reform forward in Serbia.

The choice in the Muslim world is between the present dominant media which are by definition anti-American (pushing a prejudiced message of a great “Zionist-American-Vatican” conspiracy against the Muslims, quite similar to the propaganda message of the Milosevic era), or the at barely existing independent media which if supported will bring badly-needed pluralism on all issues. In the long run, American foreign policy will be more successful if it can be debated with pro-and-con articles in the editorial pages of competing newspapers and local broadcasters in Cairo, Damascus or Teheran, rather than only through “Death to America” slogans being chanted in the streets of those cities. If Muslim societies cannot benefit from the growth of independent media (which has begun in Afghanistan since its liberation from the Taliban), then they are uniquely different from all other societies we know.

Five: Independent media and pragmatism. There is also a crucial need for the media to be bridges within a conflict, and bridges in the post-conflict period. If one looks only at the Palestinian problem, there is a need for both the Israelis and their neighbors to understand each others’ societies through a similar professional level of journalism. Throughout the conflict in ex-Yugoslavia, independent media on different sides of the conflict have kept continuous communication. And now in the post-conflict period, they are the first ones in a position to build bridges of communication between our different societies which must co-exist and define long-term common interests. Independent media by nature are much more flexible and pragmatic than the state- and mullah-controlled media that now dominate in so much of the Muslim world.

Most of the Muslim societies today are in a pre-reform state. The U.S. and its coalition of European and private media donors have succeeded, in Europe and elsewhere, in opening up many closed societies. Some of these techniques cannot be automatically applied, but much in the experience can be adapted to new conditions. The important thing, I believe, is to make a political decision not to leave these societies to transform themselves alone. For many of us who have lived and still live in transition societies, any success would have been impossible without a concerted, sustained international support effort.

Since America's first years of democracy, when Jefferson said he would rather have newspapers without a government than a government without newspapers, transition societies around the world have depended on free media. The United States should lead the way in recognizing that the same facts of life are true for the Muslim world as well. When the U.S. came to this conclusion about the Balkans, it was a key component in assuring the freedom and peace that my homeland enjoys today. I hope and I expect that a similar decision by America toward the Muslim world will help open up the societies from which terror now targets your homeland. And opening up those societies to their own voices will help bring the more normal, productive and stable lives that their citizens want most of all. Opening up more Muslim societies to their own mainstream forces can only be good for the common security, as it has been for so many years of American leadership in so many places.

Thank you for the honor of addressing the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Veton. Speaking for myself, I think it is very important that we have realistic expectations. I have been a Senator for along time, and the one thing I have always tried not to do, not because I like to think myself honest, but for very practical political reasons, is never over-promise.

For the last 30 years as the architect of most of the criminal justice policy on the Democratic side of the equation at least, I do not talk about wars on drugs because there is always going to be the problem of drugs out there, and to offer the notion that you are going to eradicate all drug abuse is not realistic. To fundamentally alter it is possible.

In this area what I do not want to do is be part of advertising to the American public if they just increase expenditures what is going to happen is we are going to be embraced by the Muslim world as their savior, as the nation they love. Americans, I try to explain to Europeans—and we had this discussion in your office, Veton, and I think my son, when he was stationed in Pristina, got to meet with you as well—is that most Americans, we think ourselves—the average American is a decent, honorable person. They truly are confused as to why people do not like us. They do not understand why Biden says send troops to Bosnia and Kosovo, and why Biden says send troops to Afghanistan, and they acquiesce in doing that, send their sons and daughters, and people do not like us for doing that.

They do not understand why, when my motivation, Veton, and you know it better than anyone, back in the early nineties, when I started the drum beat to get involved in the Balkans, was because of the genocidal activities against Muslims, yet no one in the Arab world understands that, that we went to Bosnia, we went to Kosovo, those who were there in the very beginning, because Muslims primarily were being destroyed, not just—not merely—it was a lot of people, but it was the death camps in Bosnia. They were about Muslims. The rape camps were about Muslims. They were Bosniaks, but they were Muslims because of their religion, and nobody knows that. Nobody knows that, or at least if they know it, it has not gotten through.

You mentioned the Middle East, all three of you. I have had a number of discussions, not all fruitful, not any fruitful, probably, alone with Mr. Arafat in his compound in the West Bank and here, and when I asked him why Taba was not a possibility he said, well, we have not prepared our public sufficiently. There was no effort to prepare the public, none, zero, none. None at all, and that is why I have been somewhat critical of our Saudi friends and our Egyptian friends, that if they want to be treated like mature nations, they have to act like mature leaders.

You cannot on the one hand run editorials in the state-controlled papers saying that the pastries that are going to be prepared for a religious holiday in Judaism have to be made from the blood of non-Jews as an essential ingredient and run that as news in a state-controlled paper and expect me to believe you have any interest in being a positive force in the region, so all of what each of you have said makes a great deal of sense.

I have a couple of very specific questions, and again, back to where I began with this. Veton, your, I think, very practical expectation that we should be offering to the American people here about if our efforts succeed, what impact they will have, what is the measure of success here, because we will be measured. As you know, Mr. Ambassador, we will be measured a year and two and three from now as, what has happened, what is happening.

Now, the issue of independence for indigenous independent press and U.S. aid, how do you thread that needle? How do you thread the needle where we, quote-unquote, the American taxpayers, pay for a printing press, pay for supplies, pay for salaries, even of staff, because those are the kinds of things—it is not merely saying, as you said that one time, you cannot just say it is enough to tell governments that are our friends that there is conditionality here, but there is also the need to literally have the money to buy the ink, figuratively speaking—it is not ink any more—to buy the paper, to have a studio, to have a roof. How do you square that circle? Yes, Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is one of the key issues that you point your finger at, the key paradox. We are trying to teach people about the benefits of nongovernmental independent media, and we are doing it with governmental money, so we are confronted by this question all the time. I think that there are mechanisms that could be put in place that could increase the sense of independence that we have on the ground, but so far I must say I do have to say parenthetically USAID has done a really good job in keeping its hands off and not interfering editorially, and so that practice certainly helps, but it is something we have to overcome all the time.

Our strategy in dealing with this has been to support the development of local NGOs. In every country where we work there is a local Internews or a local media NGO that we support.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, let me make sure, because I do not think most people listening to this will understand what a local NGO press person is. In other words, people think of NGOs as Catholic charities, Irish relief workers, whatever. NGOs are nongovernmental organizations. Now, are there NGOs that are also newspapers, or are also radio stations? What do you mean?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What I mean is, there are media assistance NGOs, so in Russia there is—Internews Russia is an all-Russian organization of 100 people, with lawyers and producers and what-not that basically support the hundreds of local broadcasters that are commercial operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Very important. I just wanted for the record to make sure what we are talking about. We are talking about, these NGOs are to the media what the NGOs that are teaching people how to set up accounting systems in corporations that never existed in the former Soviet Union are. I mean, they provide an expertise. They provide the legal framework. They provide other means by which they assist private organizations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are really two key points I would like to make. One is a need to support those local NGOs, but also for the U.S. Government to give all its assistance through international NGOs or American NGOs. There was an attempt back in 1989 or 1990 to create the international media fund, you may remember, after Secretary Baker called for it in his Charles University speech, and frankly that did not work, because it was seen as too closely tied to the U.S. Government, whereas other efforts of the U.S. State Department and USAID working through American and international NGOs to give that assistance works much better.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ambassador, you know the Arab world quite well. You are one of the most qualified people we have ever had in place when you were Ambassador. Before he became the guy who runs this operation, the staff director of the Foreign Relations Committee, Tony Blinken wrote an article in which he said, “now the United States has global interests and no ideological rival whose vices remind the world of its virtues,” meaning our virtues.

In other words, in the past, and Veton kind of alluded to this, when Milosevic was around, you had opposition newspapers, underground newspapers. Part of their very legitimacy was, they were stacked up against this very bad guy out there. We were able to, I would argue, one of the reasons why Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were such an incredible success, there was a known ideology called communism pursued and pushed by a totalitarian government in Moscow that everything that we said or did was measured against.

Now, we do not have an ideology that we are confronting around the world. There is all other ideologies as it relates to the way the marketplace works. The way the world economies function have basically been concluded to be more or less bankrupt, although there is great doubt about this fear of unfettered capitalism and free markets, but there is no ideology to replace that yet. I mean, no ideology to replace it. We have a different dilemma now. How much of our problem in having, if you will, the truth filter through the societies, both the good and bad about us, how much of the difficulty of that truth filtering through relates to not having a counterpoint against whom we are measured?

When you are sitting in Baghdad or you are sitting in Cairo, or you are sitting in Amman, or you are sitting in Indonesia, or various places in Indonesia, and the debate is between these two superpowers, the American choice does not seem to be as pernicious or as dangerous or as counterintuitive to accept, even in the Mus-

lim world, I would argue. Now that is gone. What is this new thing we have to—and I am not being very articulate.

Ambassador GINSBERG. Mr. Chairman, the dilemma we face since the end of the cold war in the Middle East is that the very underground press that should be most interested, at least in our judgment, of promoting democracy and freedom and ideals is actually the Islamic extremist express. It is the sermons that are being put on cassettes that are attacking the local governments. It is the underground newspapers. Indeed, most Arabs in the region understand the difference between reading a newspaper that is controlled by the government and a newspaper that they know is being put together by forces of that are opposed to the government.

My thesis in this is that we Americans do not realize at times that we are caught up in a civil war in the Middle East, that what we face between those governments that use incitement as a way of deflecting attention from their shortcomings, and the more extremist elements that are battling those very governments, is the sense that we somehow have stumbled in between the two and are being used by both as a way of deflecting the war that was already taking place on the ground between them, and all of a sudden we became the target.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, in Egypt, the war that ultimately led to the creation of al-Qaeda and its operational arms was being waged by extremists against the government for years, where hundreds of thousands of civilians were harmed and injured. The war in Algeria killed hundreds of thousands of Algerians in the name of Islamic extremism.

What these countries are facing is that their populations are dissatisfied with their leadership and blame us for in effect appearing to protect them and doing very little to change them, and if I can go down into the ground, and to say to myself, what do we do with the newspaper reporters who put the venom out and who keep writing the most incredible vitriol against the United States, this is all due, in fact, to the belief that we Americans fail to appreciate and understand their unhappiness and their concerns and their lack of hope and the despair on the ground about what we have failed to stand for.

Mr. Chairman, this is not something that just happened overnight. On the other hand, as I said, at the height of the peace process, when we had the great hope and expectations that we were on the verge of a breakthrough when Prime Minister Rabin was alive, that hatred was still very much part and parcel of the region. The attack on the World Trade Center in 1993 by the forerunner of al-Qaeda was essentially trying to cutoff the umbilical cord between us and Egypt, and we have got to understand that that is what we are facing in order to deal more effectively with the challenge before us. I am not sure if that gets to your question.

The CHAIRMAN. No, it does get to it. Veton, and then I apologize, I am going to have to end this. I have taken you 2 hours beyond what I told you you would get, and I am supposed to be, an hour ago at a Democratic Caucus, but anyway, please.

Mr. SURROI. Combining both of your questions, I think an important element is actually to establish a coalition. It is important in terms of, to your previous question of how do you support. I think

what we have seen in the Balkans from 1995 onwards was that the form of support in which the U.S., the E.U., and the private institutions helped develop is the best way to deal with this, and there are many very good people who have worked in direct assistance who have experience in dealing with this issue.

Second, it is important to develop this coalition also, because the other missing power, as you have said, is being developed, and the missing ideology is being developed, which is political Islam, and political Islam is actually trying to be the substitute for reform and for opposition in closed societies, and that is a real danger, because political Islam is basing itself on ethnicity in the Palestinian case, it is basing itself on poverty all over the Arab world, and on oppression.

In many of these societies we still have a feudal mentality, and that is why the coalition-building actually is important and especially the coalition-building that will try to undermine these three areas which the political Islam is basing itself on.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we have a good deal of work to do, to state the obvious, but I really think for the first time in the last 5 years—and let me end by telling you a question I was asked between the time I voted and walked back here by a very competent foreign policy reporter. He asked me, what did I think about the prospects for foreign aid genuinely increasing in the United States on the part of the U.S. Government, and I use this hearing as an example.

I think, to use a phrase that was new when I started in public life during the struggle for women in the women's movement was, sensitivity sessions they used to talk about, how do you sensitize the public to the plight of women in the sixties. That was a phrase that was very much in vogue.

I think there has kind of been a national sensitivity session that is sort of taking place here, and the realization on the part of the average American, to use a—he has been quoted several times today—a Tom Friedman phrase that maybe he did not originate, I do not know, but it is one I associate with him, which was, if you do not visit the bad neighborhood, the bad neighborhood will visit you.

I think there is a growing awareness on the part of the average American that we have to rethink how we make our case in a more complicated world so that all of the natural tendencies of human nature are that you, as I tell people, when you go home and your dad has just been laid off because his plant has closed down, and the next-door-neighbor drives in at the same time with a new Lexus, you do not sit at your dinner table saying, isn't it wonderful our neighbor has got a new Lexus. Isn't that a wonderful thing?

If your neighbor is smart, the neighbor will put the new Lexus in the garage once they have learned that their friend next door has lost his job. Nations are not able to be that sensitive, I do not suspect, but there is this notion out there on the part of the American public that a lot of this has to do with how we communicate. They would not call it public diplomacy. They would say, how do we tell our side of the story? How do we get involved?

And foreign aid is going to have easier sledding here now, because the American public understands you cannot have 3 to 5 bil-

lion people living on \$2 a day in the world and not have a problem eventually. People are pretty smart. Just like the people in Amman, or excuse me, in Riyadh know the difference between the state-owned press and press they get that is not state-owned, people here understand these basic fundamental things as well,

So I really do think, with your help, and I am not being solicitous, with your help and the help of others that testified today and some that have not, that we really can begin to build something that is solid and substantial that will not only benefit the United States but benefit—and I think this is one of those—we always thought during the cold war that it is a zero-sum game. This is a win-win situation, if we are smart about it, and I am going to rely—Congress is going to rely on the three of you and others to help us figure out the formula.

But I do think—maybe I am, you know, being an optimist is an occupational requirement. Maybe I am being a little too optimistic, but I do think we are on the cusp of some real progress in dealing with this notion of public diplomacy and how we interact in the world, and I look forward to working with all three of you, as others do here, as we do that. We have the draft report. We look forward to the final report from the Council, and we welcome any suggestions you have as we go on.

I have a couple of questions for each of you, if you would be willing, to submit them to you in writing. I do not want to make work for you, but I do appreciate your being here.

Veton, welcome, and thank you for the hospitality and the willingness to speak to me 6, 8 years ago and ever since. You were a rational voice in a sea of chaos when I was in your office, and I appreciate that, and I want to publicly say I admire your persona, courage, your personal courage that you showed. Over here, a press person takes a risk, he or she may get fired, and if they are overseas I might note more media people have been killed covering these things than a lot of other people, but in your country at the time you were speaking out the penalty for doing the wrong editorial might have been getting shot, so it is a very different deal. I admire your personal courage.

And I admire your input, all three of you. I thank you very much. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 2:10 p.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF HON. CHARLOTTE BEERS, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Question. What is the Department of State doing to ensure adequate interagency coordination on public diplomacy issues? What impact will the White House Office of Communications' apparent efforts to fulfill this function have on the Department of State and its leadership in the field of public diplomacy?

Answer. The most important element in coordinating our messages overseas is the coordination of communications within the Administration. At present, the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department, and the NSC staff are working to create more formal mechanisms for interagency coordination on two levels. A Policy Coordination Committee (PCC) on Public Diplomacy is under consideration, which would set strategy and focus the use of resources by the several federal agen-

cies that conduct public diplomacy activities abroad. The White House is meanwhile considering the establishment of an Office of Global Communications to represent the President's priorities and offer the President's voice to our public diplomacy efforts. While the precise relationship between these two levels has not yet been defined, the public diplomacy practitioners at both the White House and the State Department enjoy very close working relations in which State's role as the lead agency in public diplomacy is clearly recognized.

Question. What are you and your colleagues doing to realize the spirit of Presidential Decision Directive 68 (issued by President Clinton)? Have any presidential directives on public diplomacy been issued by President Bush?

Answer. The Bush Administration recognized the value of a unified message to the rest of the world by retaining a forum for interagency coordination on public diplomacy. After the emergency created by the terrorist attacks of September 11, the White House Coalition Information Centers brought assertive, day-to-day leadership to the task. At this time, we at the State Department are in consultation with the White House, the National Security Council and the Defense Department to establish more permanent structures. We want to assure a unified message and to bring together the assets and capabilities of the foreign affairs agencies of government to project it in the most effective manner.

Question. Do we need a national information strategy? What can we do to make sure that our public diplomacy and international information professionals from State, the Department of Defense, USAID, and other agencies are coordinating to develop national, international, and regional international information plans?

Answer. Yes, a national information strategy would help the U.S. to carry out public diplomacy more effectively in a world of cross-cutting national and transnational issues influenced by international and national media, NGOs, corporations, international organizations, and other outside groups.

This strategy would provide direction and a unified voice for the different international communications vehicles within the U.S. government. Such a "deliberate planning" exercise, parallel to the Administration's National Security Strategy, would enable the U.S. to speak with one voice and to respond to contingencies in a quicker, more effective fashion. White House leadership would be essential with such a plan. Because government operational strategy cannot be run effectively by committee, it is important to affirm the State Department's leadership role in government-wide public diplomacy activities.

We coordinated with our allies through the Coalition Information Centers. It was primarily the British, but the Canadians, Germans, Spanish and others were brought in for closer consultations as they became more heavily engaged. We do not normally coordinate with the UN, though we do consult with them through our U.S. Mission in New York. The most important thing is that we've developed a mechanism to coordinate a task-force like operation like the CIC. We also know that even if we aren't in a situation that would require a CIC operation, the White House can coordinate messages through a number of mechanisms with other USG agencies as well as other countries.

Question. Former USIA Director Edward R. Murrow used to say that public diplomacy needed to be incorporated into U.S. policy-making at the lift off as well as the crash landing. As you know, one of the goals of the merger of USIA into the State Department was to make public diplomacy an even more central part of American diplomacy in general. This is particularly important in light of the changes wrought by the information and communications revolutions. Is the culture of the State Department changing to better incorporate public diplomacy perspectives? What more needs to be done to encourage this critical transformation in the culture of our foreign policy institutions?

Answer. Public diplomacy has been strengthened since the merger of the U.S. Information Agency with the Department by bringing public diplomacy insights into play sooner as foreign policy is developed, rather than after the fact. Moreover, the Department requested an increase in our programs for FY 2003—the first program increase for public diplomacy programs in ten years—and public diplomacy staffing is being increased by 56 positions above attrition levels this year. An additional 28 positions are planned in the Department's Diplomatic Readiness request for 2003. In addition, the Department's leadership has fully supported public diplomacy strategies and themes to focus and augment our traditional programs.

While we continue to work within the Department to improve the effectiveness and coordination of these programs, the Department is currently evaluating the cohesion and structure of the public diplomacy organizational structure.

Question. At present the Department of State only budgets about five million dollars a year for foreign public opinion polling. Is this enough? Is enough reliable information about foreign public opinion being brought into the policymaking process? What more can be done to address this apparent shortfall? Do we need to allocate more money for polling and focus groups, and how can this type of market analysis best be integrated into U.S. government public diplomacy efforts?

Answer. Polling is an essential tool in understanding the trends of public opinion in foreign countries and regions. Since September 11, we have gained valuable information from a variety of polling sources, including our own polling in the State Department. As a result, we have, for example, ample data on attitudes about America and Osama Bin Ladin. This data has been integrated into our overall public diplomacy strategies and our tactical planning and outreach in certain market segments.

We are now working to supplement our data on what people believe about the United States and Bin Ladin with information on why and to what degree they hold their beliefs. This will increase our ability to determine the most effective strategies and tactics for public diplomacy. To the extent possible, we are seeking to do this within existing resources.

Question. How can the United States make better use of the Islamic-American community in our international public diplomacy efforts?

Answer. We are reaching out to the Muslim community in the United States, not only to gain valuable information from them about the Islamic faith and belief system, but also to articulate to them the ways in which we are seeking to communicate to the Muslim world. By educating, informing, and consulting these groups, we are actually reaching out overseas, as they communicate to their friends and neighbors living abroad.

We are very encouraged by the amount of interest Muslims in America have shown in helping to articulate the common values and shared beliefs Americans have with other cultures. Recently, we confirmed that there is a newly formed group called the Council of American Muslims for Understanding, which is seeking as its mission to educate both Americans and people outside the United States about the many important achievements of Muslims in America and throughout history. To achieve these goals, the Council will host and sponsor seminars, speaking engagements, engage in media relationships, produce and distribute its own work, and organize cultural and educational exchange programs.

These kinds of organizations, which are more flexible and often more credible than government bodies, will be indispensable in telling our story and forming an active dialogue. Dialogue demands two-way communication. If such organizations can provide a framework for non-Americans to speak to Americans, that answers an important need, which is for us to be seen as listeners, not just talkers.

Question. What is the degree to which U.S. Ambassadors are provided with public diplomacy training prior to deployment?

Answer. I meet with the Ambassadors-designate individually as well as during the Ambassadorial Seminar where we have a collective exchange of views regarding public diplomacy and its central role in American diplomacy. Also included in the Seminar program are:

1. A 45 minute interactive discussion on the importance of Public Affairs/Public Diplomacy with one or more of my senior Public Diplomacy officers.
2. Two days of intensive media skills training with a professional media trainer.
3. A session with a representative of the State Department Press Office to respond to specific concerns of Ambassadors regarding State Department rules and practices for dealing with the media (e.g., what they can say prior to Senate confirmation, prior to presentation of credentials in the host country, and coordination of their activities and messages overseas with Washington).

The Public Diplomacy Training Division of the Foreign Service Institute can, as a standard practice, coordinate with the respective bureau Public Diplomacy offices and Public Affairs Offices in the Ambassador's country of assignment to create a profile of public diplomacy activities being carried out at the post.

In addition, during consultations in Washington, most ambassadors meet with Public Diplomacy officers in their respective bureaus to gain greater familiarity with the types of public diplomacy activities being undertaken in their countries of assignment.

Question. Has any aspect of the Smith-Mundt or Zorinsky restrictions on dissemination of public diplomacy materials interfered with your ability to engage effectively in public diplomacy overseas or to garner American support for public diplomacy efforts?

Answer. These laws have not affected our public diplomacy effort. Since USIA's consolidation into the State Department, it has been a challenge to respect these restrictions while facilitating the integration of public diplomacy programs and expertise into State's mainstream foreign policy process. We have been able to accomplish this successfully, though admittedly the active use of the internet to carry out our public diplomacy mission overseas poses particular challenges.

The continued applicability of both section 501 of Smith-Mundt and the Zorinsky Amendment was discussed during consolidation and affirmed in the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998, as amended. The continued applicability of these restrictions on domestic dissemination of public diplomacy materials enables us to continue to focus effectively on one of our core missions—to inform and influence foreign audiences.

Question. How can we measure success in our public diplomacy efforts, and how can we sell this success to the American people?

Answer. We do not “sell” our successes to the American people. Rather, through periodic congressional hearings, speeches before interested audiences, and media activities, we inform the American people and their elected representatives about what we are doing.

The success of our outreach to the Muslim world and all PD efforts is defined, as it has been in the past, by the successful completion of individual programs, such as the educational exchanges, International Visitors programs, speakers and journalist tours, and television co-ops and broadcast vignettes. All of these efforts offer international audiences a look inside the U.S., and highlight the long-term contributions these programs make to establishing a world of democracies.

We show continuous progress toward these goals through specific examples of how public diplomacy has helped to effect change in the international policy arena and contributed to successful practices throughout the world—for example, of heads of state of countries joining the Coalition Against Terrorism, 50 percent were International Visitors through State Department public diplomacy programs; this exposure to the U.S. at a critical stage in the political education of these leaders had a real impact on how they conduct their relations with the U.S. today.

Another example of how we measure results is through the alumni of the Department's educational exchange programs, who have been very active in their countries talking about their experiences in the U.S. and helping to bridge the perception gap that exists between different cultures. We are going to develop a database to keep up with individuals who have participated in our educational exchange programs. As we follow their careers and continue to reach out to these alumni, we will see the results of their visits time and again over the course of their lives.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, U.S. SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

I am particularly pleased to welcome Under Secretary Beers, who has been leading an impressive State Department effort to improve our public diplomacy in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11. I am also pleased that Governor Pattiz of the Broadcasting Board of Governors will be joining us today to discuss our nation's efforts to promote our values and objectives through broadcasts in local languages in communities across the globe. The perspectives on the second panel today should also help clarify our efforts to support reliable independent media efforts in other countries.

At the hearing today, I will also join many of my colleagues in recognizing that we must take steps, as a priority, to reach out to Muslim and Arab communities around the world to counter unfortunate misunderstandings about American policy or American objectives in the campaign against global terrorism. By reaching out to these Muslim communities, we also have an important opportunity to demonstrate that the Islamic world is not unified in opposition to our country or our way of life.

As Chair of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, I have been particularly active in urging the Secretary of State to reach out to Muslim leaders in Africa. And I am pleased to have had an opportunity to travel this year to several African nations that have important Muslim communities. Through those travels, I have sought to initiate a direct dialogue with Muslim leaders. As a nation, we must continue to make such public diplomacy a priority. And I am particularly pleased to support leg-

islation that is now pending in Congress to expand public diplomacy in predominantly Muslim countries, including in countries across Africa and Asia.

But we must also recognize that effective public diplomacy must always build on and reinforce our core values as a society. Those values include a commitment to accurate and reliable information on United States policy and on the vibrant diversity of opinions and beliefs that makes us such a strong and prosperous democracy. Our public outreach must also reinforce our core commitment to human rights principles. In particular, we must ensure that our friends and allies understand that we will not ignore human rights in the interest of building an immediate anti-terrorism coalition.

I look forward to considering how we can build on the efforts that are already underway to improve our ability to communicate our nation's core beliefs to other countries and communities. This hearing today offers an important opportunity to initiate that discussion.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. SENATOR FROM
MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman, I commend you for holding this hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the important issue of public diplomacy. I welcome the opportunity to submit testimony.

One of the clear lessons of September 11th is that our country needs to do more to ensure that future generations in the Islamic world understand American values and culture. Nearly 1.5 billion people live in the Islamic world. If we ignore the anti-American attitudes so prevalent in those countries, we do so at our own peril.

If we address the problem directly, by teaching American values to young people from the Islamic world, we have a chance, in the long run, of changing negative attitudes. It's a long process, but September 11th has taught us that we must begin it now.

There are many ways to share America's values with others, and this important hearing will highlight many of them. Among the most effective public diplomacy actions at our disposal are international educational exchange programs. There are no better ambassadors for American values than Americans themselves. Student exchange programs have proven to be effective in reaching out to the next generation of leaders. As Secretary Powell said in his August 2001 Statement on International Education Week, "I can think of no more valuable asset to our country than the friendship of future world leaders who have been educated here."

On May 10, Senators Lugar, Leahy, Chafee, Dodd, Hagel, Gordon Smith, Cochran, Brownback, Jeffords, Durbin, Feingold, and Landrieu joined me in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002. Our legislation, S. 2505, seeks to increase funding for student and other exchanges between Americans and visitors from the Islamic world. It would also create a new high school exchange program for students from the Islamic world.

The Cultural Bridges Act would authorize \$75 million above current appropriations in fiscal years 2003 through 2007 to expand the activities of the State Department's existing educational and cultural programs in the Islamic world. It would also authorize \$20 million in fiscal years 2003 through 2007 for the Department to establish a new high school student exchange program to enable competitively selected students from the Islamic world to study in the United States at a public high school for an academic year.

The State Department currently manages a number of international student educational and cultural exchange programs that have helped foster mutual respect and understanding in many countries worldwide. These programs enable approximately 5,000 Americans to travel abroad and 20,000 foreign visitors to travel to the United States annually to study, teach, and engage in people-to-people programs. They have been successful in promoting American values and cultural tolerance.

Unfortunately, visitors and students from the Islamic world are significantly underrepresented in many of these programs. Individuals in the Islamic world represent approximately 25 percent of the world's 6.2 billion people. However, in fiscal year 2000, less than 10 percent of the participants in State Department cultural and educational exchange programs were from the Islamic countries covered under our legislation, and less than 12 percent of the budget was spent on these countries. According to the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, funding for exchanges has fallen by almost a third since 1993 when adjusted for inflation.

The additional \$75 million our legislation authorizes for existing programs to be expanded in the Islamic world is essential to the objective of promoting greater un-

derstanding of American values and ideals. Existing programs provide the essential building blocks for an expanded and sustained effort to reach more broadly into these societies, to foster mutual respect, and to counter the hatred that can lead to acts of terrorism.

Last October, President Bush spoke eloquently about the need to reach out in friendship to the Islamic world. In a speech to students at Thurgood Marshall Extended Elementary School in Washington DC, the President said that America is “determined to build ties of trust and friendship with people all around the world—particularly with children and people in the Islamic world.”

To facilitate the President’s goal of reaching children, our legislation would also create a new program for high school students from the Islamic world to study in the United States. No federal program currently exists to facilitate such student exchanges with the ever-increasing number of youths in the Islamic world.

There are many benefits to reaching out to students while they are young and openminded to enhance cultural understanding and tolerance. Today’s high school students are tomorrow’s leaders, and we need to begin working with them now to inform them about our country.

In an January 20, 2002 article in the Washington Post, a former Fulbright scholarship recipient from Egypt expressed concern that his university in Egypt was and continues to be fertile ground for recruiters from terrorist or extremist organizations. Our challenge is to provide young students with the opportunity to learn about America, participate in all aspects of American family life, and understand our values before they reach that stage.

The high school student exchange program authorized in our legislation is modeled on the State Department’s highly successful Future Leaders Exchange Program (FLEX), which brings approximately 1,000 students ages 15–17 from the nations of the former Soviet Union to the United States each year to attend an American high school for a year and live with an American family.

The FLEX program has been effective in shaping attitudes among the students selected to participate from those nations. A 1998 U.S. government study, which compared Russian FLEX alumni with other Russian youth of the same age, found that the FLEX alumni are more open to and accepting of Western values and democratic ideals. They are more likely to want to become leaders in and to make a contribution to their society. They tend to be more optimistic than other Russian youths about the future of their country—especially its evolution to a more democratic, rule-of-law society.

Importantly, the FLEX program has been successful in the six predominantly Islamic countries of those nations—Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. More than 1,500 students from those Muslim countries have studied and lived in the United States since the program began. FLEX alumni in Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan are teaching English in their home countries, and alumni in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan have been involved in activities to develop democratic practices. Given the track record in these countries, there is every reason to believe that a high school student exchange program would succeed throughout the Islamic world.

Like the existing FLEX program, our legislation requires participating students in high school exchanges from the Islamic world to be selected competitively and in a manner that ensures geographic, gender, and socio-economic diversity. To qualify, students must be tested extensively and interviewed under State Department guidelines. As with the FLEX program, the State Department will work with experienced American non-governmental organizations to recruit, select, and place students, and will remain in close contact with the public high school, the American host family, and American non-governmental organizations while the students are in the United States.

All students and visitors participating in programs authorized in the legislation must be admissible under all our immigration laws and procedures. Legislation recently signed into law will improve our ability to screen foreign students by requiring increased communication among the State Department, the INS, and the schools enrolling foreign students, and by closing gaps in the existing foreign student monitoring program.

Our legislation has been endorsed by the Alliance for International Education and Cultural Exchange, AMIDEAST, AFS, the Academy for Educational Development, the American Councils for International Education, the American Institute for Foreign Study, the Institute of International Education, the National Council for International Visitors, Sister Cities International, World Learning, and World Study Group.

As the Director of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, a coalition of 65 organizations with chapters in all 50 states, former Amba-

sador Kenton Keith, wrote: "Winning the war on terrorism will demand more than just our military prowess. It will require us to engage the peoples of the Islamic world about our society and values if we are to forge the mutual understanding and respect that will be the basis of peaceful productive relationships. The exchanges authorized in your bill are the most cost-effective way to encourage the positive personal and institutional relationships that will enhance our long-term national security." I ask the committee to include copies of this letter and other endorsement letters in the hearing record.

America must respond to the terrorist threat on many levels. We need to ensure that our defenses are strong, our borders are secure, and our relationships with allies are vibrant. We also need to do more in the area of public diplomacy.

It is clearly in America's national security interest to promote more people-to-people contacts throughout the Muslim world. In a May 3rd address to the World Affairs Council in California, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz spoke about the need to reach out and strengthen voices of moderation in the Islamic world and to bridge the "dangerous gap" between the West and the Muslim world. He said America must 'begin now . . . the gap is wide and there is no time for delay."

After September 11, many of the Muslim countries condemned those attacks and pledged to help the United States fight terrorism. As we have seen in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and elsewhere in the Muslim world, some individuals and factions within a country support terrorists and terrorist organizations, while others seek to resolve issues peacefully. America can reduce support for terrorism by reaching out more effectively in friendship to all nations in the Islamic world.

Building bridges of understanding and tolerance across cultures will help ensure that Americans and people of the Islamic world will truly understand and know each another. Clearly, international educational and cultural exchanges can play a significant role in America's public diplomacy efforts in the Islamic world.

I understand the Chairman intends to propose legislation to address these and other important public diplomacy issues in the near future. I welcome this leadership, and I urge the committee to include the Cultural Bridges Act in public diplomacy legislation.

[Letters in support of the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002 follow:]

WORLD STUDY GROUP,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA,
April 2, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: On behalf, of the World Study Group, I write to thank you for your leadership in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002. The World Study Group and its affiliated J-1 visa programs are dedicated to increasing understanding and trust between people through international cultural exchange.

Building productive ties with the Muslim world will require a sustained and serious commitment that reaches well beyond our current efforts. The exchanges authorized in your bill are the most cost-effective way to encourage the positive personal and institutional relationships that will enhance our long-term national security goals. Breaking down misunderstanding requires that our peoples know each other better.

Congressional leadership will be crucial to this endeavor. Student exchanges from the Muslim world are among the lowest of any region, and significant new resources will be required to jump-start this effort. Moreover, a clear federal commitment will leverage private sector support and will immediately engage the American people directly in the conduct of this high priority foreign policy initiative.

Your legislation is the right bill at the right time. On behalf of AYUSA, AuPairCare, and Intrax Inc., we thank you. You have the gratitude and support of our staff and field representatives throughout the United States.

Sincerely,

JOHN WILHELM,
President.

WORLD LEARNING,
WASHINGTON, DC,
April 1, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: Thank you for your leadership in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002. Enactment of this legislation will make possible increased opportunities to bring current and future leaders from the Islamic world to the United States and to send Americans to Muslim countries to teach and study.

Expanded opportunities for citizen exchange between the United States and the Islamic world will help to engender increased respect, understanding and trust between our peoples. Building this mutual understanding will enhance our national security by broadening the range of productive interactions between the United States and Muslim countries.

Currently, student and other exchange flows with Muslim countries are lower than with other regions of the world. The programs which the Cultural Bridges Act authorizes would provide for significant increases at this crucial time for our nation. Thank you again for your leadership in working to strengthen these important programs.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT CHASE,
Vice President.

SISTER CITIES INTERNATIONAL,
WASHINGTON, DC,
April 1, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: On behalf of Sister Cities International and the 700 U.S. cities joined in cooperative sister city partnerships with 1,500 international cities in 121 countries, I applaud your leadership in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002. The Cultural Bridges Act of 2002 will be a vital tool in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy and public diplomacy in response to new challenges facing the United States.

The need for increased international understanding and cooperation has never been more imperative than in the aftermath of September 11. International education and exchange programs are critical elements in advancing U.S. foreign policy and national security, as they build understanding and cooperation between Americans and future foreign leaders. Nearly 150 present and past foreign heads of state made their first visits to the United States on exchange programs. This powerful tool for building productive, positive relationships has served the United States extraordinarily well over the years, and has included visits from world leaders such as Anwar Sadat and Indira Gandhi, French Premier Lionel Jospin and British Prime Minister Tony Blair.

Perhaps most importantly, the Cultural Bridges Act boldly leads the way for the federal government to encourage sustainable, cooperative relationships between the United States and the Islamic world. In the fight against terrorism and efforts to improve our national security, there can be no doubt that fostering international exchanges will help diminish negative stereotypes and build an environment of mutual understanding and respect for differences. Furthermore, the Cultural Bridges Act will help foster citizen diplomacy initiatives that will promote the involvement of local citizens in international engagement. Now more than ever, the federal government must invest in capacity building at the community level to promote citizen diplomacy, particularly with regard to the Islamic world. As we know, resources allotted for these activities are drastically insufficient in the current climate, and we hope the introduction of the Cultural Bridges Act will move our nation in the right direction of enhanced cooperation.

Thank you again for your leadership on this pressing issue.

Sincerely,

TIM HONEY,
Executive Director,
Sister Cities International.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL VISITORS,
WASHINGTON, DC,
April 1, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: On behalf of the Board and members of the National Council for International Visitors (NCIV), we thank you for your initiative in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002. NCIV members—nonprofit program agencies and 95 community organizations across the United States—organize professional programs, home visits, and cultural activities for participants in the State Department’s International Visitor Program and other exchanges. More than 80,000 volunteers are involved in NCIV member activities each year, including WorldBoston, International Center of Indianapolis, and the World Affairs Council of Rhode Island.

NCIV members promote citizen diplomacy—the idea that the individual citizen has the right, even the responsibility, to help shape U.S. foreign relations “one handshake at a time” through exchanges. We are grateful for your leadership in introducing this legislation that will make more of these handshakes possible with participants from underserved areas of the world.

Sincerely,

ALAN KUMAMOTO,
Chair, Board of Directors.
SHERRY L. MULLER, PH.D.,
President.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION,
NEW YORK, NY,
April 2, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: On behalf of the Institute of International Education, including our Trustees and volunteers across the country, please accept IIE’s thanks and appreciation for the leadership you are showing by introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002. Your initiative could not be more relevant and timely.

As always, the leadership of Congress in international educational exchange is critical. Now, in vulnerable areas of the world where peace, understanding and progress through education are vitally needed to insure that terrorism and intolerance are eliminated, your legislation addresses key areas where we can work to build shared values.

Exchanges of high school and college students, graduate students and young professionals, as well as others, who can help create the climate we need where progressive democratic developments flourish are sorely needed in Africa, the Near East, Central and South Asia, and Southeast Asia. The focus of your Cultural Bridges Act of 2002 on members of the Organization of Islamic Conference includes virtually every nation we need to reach if we are serious about making people to people diplomacy work for youth. As you know, the Institute has always regarded the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchanges Act of 1961 as one of the most important of all this nation’s foreign policy documents. By directing the Department of State to establish new initiatives through the authority of the 1961 Act you will assure that the philanthropic and higher education sectors not only support your efforts but help you leverage government resources for important common purposes.

Please let me know if there is anything the Institute can do to assist you in this critically important endeavor at a time of great national need.

Sincerely,

Institute of International Education.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FOREIGN STUDY,
STAMFORD, CT,
April 2, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: As a member of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, I write to thank you for your leadership in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002.

Winning the war on terrorism will demand more than just our military prowess. It will require us to engage the peoples of the Islamic world about our society and values if we are to forge the mutual understanding and respect that will be the basis of peaceful, productive relationships. As September 11 and its aftermath make clear, our public diplomacy has fallen short.

Building productive ties will require a sustained and serious commitment that reaches well beyond our current efforts. The exchanges authorized in your bill are the most cost-effective way to encourage the positive personal and institutional relationships that will enhance our long-term national security.

Congressional leadership will be crucial to this endeavor. Student and exchange flows from the Muslim world are among the lowest of any region, and significant new resources will be required to jump-start this effort. Moreover, a clear federal commitment will leverage private sector support from universities, schools, businesses, and communities across the U.S. This initiative will engage the American people directly in the conduct of the highest priority foreign policy.

Your legislation is the right bill at the right time. You have the gratitude and support of members of the exchange community throughout the United States.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. BRENNAN,
President.

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
WASHINGTON, DC,
April 2, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: On behalf of the Academy for Educational Development, a non-profit organization serving people in more than 160 countries, I want to thank you for your leadership in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002.

International exchange programs are a critical component of the war on terrorism. Exchange programs enhance mutual understanding and build long-term bridges with individuals in other countries. Expanding the flow of people, ideas and information will promote greater understanding of the United States and will advance our foreign policy objectives.

The International Visitor Program has been particularly effective at reaching future foreign leaders and at advancing key foreign policy objectives. For example, a recent leadership development program brought student leaders from the Middle East and North Africa for exchanges with student leaders across the United States. Another program on the role of religion in the United States brought administrators from religious educational institutions, or "madrassahs," in Pakistan to meet with civic and religious leaders in several cities. Programs such as these that target key issues and leaders should be significantly expanded in the Islamic world.

Although the world's attention has been focused on the Muslim world, exchange programs from countries with large Islamic populations are underrepresented in U.S. government-sponsored exchange programs. Your bill will significantly enhance the capacity to reach out to individuals in these countries through people-to-people exchanges that are among our best tools of diplomacy.

We thank you for your leadership, vision and commitment in introducing this critical piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN F. MOSELEY,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

AFS-USA, Inc.,
NEW YORK, NY,
April 1, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: I am writing on behalf of our staff, volunteers, and board members located in all 50 states to express our pleasure and thanks for initiating the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002.

AFS is the oldest, largest, and most diverse high school exchange program in the United States and in the world. We understand and appreciate the leadership you have demonstrated in sponsoring this bill. Public diplomacy in the Islamic world requires the focus and funding contained in your bill. Our 54 years of experience in the field of exchange tells us that a serious commitment, sustained over a number of years, will be needed to defeat terrorism at its roots by increasing understanding and tolerance among people of different countries, beliefs and values. AFS exchanged students from Germany and Japan with the U.S. almost immediately after World War II. Today those countries are our allies. Democratic principles, respect for others, and individual freedom are our values, and they can be powerful when seen through daily interaction with our families and students.

You are doing the right thing. We stand ready to support you in any way we can. Thank you for your pursuit of peace and freedom.

Sincerely,

ALEX J. PLINIO,
President.

ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE,
NEW YORK, NY,
April 2, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: On behalf of the 65 member NGOs of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, I write to thank you for your leadership in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002.

Winning the war on terrorism will demand more than just our military prowess. It will require us to engage the peoples of the Islamic world about our society and values if we are to forge the mutual understanding and respect that will be the basis of peaceful, productive relationships. As September 11 and its aftermath make clear, our public diplomacy has fallen short.

Building productive ties will require a sustained and serious commitment that reaches well beyond our current efforts. The exchanges authorized in your bill are the most cost-effective way to encourage the positive personal and institutional relationships that will enhance our long-term national security.

Congressional leadership will be crucial to this endeavor. Student and exchange flows from the Muslim world are among the lowest of any region, and significant new resources will be required to jump-start this effort. Moreover, a clear federal commitment will leverage private sector support from universities, schools, busi-

nesses, and communities across the U.S. This initiative will engage the American people directly in the conduct of the highest priority foreign policy.

Your legislation is the right bill at the right time. You have the gratitude and support of members of the exchange community throughout the United States.

Sincerely,

KENTON W. KEITH,
*U.S. Ambassador (retired),
Chair, Board of Directors.*

AMERICAN COUNCILS FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION,
WASHINGTON, DC,
April 2, 2002.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
and Hon. LINCOLN CHAFEE,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS KENNEDY, LUGAR, AND CHAFEE: I write to commend you for your leadership in introducing the Cultural Bridges Act of 2002, a legislative initiative designed to engage the diverse Islamic populations around the world through international exchange programs. I particular want to thank you for focusing on high school exchanges as a highly effective mechanism for introducing the United States to this audience, and them to our fellow Americans.

While our country's public diplomacy efforts—which include exchange programs—have earned us many friends in parts of the world, the dramatic events of September 11th and our examination of our standing with key populations in the Islamic world since those terrorist attacks have revealed that we have neglected a critical world population stretching from West Africa to Southeast Asia. This arc crosses the Arab Middle East, through Southeastern Europe and Central Asia to Indochina approximately 1.4 billion people populate the countries along this arc. Your initiative would make it our national policy to reach out to the peoples of these countries to build mutual understanding.

The Cultural Bridges Act of 2002 would capitalize on our nation's capacity to educate and inform by bringing individuals to the United States to learn about our culture, language, and aspirations—all while studying in school, mastering their chosen profession, or doing research. It provides a highly effective (and low cost) way to positively influence foreign populations through citizen diplomacy, something we've done well with post-war Europe and Japan, Latin America, and most recently with the countries of the former Warsaw Pact.

My own organization has utilized academic and youth exchanges for more than 25 years with the former Soviet Union. Among our many successes in fostering understanding of the United States in that region, some of the most impressive results result from exchange programs involving youth, like the Future Leaders Exchange Program, and secondary school teachers, like the Excellence in Teaching Awards Exchange Program—both funded through an earlier congressional initiative, the FREEDOM Support Act. The Cultural Bridges Act that you are introducing in the Senate would facilitate similar successes in the Islamic World.

The American Councils has experience with working in the Muslim communities of the NIS—communities that exist throughout the 12 countries of the old Soviet Union. Some of the most dynamic needs for expanded exchange opportunities in the NIS are apparent in the predominately Islamic countries of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan—countries that are critical to addressing our urgent security concerns in Central Asia and all of which would be eligible to benefit from your legislation.

Your exchanges initiative is both an effective bulwark against ignorance of the United States and a proactive measure for securing the peace we hope to achieve through our current military campaign. I applaud your leadership in introducing this bill, and look forward to its enactment.

Sincerely,

DAN E. DAVIDSON, PH.D.,
President.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AMB. KENTON W. KEITH, CHAIR, ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, MERIDIAN INTERNATIONAL CENTER

Good morning. I'm Kenton Keith, senior vice president of the Meridian International Center and chair of the board of directors of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange. The Alliance is an association of 65 U.S.-based exchange organizations, and as you know, Mr. Chairman, we have worked closely with this committee over the years on a variety of issues. MIC is a nonprofit organization that promotes international understanding through exchanges of people, ideas, and the arts.

Prior to taking up my current positions, I was a Foreign Service Officer with the United States Information Agency. Much of my career was spent in the Middle East, including my appointment by President Bush in 1992 to be U.S. Ambassador to Qatar. Following that assignment, I headed USIA's area office that supervised all the agency's operations in the Near East and South Asia. More recently, I took on a temporary assignment for the State Department during which I established and directed the Coalition Information Center in Islamabad.

Mr. Chairman, both in my present capacities and based on my past experiences, I welcome the opportunity to provide this statement for the record about the importance of public diplomacy, especially in the wake of the horrific events of September 11 and in support of our national campaign to rid the world of terrorism.

To win the war on terrorism, the United States will need more than the might and skill of our armed forces. To ultimately defeat terrorism, we must also engage the Muslim world in the realm of ideas, values, and beliefs. No previous foreign affairs crisis has been so deeply rooted in cultural misunderstanding, and we must address this gulf of misunderstanding if we are to succeed.

Policy disagreements alone cannot account for the fact that many in Islamic countries regard the United States, the greatest force for good in human history, as a source of evil. As a nation, we have not done an adequate job of explaining ourselves to the world, or of building the personal and institutional connections with these countries that support healthy bilateral relationships.

As a long-term solution to the profound problems of cultural misunderstanding, there will be no substitute for public diplomacy. It must be a key component of our long-term effort to eradicate terrorism. We applaud your leadership, Mr. Chairman, and that of your committee in focusing attention on what must be a critical element in our successful anti-terrorism strategy.

People-to-people ties are an essential part of our public diplomacy. As Ambassador Arthur Burns once said, "The achievement . . . of true understanding between any two governments depends fundamentally on the kind of relationship that exists between the peoples, rather than on the foreign ministers and ambassadors."

In the Islamic world, we dearly have not done an adequate job of fostering relationships between our peoples. A February Gallup poll reports that 61 percent of Muslims believe that the attack on the United States was a riot carried out by Arabs. Mr. Chairman, that statistic alone speaks somber volumes about our failure to project our values and ideals effectively in Islamic nations.

We must recognize that we begin this effort in a very unfavorable position. Changing minds—or merely opening them—is a long, painstaking process. There are no quick fixes. And if we are truly to win the war on terrorism, there will be no avoiding the need to build bridges between the American people and the people of the Muslim world. Mr. Chairman, we must begin this process now.

This effort will require us to be creative, disciplined, and patient as we try to reach audiences whose attitudes towards us range from profoundly skeptical to openly hostile. We will not succeed in opening every mind, but we do not need to do so. What we must succeed in doing is challenging and changing a climate of opinion that unjustly paints the United States as a source of evil. Improving the relationships that exist between our peoples is the best way to do that. And if we succeed, terrorists will find it much more difficult to gain support or sympathy, either from governments or from general publics.

Increasing the State Department's exchanges with the Islamic world will give us the means to build a range of productive, positive relationships based on shared interests. Such an initiative will engage the American public—in our communities, schools, and universities—in this effort to project American values. We will find no better or more convincing representatives of our way of life.

And the engagement of the American public will leverage significant additional resources to support this effort.

Under such an initiative, the United States could undertake a broad range of exchange activities that would enhance U.S. national security. These programs could include:

- Greater numbers of Fulbright students and scholars working together on issues such as public health, cultural studies, conflict resolution, and economic development;
- More American universities with linkages to institutions in the Muslim world in fields like journalism, American studies, and business;
- Increased numbers of emerging leaders from Islamic countries meeting their American professional counterparts and visiting American homes and communities as part of the International Visitor program and other citizen exchange programs;
- More young people from the Islamic world encountering the U.S., its people, and its culture through long and short-term exchange programs, school-to-school projects, or by learning English from an American teacher;
- Exchanges of teachers between the U.S. and Muslim countries exposing students on both sides to differing perspectives and more balanced, objective curricula.

This will require a major effort, requiring us to engage a very broad range of countries, in an area reaching from Africa to the Middle East, stretching further eastward from Central Asia to the Indian subcontinent to Southeast Asia. Addressing so many countries and cultures will demand thoughtfully differentiated approaches to public diplomacy. In some countries, significant increases in our traditional exchanges, such as the Fulbright and International Visitor programs, will be appropriate, welcome, and effective. In other countries, such an approach may be seen as threatening. Particularly in those cases, we must be creative in finding ways of reaching more skeptical publics, such as journalists and religious communities.

This initiative will also require significant new resources. The scope of the task is too great, and its importance to our national security too critical, to be able to accomplish our goals by simply shifting money from other regions of the world. The importance of maintaining a broad, worldwide coalition to combat terrorism suggests strongly that shortchanging one area of the world in order to temporarily emphasize another will be an ineffective strategy. To do this job right will require new funding.

Reductions in public diplomacy over time have limited our reach: we have closed posts and cultural centers, reduced numbers of public diplomacy positions in our embassies, and steeply reduced the number of exchange participants. As populations in significant Muslim countries have increased by approximately 15 percent over the past 10 years, the numbers of exchange participants from key countries such as Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Turkey have declined by approximately 25 percent.

In the face of those reductions, Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to recognize the dedication, hard work, and effectiveness of the State Department's corps of public diplomacy officers. Faced with diminishing resources and a major reorganization that abolished USIA and moved their function and careers into State, these professionals have performed in their typical fashion: professionally and effectively.

Mr. Chairman, a meaningful and effective Islamic exchange initiative will require \$95 million above the current appropriation for State exchanges. We recognize that this is a significant amount of money. We believe, however, that this funding level is necessary and appropriate, given the expanse of the Muslim world and the urgency and importance of the task at hand. Moreover, this amount of money to be spent on promoting our ideas and values is very small when compared to the sums we will expend on military hardware, but is no less crucial to our success.

Mr. Chairman, we welcome the opportunity to discuss this proposal with you and your staff, and we have found broad bipartisan support for an Islamic exchange initiative in both chambers. As you know, Senators Kennedy and Lugar have recently introduced the "Cultural Bridges Act," calling for an additional \$95 million annually for exchanges with the Muslim world. Their bill has already attracted twelve additional cosponsors, drawn from both sides of the aisle. In the House, International Relations Committee Chairman Hyde's "Freedom Promotion Act" also authorizes new funds for exchanges with the Muslim world. The Hyde bill has been marked up by the Committee and has been reported to the House for its consideration. This level of support from senior members of both parties and both chambers underscores the timeliness and importance of this initiative. This is a moment when our national interests require Congressional leadership to build these cultural bridges. The U.S. exchange community stands ready to assist you in this effort, and is grateful for your support.

In addition to his Alliance testimony, Kenton Keith submits to the Committee an additional statement based more directly on his Foreign Service experience. The text of that addendum follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed timely for the committee to examine our public diplomacy assets in the wake of the attacks on our nation. I would like to draw your attention to problems that handicap the dedicated individuals who carry out public diplomacy in Washington and in the field. Structural problems stemming from the amalgamation of USIA into the Department of State have had the unintentional effect of diminishing the thrust of our public diplomacy efforts.

I also would like to comment briefly on the new regional broadcasting initiative launched by the Voice of America.

Structural Faults: An Opportunity Deferred

I served as the USIA representative on the Planning Committee. In the months of our deliberations it was clear to me that the disappearance of the USIA Area Offices would be the biggest challenge to the effective linkage of Washington to the field operations. The Area Offices, which corresponded to the State Department regional bureaus, had tremendous clout. They were headed by the Agency's senior-most career officers, they controlled field budgets, they had direct and regular access to the Agency's Directors and the political appointees who headed the Information and Educational and Cultural Exchange bureaus, and they shared with Ambassadors abroad the performance evaluations of our PAOs, the public diplomacy directors in the field. In other words, PAOs were accountable to both their ambassadors and their area directors.

In almost every case, Area Directors sat in on the meetings of State Department regional Assistant Secretaries. Indeed, it was most often the case that they had long professional relations with those Assistant Secretaries from shared field assignments, and there was a mutual respect and trust built over time. Thus, it was natural that they were aware of the short- and medium-range policy concerns of any given period. They were also the custodians of the long-range public diplomacy effort to create better understanding by foreign audiences of American culture, institutions and values.

In discussions of the foreign affairs reorganization, the interagency planning team was unable to reach a consensus on how to replace these vital functions, and the final report went forward with "bracketed language," indicating this disagreement. In the event, the amalgamated Area Offices were reduced in size and power. Area Directors were replaced by office directors within the State regional bureaus. Also, some public diplomacy officers, usually even more junior, were assigned to functional bureaus. Moreover, budget control for field operations was moved to the Executive Officers in the regional bureaus in Washington, and to State administrative officers in the field.

What Was Lost?

- *Coordination.* USIA Area Directors had the power to intercede with the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Information Bureau (and to some extent with the VOA and television producers) to shape products for field use and to ensure that they were integrated into a well-managed public diplomacy operation in the field posts. This made it possible to mount a region-wide public diplomacy effort to meet emerging needs.
- *Accountability.* PAOs were accountable to their ambassadors, of course, as they are today, but they were also accountable to the Area Directors. With this arrangement, PAOs not only responded to the "brush fire" public diplomacy issues at the mission, but also to the longer range challenge of building understanding and trust through exchange programs, libraries, English language teaching and cultural exchanges.
- *Flexibility.* Once PAOs lost their status as representatives of an independent agency, they lost their independent administrative infrastructure. The idea was to eliminate redundancy and save money. The result has been that PAOs have become mired in the bureaucratic complexities of the Department's operations, and have had to spend time with added forms and reports when they should be out engaging with audiences. Over the years, USIA had developed procedures, including grant management and flexibility in raising money from the private sector for joint programs, that took account of the fact that it was a programming agency. This was new to State, and the loss of these tools has hampered public diplomacy operations.

Under the current structure, which I believe to be fundamentally flawed, the primary purveyors of public diplomacy resources—the Under Secretary for Public Di-

plomacy and Public Affairs, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, and the Office of International Information Programs—have no formal bureaucratic connection with the public diplomacy sections in our embassies. The Department's senior official responsible for the conduct of our public diplomacy (the Under Secretary) has no authority over the field operations that perform that mission.

This anomalous structure runs the risk of marginalizing public diplomacy within State, and already has diminished its effectiveness. Those senior officials with responsibility for public diplomacy do not control field resources; those with a direct connection to the field resources are mid-ranking office directors, and do not have the clout to take bold action. The structural flaw already is manifesting itself in a diminished focus, uncoordinated activities, and reduced field resources.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the prescription for change would include the following elements:

Each regional bureau should have a Deputy Assistant Secretary (DAS) charged with overseeing its public diplomacy activities. Only by providing senior leadership will public diplomacy succeed at State.

Establishing a DAS in each regional bureau would ensure that public diplomacy is actively represented in senior-level meetings and thus an integral component in our approach to every foreign policy issue. A senior officer with these responsibilities could effectively coordinate public diplomacy activities across the region, make the case for additional resources when needed, and play an active role in relevant personnel matters. The DAS's would coordinate closely with the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, who would have input into their annual personnel evaluations.

Creating and maintaining DAS positions would be a critical first step in changing the Department's culture, and would send an unmistakable message to those who work at State: that public diplomacy matters, and matters enough to require senior leadership.

Second, a formal link should exist between the regional DAS for Public Diplomacy, the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, and the Coordinator for International Information Programs. In USIA the close coordination with the Director, the Counselor and the Area Directors facilitated broad public diplomacy responses to any given challenge. At present, the only persons within the Department who have the authority to launch public diplomacy initiatives across regional bureaus are the Secretary of State and his Deputy.

A New Voice of America

Mr. Chairman, the Voice of America has launched the Middle East Radio Network, which provides FM broadcasting to Arab audiences with substantial programming of local news and features voiced by speakers of the principal regional dialects, with a centrally produced world news program in modern standard Arabic. In my judgment as someone who has served in the region for substantial portions of my career, this is an ambitious experiment that deserves the full support of Congress.

For too long we have clung to short wave broadcasting with a diminishing audience, or we have used FM signals that were too weak to be heard. But just as important as having the right signal is the need for content that speaks to the audiences we seek to reach. This requires the kind of research and production effort that costs money, but will pay great dividends. Middle East Radio Network is a very promising concept, and one that has the potential to play a critical role in our long-term public diplomacy strategy.

