

NOMINATION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 23, 2010

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.fdsys.gpo.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

65-254 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2011

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
BARBARA BOXER, California
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland
ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., Pennsylvania
JIM WEBB, Virginia
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
EDWARD E. KAUFMAN, Delaware
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
BOB CORKER, Tennessee
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma

FRANK G. LOWENSTEIN, *Staff Director*

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

CONTENTS

	Page
Casey, Hon. Robert P., Jr., U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, opening statement	1
Kaufman, Hon. Edward E., U.S. Senator from Delaware, statement	6
Lugar, Hon. Richard G., U.S. Senator from Indiana, opening statement	4
Munter, Cameron, nominee to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan	6
Prepared statement	9
Responses to questions submitted for the record by Senator Russell D. Feingold	23

NOMINATION

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2010

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

Cameron Munter, of California, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:45 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Robert P. Casey, Jr., presiding.

Present: Senators Casey, Kaufman, Lugar, and Risch.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT P. CASEY JR., U.S. SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Senator CASEY. Good morning. The Committee on Foreign Relations hearing on this nomination will come to order.

And we meet today to discuss the nomination of Cameron Munter to be the President's Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Ambassador Munter, welcome. And I want to thank you for your service to the country in difficult assignments in both Serbia and, more recently, Iraq, among other places, which in both cases is good preparation for the assignment that you would undertake upon your confirmation.

I would also like to extend a welcome—and we just had a moment to say hello to your parents. Your parents, Helen-Jeanne and Len, who have joined us here today. We thank you for being here.

This hearing affords us an opportunity to discuss the critical importance of our relationship with Pakistan. It is an understatement to say that the people of Pakistan have suffered greatly in recent years as they confront the growing threat posed by Islamic extremism. Recent bombing attacks in Quetta and Lahore brought this message home in stark terms.

I and, I know, so many Americans are appalled at the violence and the scale and the destruction of that violence seen in Pakistan in recent years. All of us, in one way or another, pray for the families of Pakistan who have made the ultimate sacrifice in this conflict, and I am confident that their loss will not be in vain.

The Pakistani Taliban, Tehrik-e-Taliban, claimed responsibility for the recent attacks, a group that the United States has designated as a foreign terrorist organization. Faisal Shahzad, who attempted to set off a car bomb in Times Square last May, said he

was trained by explosive experts in the so-called TTP. The TTP also threatens attacks against the United States and Europe. This is a common thread—or I should say there is a common thread to United States and Pakistani security, and we must do all we can together to confront these killers.

Extremism is the common enemy of the United States and Pakistan, all too often manifested in the form of improvised explosive devices and their precursor components. These bombs have killed Pakistani troops and civilians, as well as scores of Americans in Afghanistan. It is the No. 1 killer of our troops in Afghanistan, the so-called IEDs.

I have long sought to highlight this threat and support United States and international efforts to crack down on the proliferation of the precursor chemicals, the most notorious and most destructive being ammonium nitrate. The Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, known by that long acronym, JIEDDO, has led an effort to combat IEDs at every step in the process. The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency recently commenced Project Global Shield, which is an unprecedented multilateral law enforcement operation aimed at countering the illicit diversion and trafficking of these precursor chemicals.

Pakistan has made efforts to contend with ammonium nitrate in large part because the threat has begun to impact security in Pakistan itself. Recent coordination between Pakistani civilian and military entities on the IED issue has been very positive. The government of Pakistan formed an interagency national counter-IED forum. We are also beginning to see efforts at the local level, such as small-scale bans and regulations in the district of Malakand.

Ambassador Anne Patterson, someone that we have all come to know and greatly admire her work, she has led a remarkable effort to engage with the Pakistani Government on this issue. I hope that Pakistan expeditiously approves its draft legislation to better control explosive materials in the country and makes a concerted effort at enforcement. I also hope that we can work with the private sector to build understanding of the threat posed by IED precursors and encourage better self-regulation.

We must exercise, in my judgment, extraordinary vigilance in stemming the unregulated flow of ammonium nitrate in this region because it directly affects the security of our troops. Pennsylvania—the State I represent, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—has lost 56 servicemembers in Afghanistan, many of whom were killed by IEDs.

Implementing more robust seizure and interdiction measures is important, but we also must do more to dismantle terrorist and other criminal organizations involved in making IEDs. This will involve multilateral engagement, regulatory measures, training and technological efforts, building border control capacity, as well as other means.

The people of Pakistan have suffered from the recent devastating floods as well, the worst natural disaster in the history of the country. To assist the people of Pakistan during this difficult time, the United States has provided more than \$340 million to support immediate relief and recovery efforts. The United States has provided

food, infrastructure support, and air support to transport goods and rescue those stranded by the floods.

These devastating floods require a substantial international commitment of assistance. The United Nations has issued an appeal of \$450 million, most of it remaining unfulfilled. Private contributions have slowed to a trickle. So I look forward, and I know many others look forward, to hearing from our nominee on the United States response to the floods and what we can be doing to have a more tangible impact in the lives of Pakistanis affected by this horrific tragedy, the tragedy of the flood.

Recognizing these enormous challenges, Senator Kerry, our chairman, and our ranking member, Senator Lugar, have led a bipartisan effort to encourage a United States-Pakistani relationship that is based on more solid footing. And we know the legislation often by the names of those who led the fight and made sure it got passed—Senator Kerry, Senator Lugar, and, in the House, of course, Congressman Berman.

The Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act, known more colloquially by the name of Kerry-Lugar-Berman, authorizes \$7.5 billion in nonmilitary assistance over 5 years. Through this investment by U.S. taxpayers, we seek to establish partnerships between our citizens in order to truly build a strong foundation of mutual trust. Development of durable Pakistani institutions and exchanges between teachers, businessmen and businesswomen, lawyers, doctors, engineers, and students will be the hallmark of a new relationship built on common values.

The people of Pakistan do not want a future condemned by incessant violence. I believe our efforts will help to create an environment that successfully counters extremism.

An essential element of putting our relationship on a more solid footing is how we communicate with the Pakistani people. A June 2010 Pew research survey found that only 17 percent of Pakistanis held a favorable view of the United States, an opinion that has held constant over the past 3 years. Fifty-nine percent in that same survey describe the United States as an enemy. Our diplomats are contending with very difficult dynamics and high levels of mistrust in conducting public diplomacy.

I believe we have made progress in furthering a strategic dialogue with the Pakistani Government, but what we really need is a strategic dialogue with the people of Pakistan. One that, in fact, communicates in Urdu. One that uses media that Pakistanis watch. And one that looks to amplify those moderate, progressive, and credible voices among Pakistan's diverse population that want a better relationship with the United States of America.

There is perhaps some dismay—and that might be an understatement—among the American people for what they perceive as ingratitude from Pakistan. But we cannot expect anything different if the Pakistani people do not know the extent of our investment and partnership. We have got to talk about what we have done there in a more substantial way and in a more strategic way. I look forward to hearing our nominee's perspective on this issue and hope that we can work creatively to shift those public opinion numbers in the years ahead.

Part of improving this relationship with the Pakistani people is maintaining our support for a strong civilian government, as well as democratic institutions. The durability of democratic institutions will be the long-term bulwark against extremism and allow the Pakistani people and its vibrant civil society to express its desires through peaceful democratic means. We have strongly indicated our long-term support for development through the Enhanced Partnership Act, and I look forward to hearing the thoughts of our nominee about how this vehicle can be used to improve the lives of Pakistanis and enhance the standing of the United States in the country.

So, Mr. Ambassador, I once again want to thank you for being here today and for putting yourself forward for continued public service. Your service to our country is greatly appreciated, and we certainly thank you for the work you have done up to now to appear before us.

And I would now like to turn to our ranking member, Senator Lugar, for any opening comments.

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

Senator LUGAR. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I thank you for your work with our chairman, Senator Kerry, to make this hearing possible. The importance of the continuity of having an Ambassador to Pakistan is very obvious, and the need for us to have this hearing and to move it in our business meeting and, hopefully, for the Senate to move rapidly during this time as we head toward recess is imperative. So I take the liberty of mentioning the timeliness of all of this to begin with and with congratulations to all who are trying to move ahead with the business of the Senate.

But nevertheless, I would also say that American national security interests are directly linked, as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, to Pakistan's political, military, economic, and social challenges.

Because Pakistan represents a key regional and national security interest for the United States, in July 2008, then-Senator Biden and I introduced the original Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act to broaden and strengthen the important relationship between the United States and Pakistan.

American economic and military assistance for Pakistan enhances our mutual security, while helping to build a more economically and politically stable country. Economic assistance is as critical to security as strengthening the ability of the Pakistan military to counter terrorism, especially by improving the capacity for governance and economic growth in Pakistan.

I have since had the pleasure to work with Senator Kerry and Congressman Berman and others to see this legislation enacted, with a 5-year authorization of \$7.5 billion. I am pleased to continue to work with them, for example, in the introduction of the Pakistan-American Enterprise Fund. This bill was passed out of our Foreign Relations Committee earlier this week. It should leverage American and Pakistani ingenuity and experience in driving business expansion in Pakistan.

In disbursing Kerry-Lugar funds, effectiveness through proper planning and implementation is more important than speed because the goal is sustainability and a long-term partnership. Initial implementation has proven uncertain, and resources should only follow those efforts that prove effective. Additional collaboration with Pakistani institutions is certainly necessary to assure progress.

Rushing aid and accelerating programming could inhibit our goals of helping Pakistan achieve a more stable and productive economic situation. The country team should avoid spending for the sake of spending but make clear to the Pakistani people the planning and organization that is going on with the government at the federal and provincial levels. This is not a one-sided effort. Pakistan must also initiate and enable cooperation between our two governments to maximize the impact of these resources, as well as create a sustainable environment for economic development.

As Secretary Clinton stated at the United Nations this week, and I quote the Secretary, "As we take these steps, we will follow Pakistan's lead. We look to the Pakistani Government to help shape a strategy that reflects the needs of the Pakistani people. And we are encouraged by the efforts that Pakistan itself is making to institute the economic and tax reforms that will help pave the way toward self-sufficiency. The international community will support Pakistan's efforts, yet we know it has to be a partnership."

While Pakistan's own institutions are primarily responsible for providing rescue and relief during the recent floods, the United States has not wavered in its commitment to help them respond to the crisis through a commitment of over \$345 million. This includes the rescue of 15,000 people and the delivery of helicopters and boats, as well as hundreds of thousands of meals for the displaced and the isolated. In addition to Government action, individual Americans have also given generously through charitable organizations.

The floods have not changed the need for the kind of long-term investment in Pakistan envisioned in Kerry-Lugar-Berman. Humanitarian relief from other sources in response to the floods is appropriate and should be used to the maximum extent possible. Such funding is typically more responsive and properly suited to emergency situations. Due to the crisis environment, however, humanitarian assistance resources are also not as easily monitored.

Some Kerry-Lugar-Berman resources may be appropriate for recovery from the floods, including early recovery, when there is a well thought-out strategy that is consistent with the goals and purposes of the legislation. In such cases, a shift in programming should be considered and the appropriate committees notified. Staff has made clear that transparency and accountability for Kerry-Lugar-Berman funding remains an elemental part of the assistance package.

We welcome the President's nominee for Pakistan here today to replace our able and effective Ambassador, Anne Patterson, and we look forward very much to his testimony.

And I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CASEY. Thank you, Senator Lugar.

And again, we want to commend the great work you have done on Kerry-Lugar-Berman to get that aid through—that package through the Foreign Relations Committee and then through the Congress. We are grateful for that, and we want to monitor very closely how that legislation gets implemented.

We are joined by Senator Kaufman. I wanted to recognize him for opening comments.

**STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD E. KAUFMAN,
U.S. SENATOR FROM DELAWARE**

Senator KAUFMAN. Thank you very much.

And first, I want to thank you for your service, and frankly, even more, thank your family for your service. I know how tough it is on a family to go through this.

And obviously, taking on Pakistan, as you listened to my two wonderful colleagues—Chairman Casey and Ranking Member Lugar—this is a very, very, very, very hard assignment that you have here. But as I told you when you came by the office, my mother used to tell me that nothing in life that is worthwhile is easy. And I might change that to anything that is very, very, very worthwhile is very, very, very hard.

So I really want to thank you for what you are doing. I think you are the right person for the right time. Pakistan is incredibly important, again, as the chairman and ranking member said.

So I want to thank you, and thank you for your service. And I am looking forward to your service in Pakistan.

Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CASEY. Thanks, Senator Kaufman.

Mr. Ambassador, you have about 7 minutes.

**STATEMENT OF CAMERON MUNTER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE
AMBASSADOR TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN**

Ambassador MUNTER. Thank you very much.

Senator Casey, Senator Lugar, Senator Kaufman, it is a privilege and an honor to appear before you this morning, seeking your consent to my candidacy as America's next Ambassador to Pakistan.

I have many to thank for this opportunity—the President and Secretary Clinton for their confidence in my abilities, Senator Casey for making this hearing possible on short notice, Ambassador Holbrooke for his support and guidance.

Thanks also to my parents, who are here—Helen-Jeanne and Len Munter, here today from California, whose wisdom has guided me throughout my life.

My wife, Marilyn, is not here today, but she has been strong and consistent in her love and support for the last three decades of our marriage. And if I am confirmed, Marilyn will join me in Islamabad to end more than 2 years we have spent apart during my recent service in Baghdad and, before that, following the American evacuation of dependents from Belgrade after the attack on the embassy there.

Success will come in Pakistan by building confidence in and working with a strong civilian government. It will be the result of patient efforts on our part to define and address areas of interest

that America and Pakistan share—our counterinsurgency against violent extremists, Pakistan’s ability to achieve its full economic potential, our commitment to social development. We can only achieve this common success with a strong partner in Pakistan’s democratically elected civilian government.

The Enhanced Partnership Act with Pakistan of 2009, which we refer to as Kerry-Lugar-Berman, has demonstrated that Congress supports this approach, providing generously for our efforts to build a long-term partnership between the people of the United States and Pakistan. But the floodwaters that struck Pakistan have made the challenge more difficult.

As Senator Kerry pointed out after his recent trip, the devastation created by the floods is gut-wrenching. Seventeen hundred Pakistanis have died. Twenty million have been affected. America can be proud that it was the “first and the most” in responding to this crisis, providing, as you noted, more than \$345 million with relief and recovery efforts so far, not to mention 50 million dollars’ worth of in-kind assistance from the U.S. military, including evacuating more than 15,000 people, delivering more than 7 million pounds of relief supplies.

International partners and the U.S. private sector have also given generously. We have provided relief and will continue to assist in the longer term recovery and reconstruction because it is the right thing to do. Pakistan needs our support to overcome this terrible tragedy, and the United States will be a source of support in the years to come.

This last key point is key. We are in this for the long haul, as all of you have emphasized. Not only will we supply immediate humanitarian help, we will help Pakistani institutions so they will serve Pakistan well in the years to come. We will do all we can to increase transparency of the relief and recovery effort.

The Pakistani Government can serve its people in a time of need now, tomorrow, and the day after. And we have shown we will be there to help. We and the international community cannot do this alone, however. Pakistan must raise its revenues internally to pay for the needs of its people.

The task ahead requires our firm commitment, and that is why even before the floods struck in July, the administration created and began to implement an ambitious agenda under the strategic dialogue of Pakistan and the United States. The dialogue gets to the heart of our mutual interests by engaging the leadership of our countries in key areas, such as health, agriculture, and economic reform, which, in the aftermath of the floods, will be priorities for us all.

In addition, the strategic dialogue addresses energy issues, defense, and counterterrorism cooperation, nonproliferation, water management, and more. The strategic dialogue is comprehensive and provides the framework for a lasting relationship.

And of course, this partnership has a crucial security element. Pakistan’s security is vital for us and for the region. A secure and stable Pakistan will strengthen security globally.

In 2009, extremists had seized the Swat Valley just 100 miles from Islamabad. Now the Pakistani military is actively engaged and more effectively fighting extremists. This trend must be sus-

tained. Terrorists are still inflicting a terrible toll on Pakistanis, still undermining our efforts in Afghanistan, and still planning attacks on the American people and American cities. Simply put, more must be done.

We must help Pakistan fight the terrorist elements that threaten its own safety and all of our long-term security. We will work closely with our Pakistani friends to ensure the success of democracy and prosperity in neighboring Afghanistan. We will work closely with our Pakistani friends to build confidence in our commitment to nonproliferation.

If confirmed, I pledge to lead a unified team of Americans from across the United States Government to address difficult security challenges and build a lasting relationship with Pakistani counterparts based on honesty and mutual respect. We will not always agree with Pakistan on every priority, but we will work through our differences as partners, with our eyes on a vision we share of a strong, independent Pakistan at peace with its neighbors and free of terrorism.

The administration and the Congress have thus put forth our vision of Pakistan in the years to come—Pakistan as a friend of democracy, Pakistan as a partner in regional security. This vision requires hard work because our policy initiatives must rest on a strong and confident social and economic base in Pakistan, and that base is not as strong and or as confident as either country would like.

We must foster educational and employment opportunities for Pakistan's young people, to explore markets for Pakistan's products to enhance its self-reliance and prosperity. Without a strong civil society, economic growth and reform cannot be sustained. We will continue our robust assistance to the Pakistani Government and to the Pakistani NGO sector to strengthen public support for strong democratic institutions.

These institutions defend the rule of law, protect human rights and the rights of ethnic and religious minorities. They empower women. In short, they make a country great. We will support these institutions with determination, and we will do so humbly as well, with respect for the impressive traditions of Pakistan's people, so that the universal values of equality and justice are pursued as the people of Pakistan would have them pursued.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, these are the key elements of the agenda for the United States in Pakistan—our common fight against terrorism, our common commitment to the stability of the region, and our common task in building the civil institutions in Pakistan to recover and rebuild from the floods and, by doing so, strengthen those institutions for many years to come.

To do these and many other tasks, the U.S. mission to Pakistan must grow, and I thank Congress for recognizing the need for greater resources, especially in these tough times.

If confirmed, I pledge to do my utmost to ensure these resources are applied effectively and transparently. And as you have mentioned, public diplomacy is key. Let us be honest about this. We need to overcome historical skepticism among Pakistanis about American motives in South Asia, and this will require ceaseless engagement, energy, and outreach. It will require wisdom and the

ability to listen, and our excellent press office in Islamabad must do even more. Our cultural exchange programs, including the world's largest Fulbright program, must be constant, confident, and, above all, focused on our goals.

Because if we are to say, as I do, that Pakistanis and Americans are natural friends and natural partners, we must work together, and we must talk openly. We are both diverse cultures. We are both open and generous peoples. And we are young countries, priding ourselves on the traditions we embody.

This diversity, this generosity, and this pride is tested at times like these, as Pakistan and its friend America face great challenges. But it is from great challenges that even greater friendships can be forged.

Thank you for your comments. Thank you for your support, and thank you for your attention to my comments. I welcome the opportunity to answer any of your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Munter follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR-DESIGNATE CAMERON MUNTER

Senator Casey, Ranking Member Lugar, committee members, it's a privilege and an honor to appear before you this morning, seeking your consent to my candidacy as America's next Ambassador to Pakistan. I have many to thank for this opportunity: the President and Secretary Clinton for their confidence in my abilities; Senator Casey for making this hearing possible on such short notice and thus emphasizing our common commitment to American interests in and relations with Pakistan; Ambassador Holbrooke for his support and guidance. I also express my thanks in an even more profound way to my parents, Helen-Jeanne and Len Munter, who have joined us today from California, whose wisdom has guided me all my life. My wife Marilyn is not here today, but she has been strong and consistent in her love and support during three decades of marriage; if I am confirmed, Marilyn will join me in Islamabad to end more than 2 years of separation, during my recent service in Baghdad and before that, following the evacuation of American dependents from Belgrade after the attack on our Embassy there. And thanks also to my children, Dan and Anna, whose lives have also been shaped by the challenges of a Foreign Service career.

I'm well aware that the job of American Ambassador in Pakistan is extraordinarily difficult, and I hope that the challenging Foreign Service career to which I alluded has prepared me well for it, should I be confirmed. In Baghdad, I ran the day-to-day operations of the largest embassy in the world in wartime, and am most proud of my contribution to interagency cooperation and especially to strong civil-military relations during a pivotal year in Iraq. In Belgrade, I tackled the issues of Serbia's post-Kosovo status and aspirations, kept my people safe, and engaged energetically in diplomacy, public and private, to improve our standing and interests in the Balkans. Throughout my career I have contributed to U.S. goals in countries in transition to prosperity and democracy. Our Pakistani friends are sophisticated and experienced, and they deserve our unstinting respect and our unfailing honesty as we face daunting problems together; I hope that my experience presages a cooperation that rests on both idealism and realism.

Success will come in Pakistan by building confidence in, and with, a strong civilian government. It will be the result of patient efforts on our part to define and address areas of interest that America and Pakistan share: our counterinsurgency against violent extremists who attack Pakistan's civilian population and security forces, as well as innocents in the region and around the world; our ability to help Pakistanis realize the full economic potential of their large and talented nation, so that its prosperity improves the welfare of its people and helps build a stable peace in the region; our commitment to social development so that our cultural affinities can flourish. We can only achieve this common success with a strong partner in Pakistan's democratically elected civilian government. The Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009, also known as the Kerry-Lugar-Berman bill, has demonstrated that Congress and indeed, the American people, are giving equally strong backing to this approach, providing generously for our efforts to build a long-term partnership between the people of the United States and Pakistan.

But the floodwaters that struck Pakistan just weeks ago, and are only subsiding now, have made the challenges much more difficult. As Senator Kerry pointed out after his recent trip to view the damage wrought by the flooding, the devastation created by the floods is gut-wrenching. Some 1,700 Pakistanis have died, and 20 million have been affected; there is an immediate need for shelter, food, medicine, and there will be a long-term challenge to rebuild Pakistan's infrastructure. America can be proud that it has been the "first with the most" in responding to the crisis, providing nearly \$345 million dollars to assist with relief and recovery efforts, not to mention nearly 50 million dollars' worth of in-kind assistance from the U.S. military to include halal meals, temporary bridges, and air support for rescue and transport, evacuating more than 15,000 people and delivering 7 million pounds of relief supplies. We have worked closely with international partners, and the U.S. private sector has also given generously. We have provided relief, and will continue to assist with the longer term recovery and reconstruction, because it's the right thing to do. Pakistan needs our support to overcome this terrible tragedy—and the United States will be a source of support in the years to come.

This last is a key point I wish to stress: we are in this for the long haul. Not only will we supply immediate humanitarian help. We will do all we can to help Pakistani institutions as they deal with this challenge, knowing that they will serve Pakistan well for years to come. We will do all we can to increase transparency of the relief and recovery effort because this transparency is in the long-term interest of the Pakistani people, donors from abroad, and the businesses that ultimately must support a more stable and secure Pakistan. Now is the time that the Pakistani Government can serve its people in a time of need: now and tomorrow and the day after, we have shown that we will be there to help.

This will require an even closer relation to the people of Pakistan. That is why, even before the floods struck in late July, the administration had created and begun to implement an ambitious agenda under the Strategic Dialogue between Pakistan and the United States. The Strategic Dialogue gets to the heart of our mutual interests by engaging top leadership of both countries in key areas such as health, agriculture, and economic reform, which, in the aftermath of the floods, will be top priorities for us all. In addition, the Strategic Dialogue addresses energy issues, defense and counterterrorism cooperation, nonproliferation, and water management, to name just a few areas. The Strategic Dialogue is comprehensive, and creates an effective working environment to engage on these and other key issues in coming years. It is providing the framework for a lasting partnership.

Of course this partnership has a crucial security element. Pakistan's security is vital for us and for the region, and a secure and stable Pakistan will strengthen security globally. In 2009, extremists had seized the Swat Valley just 100 miles from Islamabad. Now the Pakistani military is actively engaged and more effectively fighting such extremists. This progress must be sustained—terrorists are still inflicting a terrible toll on Pakistanis, are still able to undermine our efforts in Afghanistan, and are planning attacks on American people and American cities. If confirmed, I will make sure we are doing all we can to encourage and enable Pakistan to continue and expand its efforts against militants.

We must help Pakistan fight the terrorist elements that threaten its own safety and all of our long-term security. It is appropriate that we work closely with our Pakistani friends to ensure the success of democracy and prosperity in neighboring Afghanistan. It is appropriate that we work closely with our Pakistani friends to build confidence in our commitment to nonproliferation. On the American side, this will be a true expression of our unity of purpose, as the civilian and military personnel serving in Pakistan pull together to give clear and purposeful help to our hosts. If confirmed, I pledge to lead a unified team of Americans from across the U.S. Government to address these difficult security challenges as it builds a lasting relationship with Pakistani counterparts based on honesty and mutual respect. We will not always agree with Pakistan on every priority, but we will work through our differences as partners, with our eyes on a vision we can share of a strong, independent Pakistan at peace with its neighbors and free from terrorism.

The administration and the Congress have thus put forth our vision of Pakistan in the years to come: Pakistan as a friend of democracy; Pakistan as a partner in regional security. This vision requires hard work, because our policy initiatives must rest upon a strong and confident social and economic base in Pakistan; and that base is not yet as strong and confident as either country would like. So we must help foster educational and employment opportunities for Pakistan's large and growing population of young people, and the development of markets for Pakistan's products to enhance its self-reliance and prosperity. Without a strong civil society, economic growth and reform cannot be sustained, so we will continue our robust assistance to the Pakistani Government and to the Pakistani NGO sector to

strengthen public support for strong democratic institutions. These institutions defend the rule of law, protect human rights and the rights of religious and ethnic minorities, and empower women—in short, they make a country great. Pakistan has a very vibrant and strong civil society that fights for the well-being of the Pakistani people. We will support such institutions with determination, and we will do so humbly as well, with respect for the impressive traditions of Pakistan's people, so that the universal values of equality and justice are pursued as the people of Pakistan would have them pursued.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, these are the key elements of the agenda of the United States in Pakistan: Our common fight against terrorism; our common commitment to stability in the region; our common task of building civil institutions in Pakistan to recover and rebuild from the floods and by doing so, strengthen those institutions for years to come. To do these and many other tasks, the U.S. Mission to Pakistan will increase its staffing, and I thank the Congress for recognizing the need for greater resources, especially in these very tough times. If confirmed, I pledge to do my utmost to ensure that these resources are applied effectively and transparently; that Americans serving in Pakistan, from AID or the military, consuls to analysts, will all be part of a unified team providing a clear message. Effective communication with the people of Pakistan, Pakistani institutions, and indeed the people back home, is not just the task of State Department officials or ambassadors, but rather, it is the task of everyone on the team. Let's be honest about this: we need to overcome historical skepticism among Pakistanis about American motives in South Asia, and this will require ceaseless engagement, energy, and outreach; it will also require wisdom and the ability to listen. Our excellent press office in Islamabad must do even more, our cultural exchange programs, including the world's largest Fulbright scholar exchange, must be constant, confident, and most of all, focused on the goals we seek to achieve.

Because if we are to say, as I do, that Pakistanis and Americans are natural friends and natural partners, we must back our words with deeds. We are both diverse cultures; we are both open and generous peoples; we are both young countries priding ourselves on traditions we embody. This diversity, this generosity, this pride is tested at times like these, as Pakistan and its friend America face great challenges. But it is from great challenges that even greater friendships are forged.

Thank you for your commitment to the task ahead, and thank you for your attention to my comments. I welcome the opportunity to take your questions.

Senator CASEY. Thank you very much.

And you may have set a record by staying just a few minutes over the time limit. That is—usually, we have folks that go minutes over, and we have to figure out a way to get them back and within their time. We are grateful for that.

I wanted to start with this question, and it is a question that you and I spoke about when you visited my office. And I know you have been deluged with this same question or a related set of concerns throughout this process of preparing for your nomination hearing.

And it is this question of communication. That is one way to describe it, and kind of an image problem in terms of how both sides—the people of both countries view each other. I cited those polling numbers. I hate to read those because they are not encouraging. But it is important to start from some factual basis. That as a people, we are not very popular in Pakistan.

And maybe they differentiate between the U.S. Government and the people of the United States. I hope they do. That always helps. But I think we also have on this side of the discussion a lot of Americans who see Congress moving forward with Kerry-Lugar-Berman and providing \$7.5 billion of taxpayer money, and they expect to have some measure of gratitude extended.

So there is a good bit of distrust or frustration or however you want to describe it on both sides of this. What do we do about that? What do you think has worked in the past to be effective in having a better communication strategy? And what would you do, upon

confirmation, to make sure that we get that—get a better strategy in place to communicate better?

Because it is vital. We can't have the kind of dialogue, strategic dialogue, and get the results from that unless we have better understanding and more mutual trust, which can only come with a lot of engagement.

Ambassador MUNTER. Senator, that is a key issue, and it is at the core of what I hope to achieve, if confirmed and am able to go out to post. The ground that has been laid by Kerry-Lugar-Berman and by our other efforts has changed, in a sense, the opportunity for us inasmuch as we know there is a good story to tell.

And the story to tell is that which you have and your colleagues have emphasized, which is at one of the cores of the narratives in Pakistan about America's staying power and long-term commitment. The fact that you have authorized \$1.5 billion not just now, but over the next 5 years, and that this is seen as something that will lead to even closer ties in business, in culture, et cetera, I think is one of the substantive things that we can then communicate.

So, to begin with, I think what you have allowed us is to have the proper message, and now the mechanisms of how we deal with that message and the mechanisms of how we work with the Pakistanis to communicate are things we must work on very carefully.

I propose, should I be confirmed, to take a team out to the Embassy that would mirror what has happened at some of our other posts where we go beyond the excellent work that our traditional public affairs officers have done to a broader, integrated strategic messaging program.

And this means that everyone, not just the Ambassador or the public affairs officer, everyone is an Ambassador. Everyone is dealing with the public, from our military to our consuls, to our people at our consulates in Lahore and Karachi. In other words, making sure that there is a broad effort to communicate a set of messages that we are not only aimed at having them, in a kind of a crude sense, to appreciate us, but to understand us better.

To do that, I think we have to do better at coming up with less aggregate data, these numbers that you and I have read about the 17 percent or, conversely, the 64 percent of the people in this country who would like to have a better relationship with us. I think we need to do better to understand—to break down, to understand what are the differences. What do different elements of the society—youth, different ethnic groups, women, different political constituencies—what are their priorities?

Because we may have made the mistake in the past of having messages that were, for lack of a better term, one-size-fits-all. A press release from the embassy that talks about something that we are doing. It is a very good thing that we are doing, but somehow it doesn't resonate with certain groups in the country.

This takes a little homework from us—not that we don't know these people, but we have to have a dialogue with different groups in a very diverse country to make sure that, as you have mentioned, the media that we use are the correct media. Just to focus on the print media is important, but not sufficient. Many people get their information in this country from radio.

So that we would have to understand our audience better, have a greater dialogue on what the narrative that they use and their understanding of what we are doing is clear, that we keep very good track of all of the things that we are doing under the assistance and the engagement that you have allowed.

This allows us to deal with the American public in a more coherent way. That is to say that we understand there is not a Pakistan. There are many Pakistanis. There are many interest groups there. We are engaging with all of them, thanks to the resources you have given us, and that this rather complex picture breaks down the stereotype that there are the Pakistanis who have an opinion, but rather there is a diverse and very—a potentially very powerful and successful country with which we can engage on a more nuanced level.

So I can only repeat that, if confirmed, I plan to make this a top priority to bring resources to bear, both so that we can learn more, because public diplomacy is about listening as well as talking, and that we can use that knowledge, both with these various constituencies in Pakistan and with the American public as a whole.

Senator CASEY. Let me just say by way of a comment, that I know that in the work that Anne Patterson has done and the State Department itself, frankly, going back to over two administrations, I saw evidence of that when I was there.

I made two visits the last couple of years, in both instances spending some time in Islamabad getting the briefings that members of Congress get. But also in both Islamabad and in Karachi, another major city that I visited, in both places, in addition to the usual briefings, Ambassador Patterson and others made it possible for us to interact with civil society, business people and public officials and others within Pakistani society.

So I think there have been strenuous efforts made, but it is a particularly difficult situation. And just as our taxpayers and folks here in Washington do get frustrated when we think there is not enough gratitude, on the Pakistani side, they say to us we appreciate your help, but you guys have been short-term friends. I mean, I am encapsulating a larger argument.

So the word that jumped off the page in your statement were two words, “long haul.” That we want to establish a relationship that will be enduring. It won’t be short term and tactical and transactional. It will be of long duration. And it will be, in fact, strategic—not just strategic in a military sense, but in a sense of building a stronger relationship.

So I think the most important thing that we would look for, if you are confirmed—and I think you will be—once you get your feet on the ground and you are up and running, so to speak, if you could provide some way of reporting back to this committee and the Congress about not just general progress on this question, but even outlining a strategy that you can then give us feedback on.

So I know that we could spend even more time on that. But I wanted to move to a second issue, and we may not get enough time to fully develop it. But it is this whole issue of IEDs and the ammonium nitrate that goes into the IEDs. It is a horrific problem for our troops.

And those who follow this know that it isn't simply a question of ammonium nitrate flowing into Afghanistan to be used for IEDs to kill our troops. But, frankly, that is a lot of it or most of it. There might be other places where it is—other sources of it. But for whatever reason, not nearly enough progress has been made on convincing the Pakistani government to not only legislate—that is critically important—but enforce and build a strategy to prevent the flow of this into the country, which is killing our troops.

And even though it is outlawed in Afghanistan, we know we need more of an effort by the Pakistanis. This is a problem that everyone is aware of and working on, starting with the President, his administration. Secretary Clinton has worked on it. General Petraeus is aware of it. I have spoken to him about it—General Jones. I mean, everyone who has anything to do with our national security is working on this. But we haven't made nearly enough progress.

What is your sense of that in terms of what you can do specifically, as Ambassador, to move the ball down the field on preventing the inflow, for lack of a more technical word, of ammonium nitrate into Afghanistan that finds its way into IEDs?

Ambassador MUNTER. It is a key issue. And it is one that illustrates—and I will be frank—how difficult this job is going to be and how our progress will be measured in increments rather than, I imagine, than breakthroughs. Nonetheless, the fact that we are getting incremental progress is a good thing. And it will be across the board.

You mentioned our international efforts that we will keep up. It will be primarily—that would be from the State Department through Global Shield to make sure there are international regiments to regulate the transfer of ammonium nitrate. We also will be working as part of the assistance program that we supply to border guards—we have already begun this—to train them to be able to be more effective in keeping this ammonium nitrate from crossing borders.

And as you had hinted earlier, this is not just a question of skills. It has to be a question of motivation. We have to work with these people to understand these are not just explosives that kill Americans. These are explosives that kill Pakistanis. These are explosives that kill people throughout the region. It is a larger question than ours. It is a partnership issue. I think we can demonstrate that.

As you mentioned, our engagement with private sector is very important. Inasmuch as the working with Honeywell, for example, about ways in which to identify or to at least make the product less explosive and things of that sort, if we can work with the producers as partners to make sure that we don't have—that we lessen the danger of these products. And similarly, the producers in-country to make sure that we are working with them in whatever way we can to oversee, to control, to keep track of the ammonium nitrate.

So that, in other words, it is not something that I see is a quick fix. And it is certainly what you mentioned. This is going to take sustained work throughout that area in which we have—hope to have research. It will be a question every time I talk to the legisla-

tors. It will be a question what—how are they doing on this legislation.

When we are blessed with your visits, I think legislators hearing from legislators makes a big difference. And that is why we welcome your engagement not only here in Washington, but at post as well. So that they hear not only that we are asking something. They understand what a threat it is to them and how in a broad way we can continue to address this issue.

But it is such an illustration, again, of how we are going to make—we are going to grind out the yardage on this one. We will keep doing it, and I think it is going to take us a long time. But nothing could be more important.

Senator CASEY. Thank you. I know I am over time.

Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador, my first set of questions are with regard to accountability for United States assistance. One of the hallmarks of the Kerry-Lugar-Berman Act was that we stressed accountability. And we stressed it because it is key to ensure annual funding. We are going to have to appropriate money each year, even though we have a 5-year authorization commitment.

And we can ill afford to continue to read reports of inadequate monitoring and evaluation controls, such as the June 2010 inspector general report for the 2009 program, which said that it could “not provide reasonable assurance that the \$44 million in cash transfer funds had actually reached 140,000 displaced families,” as intended.

While there are acknowledged challenges to delivering assistance, there must be adequate efforts to ensure its proper use. Staff visits earlier this month found similar concerns exist for an \$89 million cash transfer program initiated earlier this year. My questions are: How will you address such findings as Ambassador? What options do you have in altering or ending programs that fail to live up to our expectations?

And second, while the administration is emphasizing greater flows through host country institutions, how prepared are the Pakistanis to partner with us on the effective expenditure of those funds? While the goal of achieving such cooperation and oversight is laudable, shouldn't we continue to work mostly with transparent aid organizations familiar with the region that they are in?

Ambassador MUNTER. Thank you, sir.

This gets to the heart of the difficulty of implementing the generosity of KLB. And you are right that what the inspectors have talked about is something that the Embassy is very aware of. And I pledge that if I am confirmed, I will certainly spend enormous amount of time with AID to make sure that we get a handle on how the aid is being disbursed and how we can oversee it.

One item will be that we will continue to have an assistance coordinator at the Embassy. That position will remain. In my experience in Baghdad, I felt that this was something that in the embassies that have a large aid portfolio, it is crucial that we have someone who is coordinating and keeping track of all of the technical questions that people are following.

Similarly, I think that we will see, now that the AID mission has come up to full staffing and has gotten some new leadership, that their plans to address the questions of the weakness or perceived weakness of the Pakistanis in getting aid out can be addressed through such mechanisms as the preaward assessments, the insistence that either the institution or the ministry has proper auditing facilities, and, if not, that we will actually supply that auditing and that we will do comprehensive reviews.

We will keep the IGs there. The State IG and the AID IGs play an important role in watching over these issues. And I would say that I am optimistic that what my predecessors, what Anne Patterson and her team have built over this last year in adjusting to the first wave, if you will, of Kerry-Lugar-Berman has set the stage for a regime for transparency that, though I don't yet know the details, not being at post, but if I am confirmed, I will look into this and make sure that we have—we can give you confidence that these kinds of questions about aid are answered.

Senator LUGAR. My second set of questions you have partially answered. I wanted to talk about the Embassy's organization for assistance. The creation of the position of coordinator of economic assistance within the country team has led to a situation where the longstanding role of USAID as the lead on development has been modified.

Now this structure has been used in war zones, such as Iraq and Afghanistan, as you are aware. You have already said you would sustain the coordinator position for Pakistan, and you also indicated, and I was going to ask, what role you envision for the mission director and the USAID mission. I would also like to ask, Who coordinates with the Office of the Defense Representative within the Embassy?

Ambassador MUNTER. I believe that the person who should pull this together on all assistance, the strategic view of assistance and the transparency and implementation, should be the strategic—should be the assistance coordinator. That means there would be a team, a cross-cutting team under her direction that would include the people from the ODRC, from the military, that would include the AID team.

This is not meant to clip the wings of AID. And my experience in Baghdad and my experience talking with Mr. Shah at AID, we want to make that very clear. AID has extraordinarily important role, has skills that no one else in the embassy does. The point here is not to tell them what to do. The point is to make sure that everyone understands and everyone consistently follows the strategic guidelines that are not only applied to those specific AID tasks, but throughout the mission.

Senator LUGAR. Well, we are counting on you from your experience with such situations in other countries to understand how this country team has to have a very special organizational structure for the crisis situation that we face in Pakistan. I think you have outlined a very reasonable approach to this, but I raised the question simply because this committee, obviously, will be tremendously interested in how all of this works and your subsequent reports as to how the country team incorporated each of these elements.

Now I would also like to inquire with regard to post-flood assistance. Humanitarian assistance is responsive and has proven effective in delivering needed relief to crisis zones. Development assistance is the key foreign policy tool designed to have a greater degree of scrutiny and far-reaching impact.

How does the administration and how will you as Ambassador consider the Kerry-Lugar-Berman resources in light of the competing humanitarian and recovery needs that face Pakistan this year? What priorities and what purposes do you see as you review some of the existing programs and plans?

Second, the United States response to the 2005 Pakistan earthquake was through humanitarian resources. Are the short-term public-relations gains of the 2005 earthquake response sufficient to warrant the use of development funds for humanitarian purposes?

And finally, crisis response zones make it increasingly difficult to monitor the use of assistance. How will strict oversight parameters outlined in the Kerry-Lugar-Berman legislation be maintained in this post-flood environment? In other words, describe the current situation, the flood and that which precedes, but likewise, inter-relationship with the development cost, the thing we have just discussed with the country team and the coordinator monitoring.

Ambassador MUNTER. It is a complex task. And if I am confirmed, it will be something that—I will be honest with you—I will have a great deal to learn from the experts who are there. But what we have in mind is to be rigorous in our understanding of the three phases that we are facing—the relief phase, the recovery, and then the reconstruction.

Obviously, we never want to lose sight of the fact that Kerry-Lugar-Berman funds, the intent of the authors—and I don't mean to tell the authors what their intent was—but that the intent, obviously, is long term. That is to say these are not band-aids.

In this first phase, the AID funding generally and the funds that we use for humanitarian work have generally been sufficient. We have generally out of the kind of the funds that we have cited in, I think, all of our prepared remarks—that has been OTI, other kinds of AID funding—that has been very effective.

Inasmuch as there is a use for Kerry-Lugar-Berman funds that would address the floods, it would be my guidance to the team that I have described to you that that use would be only in preparing, in addressing the needs of the flood to prepare for more effective use of the long-term projects.

To give an example, if we have a project that involves making irrigation ditches more effective and if, as we know, the irrigation ditches about which we spoke maybe 6 months ago are gone, we have some choices in the immediate relief and in the reconstruction and in recovery to address how we deal with bringing things back to status quo ante.

And if we do it in a way that leads to more effective use in the long runs of irrigation projects, I would consider that legitimate to have a discussion about using Kerry-Lugar-Berman funding, because it is not just replacing something. It is building a recovery that has a long-term perspective. So that kind of strategic guidance is what I would have in mind there.

Now, the priorities—we have a very ambitious strategic dialogue that goes into so many areas and uses that applies the funds that Kerry-Lugar-Berman have given us, 13 areas of strategic dialogue, all of which are important.

I think that we are going to have to do some prioritizing, and I think that the reason for that is that things like health, things like agriculture, things like infrastructure repair are going to be things we need to do quickly. We have to have impact. And this, to me, circles back again to our public diplomacy question.

What are those things that will be most recognized by the Pakistanis so that if, for example, we are rebuilding the bridges that have been swept out of the Swat Valley, that those bridges are there quickly and that those bridges are recognized as something America has done for the country?

That is to say, it is all part of an attempt to build, and through the relief and perhaps through the use of Kerry-Lugar-Berman funds, for the long-term goal of meeting the needs of the Pakistani people, but also meeting the needs of understanding in the public sphere what we are doing. So that is how some of the priorities might change somewhat from where they were 6 months ago.

And as for the oversight, once again, I am hoping that in our assessment of how the assistance coordinator and AID work with me, but also work with our military colleagues, who are also engaged in some of these questions, that it is consistent and clear to you, and better be clear to me.

Thank you.

Senator LUGAR. I thank you for that comprehensive answer. My time has expired, but I will add one footnote.

Dr. Peter Armacost, who is the president of Lahore Christian College, is a personal friend. He was formerly president of Eckerd College in Florida and courageously headed out to Lahore, where he has been now for 6 years. A lot of my insight as to what is occurring there has come through Dr. Armacost.

But I mentioned that university because it does seem to me to offer a potential business plan for progress in higher education in which Muslim students, Christian students, others, from across the entire country, have gathered together, I believe, with a student body of 4,000 or 5,000 students and had an impact. I would just draw that to your attention, to that effective platform, as an area of potential where I know that there is some work with the Embassy now.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador MUNTER. And thank you. And believe me, in the notion of outreach, we certainly don't want to limit that simply to government, though that is important. But that these institutions, and especially institutions of higher learning, this is a potential area for great cooperation for us to learn and for us to implement what you have laid out in Kerry-Lugar-Berman with really good partners who know their way around. So, thank you.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

Senator CASEY. Thank you, Senator Lugar.

We are joined by our ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator Risch.

Senator RISCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Munter, can you help enlighten me about America's reputation in Pakistan, what they think of us, what kind of an appreciation they have? I have read the polling materials, which really aren't very encouraging, to say the least.

Do they have even a modicum of understanding that what we are doing for them, whether it be building bridges in the Swat Valley or what have you, that we are encumbering our kids' and our grandkids' future, that we don't have any money anymore? This Government is going to borrow 41 cents out of every dollar it spends this year.

And I mean this is a real sacrifice Americans are making, and they are sacrificing their children's and grandchildren's future in order to build infrastructure in Pakistan. Do they have even a modicum of appreciation for what Americans are doing for them?

Ambassador MUNTER. I think this, as we noted earlier, is a vital question because, in general terms—and I am speaking of someone who has not yet come to post and, if confirmed, I will try to verify this—I don't think it is a question that they don't know what we are doing. The question is the skepticism of why we are doing it and what our goals are and what our relationship is.

I think the historical experience of America and Pakistan indicates that there have been times of mistrust. And we are—at this point, with our generous help to Pakistan, which we understand to be in the interests of both countries, we are perhaps not doing as well as we might in understanding the impact of that past and that idea in the mind of Pakistanis when we see these aggregate figures of popularity, 17 percent of the people positive, and skepticism about the American assistance.

So the task, I think is to make sure that we are honest, open, and clear, as Senator Lugar has said, about the process, that it is understood to be a straightforward and honest process in investing this money and that it is understood why we are doing it, and that we understand and we are able to articulate to Americans that the reason this is taking time is because of the historical skepticism.

Whether or not they are right, the question is there are many who are skeptical about our motives. And we at the Embassy have to explain, perhaps in better ways, or engage with our friends to explain for us—our friends from academia, our friends from the business community—to explain on our behalf why the Americans are being so generous, why we are taking on this task, which is a big burden for America, an enormous burden for America.

That is the task of this public diplomacy to which I alluded at the very beginning of this session that we need to do better to engage them so that this question becomes easier for us to understand. So that they are able to say, "I get it. I see why you are doing this," and build trust. And that trust, I think, will ultimately reflect itself in these public figures.

But this is a long and very, very complex issue. And I wish I had an easier answer, and I understand the frustration of the American people and the American Congress. And yet, this is something that we have to solve through painstaking engagement all across Pakistani society.

Senator RISCH. Well, thank you, Mr. Munter.

And I mean, it is human nature that people like to see some kind of appreciation for the sacrifices that they are making. And perhaps when you are there, in order to diminish the fear of the motives and what have you, if they have a clearer understanding of the sacrifice this is. I mean, this is—you know, we don't have any money anymore. It is gone. We are spending our kids' and our grandkids' money.

And certainly, they are human beings like we are, and they understand when you are encumbering your kids' and your grandkids' future, what a sacrifice that is and what level that rises to as far as sacrifice is concerned. So perhaps that will help, as you move forward, to convince them that our motivations are what they are.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador MUNTER. Thank you.

And I don't have a higher priority than addressing that issue because I know it is at the root of our relationship with Pakistan. Thank you.

Senator CASEY. Thank you, Senator Risch.

I wanted to raise a question about religious freedom. Before I do that, I wanted to go back for a moment to the ammonium nitrate question. When we passed a resolution through the Senate by consent—and as anyone who follows the Senate knows, that doesn't happen very often, unless it is something that is often of not great significance. So to do something as significant as getting an ammonium nitrate resolution through was a great achievement, but it was bipartisan, a bipartisan resolution.

And I wanted to highlight that because it is something—as I said before, I have raised this issue with everyone who will listen, spoken a number of times both, you know, from the chair that I sit on the committee, to Ambassador Holbrooke, and he has worked very hard on this, in addition to those—the many other administration officials, starting with the very top at the State Department, Secretary Clinton and others.

But I would ask you, when you are—and I believe you will be—confirmed, but upon confirmation, when you are on the ground, to use that resolution as a guide. It is not a comprehensive list of strategies or methods to make progress on getting legislation passed on ammonium nitrate, but if you want to get a sense of what the Congress is most concerned about—and I believe, by extension, the American people—is that we want to take—or make, I should say, every effort by the State Department, by the Congress, by any means necessary to get legislation passed on ammonium nitrate so it doesn't keep killing our soldiers, and regulation and enforcement. A law is no good if it won't be enforced. So I would just ask you to use that resolution as a guide.

As it relates to religious freedom, in July, Pakistan's federal minister for minority affairs, Shahbaz Bhatti, established a national interfaith council to promote understanding and tolerance among different faiths in Pakistan. Such efforts can help lead to a more stable Pakistan, and I think that is self-evident not only in that country, but in any country.

And even more urgently needed, given the devastation caused by the flood, the statement issued directly after the council met urged increased tolerance and denounced terrorism and was signed by

Pakistan's leading religious figures—the four principal imams, the heads of its principal madrassas, the leading Catholic and Protestant bishops, and the leaders of the Ahmadi, Buddhist, and Farsi communities. That is a pretty comprehensive list of faith leaders.

In conversations I had with him earlier this year—I am talking about Mr. Bhatti—detailing how promoting interfaith understanding can help win the hearts and minds of Pakistanis and pull them away from extremist groups, his work with the council and other initiatives present a unique opportunity for the U.S. to support Pakistani initiatives that is critical to our efforts to promote human rights and democracy and, obviously, has national security implications.

I would ask you how, if you are confirmed, you would partner with Mr. Bhatti and others to do everything possible to further and advance that important work on interfaith dialogue and interfaith efforts to put in place better understanding between faiths that I know will have good results if we are successful with advancing it?

Ambassador MUNTER. Well, I agree absolutely with what you said, that this is an enormous opportunity that we have to support. My understanding is that the Embassy, led by Ambassador Patterson, is in close touch with Mr. Bhatti and, indeed, that when we have visits from senior American figures, both from the Senate, from the Congress, but also from the executive branch, we make a point of hearing his opinion and those people around him.

Now, he is not only engaged in the interfaith dialogue, but from his ministry, which does focus primarily on Christian-Jewish-Hindu areas, there are other faiths that need to be brought into even greater focus in our concerns, our interests. That is the question about the Ahmadis, who are the victims of violence even this year, the question of the Buddhists, Farsis, the others, for whom there is not only the question of tolerance and freedom, but the respect for their heritage and sites in the country that we also believe and supported.

I think that inasmuch as we can support him, inasmuch as we can support the interfaith dialogue, and inasmuch as we—through this outreach that I was describing, getting more to the constituent parts of Pakistan—can identify even more partners not only at the high levels, but for our young officers as well, it has got to be a key element that we have. And this is where I think the diversity of Pakistan finds a certain resonance with the diversity of the United States.

I think we can have a dialogue that gets past some of these elements that I talked about, the skepticism about the past, to find those kinds of similarities that we have and to find among these kinds of partners the commitment to interfaith reconciliation can only help us in our long-term cultural counterpart to the economic help that we are giving them as well.

Senator CASEY. I was recalling, as you were answering, that one of the best moments I had in my last visit there—this would be August of 2009. I think it was our last—a last part of our schedule before we got up the next morning to leave—was an interfaith dinner with folks who had been laboring through Ramadan.

And what a remarkable faith tradition that makes it possible for people to express the tenets of their faith through fasting. And we

were able to talk in a very constructive way with a cross section of faiths at that dinner. So it was a real highlight. And something that doesn't get in the newspaper very often, the way that there is an interfaith dialogue, a foundation there. And I think we can foster and amplify that.

Let me ask you one more question in this area of religious freedom. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has recommended that Pakistan be designated a "country of particular concern" for the systemic, ongoing, and egregious violations of religious freedom. The country's blasphemy law carries the death penalty. It requires no evidence and has been repeatedly used against minority religious groups and also against Muslims viewed as breaking with certain orthodoxies.

Pakistan has aggressively pushed a so-called "defamation of religions" resolution at the United Nations. This resolution is essentially an attempt to internationalize blasphemy laws. It would undercut international norms on the freedoms of religion and expression.

Taking all of this into account and comparing Pakistan's conduct with other countries currently listed as countries of particular concern by the State Department, Pakistan meets the criteria and is a glaring omission. What is your view of this part of the religious freedom discussion and debate? And how can the United States do more to improve conditions in the country as it relates to this particular concern about the blasphemy resolutions and the violations of religious freedom?

Ambassador MUNTER. In the specific issue, we have always gone to the Pakistani Government and to the Pakistani public that we believe that any restriction on press freedom serves no purpose, that it doesn't help achieve a goal. In fact, it does the opposite. We weight it many times against the restrictions of the blasphemy law.

I will have to check for you on the reasons for the ranking of Pakistan in the religious freedom report and get back to you on that. I can only say that everything I understand about what the Embassy is doing now puts the blasphemy law and other issues of religious and minority freedom on the agenda always in meeting with the leaders of the country. I certainly plan to continue that. And on that specific question, I will look into that and let you know.

Senator CASEY. Thank you.

Senator LUGAR.

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Chairman, I have just one further question.

We have, from time to time, lamented the work of A.Q. Khan and his work with others, for that matter, to spread the technology of nuclear weapons and potential for difficulty this entails in a host of countries. My understanding is that he is free of house arrest now, and is still considered in heroic status in Pakistan.

We have dealt today essentially with questions regarding economics, politics, and the development of civil society. But a very large part of the relationship that the United States has with Pakistan and, in that matter, with other countries, frequently comes down to nonproliferation, or at least the inventory and control of weapons of mass destruction. This is because proliferation has the potential to create violence not only for the specific countries in-

volved, but in others who may feel threatened by this state of affairs and wish for defenses and international regulation.

This is a question which is entirely speculative, but one which I suspect that you are prepared to attempt to address through work with the Pakistani Government. As the rest of the world comes to conferences, such as we just had in Washington this time on non-proliferation, countries pledged to, in essence, ship back various weapons or materials in a manner fully transparent with the other countries. Such pledges at the conference were made so that the world might be safer, as opposed to there being questions of security if proliferation occurs.

Now, have you given any thought to this general area? And what kind of thoughts or response can you give as part of this hearing?

Ambassador MUNTER. Here, I don't think we have made a lot of progress with the Pakistanis. And I intend to raise the question again of our repeated requests to have our people be able to interview Mr. Khan. And the point being that we are trying to communicate the idea that this is an issue that is an issue for everyone, not just an American favor asked of Pakistan, but something that American-Pakistani partnership, if we are able to build it, this must be a part of it as well.

In addition, the fissile material control treaty, which is, in fact, being blocked at certain times or certainly is being held back by the Pakistanis, this is not something that we think makes sense. We urge them to be constructive in this area, once again, not because they are doing it for us in a transactional way, but because this is something that is of interest to everyone in the world, not just Americans, but the international community and Pakistan itself.

If confirmed, I will address this. But again, I think this is going to be a very tall order. I think we have had real difficulties on this in the past. But we have got to stay on it.

Senator LUGAR. Well, I thank you for that statement and your preparation, as you say, for a very tall order.

Ambassador MUNTER. Thank you.

Senator LUGAR. And I congratulate you on your testimony today and look forward to supporting your nomination. We are hopeful that you and your wife will be able to serve with safety to your persons and likewise with the full confidence of this country behind you.

Ambassador MUNTER. Thank you.

Senator CASEY. Let me reiterate and associate myself with what Senator Lugar just said. We are grateful for the effort you are putting forth to continue your public service, and we look forward to your confirmation as Ambassador. We have lots more questions, but we are out of time.

But thank you so much for being here today. We will try to move as fast as we can to get this confirmation completed.

Ambassador MUNTER. I am grateful, and I look forward not only to working with you here, but to see you out in the field as well.

Senator CASEY. Thank you.

This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:58 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF AMBASSADOR-DESIGNATE CAMERON MUNTER TO QUESTIONS
SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD

Question. In your view, how can the United States and other regional partners work to help Pakistan and India make improvements in their bilateral relationship, which are not only in their interest, but in the interest of broader regional stability? What do you see as the prospects for improved relations between these two nations during your term, if confirmed?

Answer. We have strong bilateral relations with India and Pakistan that are based on interests we share with each country. Good relations with either country do not come at the expense of good relations with the other. If confirmed, I look forward to meeting with Ambassador Roemer, U.S. Ambassador to India, to discuss this issue going forward.

Ultimately, it is up to India and Pakistan to set the pace and parameters for improving their relations. We look forward to the day when India and Pakistan enjoy friendly, neighborly relations and believe both India and Pakistan have an important role to play in stability and security of South Asia. We are engaged with both countries, and encourage them to work together to bring peace to their region.

We applaud the Indian and Pakistani governments for holding talks this year and encourage future meetings. We are pleased that their Prime Ministers met formally at the SAARC summit in Bhutan this April (we understand that their previous meeting dated back to July 2009), followed by meetings of the Foreign Secretaries and Home Ministers in June and Foreign Ministers meeting this July.

Question. It has been our strategy for several years to increase aid to Pakistan in the hopes that it will begin to consistently address all of the militant groups in the country but it has not done so. At what point should we pursue a new strategy to address this problem and what ideas do you have for new approaches?

Answer. The highest U.S. priority in both Afghanistan and Pakistan is defeating and destroying al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups, and eliminating extremist safe havens in Pakistan. Implementing this policy in Pakistan requires three distinct but mutually reinforcing elements:

- Short-term stabilization, to include humanitarian relief and immediate assistance to conflict- and flood-affected areas.
- Security assistance that builds the capacity of the Pakistani military to conduct counterinsurgency operations and strengthens civilian law enforcement capabilities.
- Medium- and long-term development and security assistance programs that create the foundation for a stable economy that provides jobs and supports a strong, moderate, competent government that exercises control across all of its territory and is responsive to its people.

The success of these efforts will depend heavily on our ability to build a sustainable strategic partnership with the Government of Pakistan and the Pakistani people. Over the past year, the administration has made significant progress in building the foundation for a stronger partnership through the U.S.-Pakistan Strategic Dialogue and other hands-on efforts to directly engage Pakistani leaders and the general population.

Question. According to our intelligence community, instability in Pakistan is driven primarily by poor governance and lack of socioeconomic reform. Efforts to encourage Pakistan to address these issues are therefore critical to our success in the region.

- How would you assess progress in this area and how can we work with various partners in Pakistan to prevent militant elements from taking greater advantage of the current crisis generated by the floods?

Answer. Over the past year we have made great strides in expanding our relationship with Pakistan beyond security issues. We are engaged in an active dialogue with the Pakistanis, the international community and the Pakistani diaspora to help the Pakistani people overcome the political, economic, and security challenges that threaten Pakistan's future and undermine regional stability.

Our civilian assistance strategy is focused directly building the Pakistani Government's capacity to address the basic needs of its people, and to provide improved economic opportunities to engender a more stable and prosperous nation. The recent humanitarian disaster caused by the floods has added a tremendous challenge for the country. We can only prevent militant groups from taking greater advantage of

the current crisis if we make sure that there is as little room as possible for anyone else who tries to exploit the desperate needs of so many people. For this, we need to be present and visible over the long-term.

We have to ensure that the Pakistani people understand that we are in there for the long haul and that our engagement with their government goes beyond just security cooperation. We can do this by working with the Government of Pakistan and our implementing partners on the ground to provide assistance that better the lives of Pakistanis affected by the flood. We must also improve upon our ability to communicate effectively with the Pakistani people to get the message out about our assistance and help build the relationship over the long term. This is a significant challenge, and a top priority for me, if I am confirmed.

- With respect to the floods, are you satisfied that there has been equal access to aid across the populace?

Answer. We are monitoring the situation as closely as possible in order to make sure that assistance is distributed in an equitable manner. In addition, the Government of Pakistan has set up a commission to oversee the equitable distribution of aid within the country and ensure transparency with the international donor community. While the exact mechanisms and authorities of this commission remain to be defined, we continue to work with the civilian administration in Pakistan to address concerns of accountability and transparency related to assistance.

Question. There is broad agreement that a major source of discontent in Pakistan is lack of access to justice. The Kerry-Lugar-Berman bill sought to address this by requiring assistance for civilian law enforcement. The Kerry-Lugar money was intended to train police officers to do criminal investigations that will enhance access to justice, not to train police officers to perform as an extension of the military, but I am concerned that this is not being implemented as intended. If you are confirmed, will you commit to reviewing this issue and reporting back to me?

Answer. In keeping with the Afghanistan-Pakistan Regional Stabilization Strategy, our law enforcement assistance in Pakistan focuses on building capacity in areas most affected by the insurgency: Khyber-Pakhtunkwa (KPk) and the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). To achieve this objective, in 2009, the Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement (INL) commenced a new training effort in KPk enabling its police to prevent and respond to insurgency-related incidents, including suicide bombings, improvised explosive device IEDs detonations, kidnappings and targeted killings in addition to the traditional tenants of civilian policing, such as human rights, investigative skills and community policing.

Also, INL is working to strengthen the capacity of the FATA tribal Levies by providing police skills training and equipment, as well as “hard police” training to enhance their response to volatile security situations.

Improved performance of civilian law enforcement in these regions is critical to the long-term success of the Pakistan military’s counterinsurgency effort and will also bolster public confidence in civilian institutions.

Question. Religious freedom is a noted problem in Pakistan, and according to the most recent State Department report, serious problems remain, including that “[d]iscriminatory legislation and the Government’s failure to take action against societal forces hostile to those who practice a different religious belief fostered religious intolerance, acts of violence, and intimidation against religious minorities.” This has been of particular concern to Ahmadiyya Muslim communities in the United States, including my constituents.

- If confirmed, how would you work to underscore the importance of religious freedom and other human rights issues with the Pakistani Government?

Answer. We remain deeply concerned about the treatment of all religious minorities in Pakistan, including Ahmadis. The close monitoring of the human rights situation in Pakistan is one of our highest priorities. In our discussions at all levels with the Government of Pakistan (GOP) as well as with members of the Pakistani civil society we underline the importance of equal protection of every Pakistani citizen.

That is especially true with regard to religious freedom. Although the GOP has undertaken some steps in order to enhance the situation of religious minorities, more can be done. Pakistan’s Constitution states that adequate provisions are to be made for Muslim and non-Muslim minorities to profess and practice their religious beliefs freely. However, Pakistan’s “blasphemy laws” are often used to justify acts of violence and intimidation against religious minorities as well as against Muslims who hold minority views, such as the Ahmadiyya community. As stated in our “Annual Report on International Religious Freedom” and “Country Report on

Human Rights Practices,” while the Government of Pakistan has taken steps to improve the treatment of religious minorities, serious religious freedom concerns remain. The Department of State considers Pakistan’s blasphemy and anti-Ahmadi laws discriminatory.

If confirmed, I will continue to raise concerns with the GOP about this discriminatory legislation and call on the GOP to expand its efforts to grant protection especially to those within the Pakistani society who need it the most. In addition, we need to maintain a robust dialogue with those religious leaders, teachers, and other people within Pakistani civil society who can serve as multipliers for promoting peace and tolerance in order to ensure better protection of the fundamental rights of every Pakistani citizen.

