

**NOMINATIONS OF THE 113TH
CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION**

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—
MAY 7 THROUGH DECEMBER 17, 2013
—

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



S. HRG. 113-319

NOMINATIONS OF THE 113TH CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MAY 7 THROUGH DECEMBER 17, 2013

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

48-305 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2014

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

**NOMINATIONS OF CAROLINE KENNEDY, ANNE
PATTERSON, GREGORY STARR**

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

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

Caroline Kennedy, of New York, to be Ambassador to Japan
Hon. Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of
State for Near Eastern Affairs
Gregory B. Starr, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for
Diplomatic Security

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Hon. Robert Menendez (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Menendez, Cardin, Shaheen, Murphy, Kaine, Markey, Corker, Risch, Flake, McCain, and Barrasso.

Also Present: Senators Charles Schumer and Kristen Gillibrand.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY**

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. This hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will come to order. Today we have a distinguished group of nominees for some critical positions in our Foreign Service. We will start off with the nominee for the ambassadorship to Japan, Caroline Kennedy. Normally, the chair and ranking member would make their opening statements first, but since we have two of our colleagues here today we are going to extend them the courtesy of making their comments and presentations to the committee first, and then we will give our opening statements. We look forward to having our two distinguished colleagues present their constituent from the State of New York.

I also appreciate my colleague and friend, Congressman Crowley being here in the audience as well.

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW YORK**

Senator SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and Senator Corker, not only for the courtesy of introducing our great constituent, but for the great job you have been doing on this committee, and thank all the members for being here.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, it is my great privilege to introduce an individual who is well known to this committee, to most Americans, and to so many people around the world. Caroline Bouvier Kennedy is an American author, editor, philanthropist, and attorney, and I am proud to present her as President Barack Obama's nominee to be the next Ambassador to Japan.

I would like to welcome her lovely family, who I have had the privilege of knowing. Her husband Edwin Schlossberg and two of her three wonderful children are here: Tatiana, who actually went to high school with my daughter, and John. And Rose is in California, as well as Vicki Kennedy, Tim Shriver, John Bouvier, who are joining us here today as well. I am also sure that her father, mother, her uncles, and extended family are looking down with pride upon this hearing.

I should also note that I am extremely impressed that Caroline made it to this hearing today. You see, Mr. Chairman, just this past weekend she and her daughter Tatiana swam the Hudson River to raise money for the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society. It is a 3-mile swim from Nyack to Sleep Hollow, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure either of us could have accomplished that amazing feat.

But back to the introduction. Caroline Kennedy was educated in New York and Massachusetts. She attended the Brearley School, the Convent of the Sacred Heart, and the Concord Academy. She earned her bachelor of arts at Radcliffe College at Harvard University, her J.D. from Columbia Law School, graduating in the top 10 percent of her class.

From there, she embarked on a long and distinguished career that has spanned law and politics, as well as education and charitable work. It is a career that leaves me no doubt she is well qualified to take on this great task that awaits her if she is confirmed as the next United States Ambassador to Japan.

Caroline Kennedy grew up in the public eye and we as a nation grew up with her, sharing her joys as well as her heartbreaks. Born into a family that has built a legacy of service, both domestic and globally, she has dedicated her life to public service and to the elevation of our public debate, something badly needed these days. She has authored and edited books on the Bill of Rights, the right to privacy, poetry, and patriotism. She has served as a member of many, many boards of directors, the Commission on Presidential Debates, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, and New York City's Fund for the Public Schools.

She also serves as an adviser to the Harvard Institute of Politics and as president of the Kennedy Library Foundation, something all of us here have taken a great interest in because it is doing such a great job up there in Massachusetts.

In 2002 Caroline turned her attention to New York City's public schools and she accepted Mayor Bloomberg's offer to serve in the New York City Department of Education as the Director of the Office of Strategic Partnerships. In that position she succeeded in raising tens of millions in private funding to help modernize New York City's public schools, and we have many beautiful, new, up-to-date public schools in New York teaching kids, giving them a path, because of her efforts.

You see, Mr. Chairman, Caroline Kennedy represents the best of what our Nation has to offer and her dedication to public service continues in her desire to represent our Nation in Japan.

Too often forgotten in the history of the United States-Japanese relations is the critical role her father, President John F. Kennedy, and her uncle, Senator Bobby Kennedy, played in stabilizing that relationship in a time of crisis. Their efforts enhanced bilateral relations on a personal, cultural, and diplomatic basis and helped solidify the close and enduring ties between our countries that have lasted to this very day. A half century later, Mr. Chairman, I am fully confident that Caroline Kennedy will help nurture those ties built by her father and uncle and no doubt strengthen relations for another half century to come.

We all know that Japan remains one of our important allies in the Asia-Pacific region. It is a critical partner as we continue our economic strategy and pivot to the region. It is entering one of the most exciting periods in its history, because Japan is launching a bold economic program, which includes a major focus on women in the workforce, what has come to be called "womenomics." I am confident that Caroline Kennedy will serve as a role model for Japanese, as well as American, women, especially in light of the fact that, if confirmed, she would be the first woman to be Ambassador to Japan, something that makes me and Senator Gillibrand very, very happy.

Caroline's appointment would be a reaffirmation of the importance we place on bilateral relations at a time when Prime Minister Abe says "Japan is back."

As you well know, Mr. Chairman, a key to successful ambassadors in Japan and elsewhere has been a close relationship that the ambassador has with the President. Caroline Kennedy has precisely the sort of close relationship with President Barack Obama that will ensure United States-Japan relations remain a focus at the very highest levels.

I have known her for many years. We have worked on many things together. She is one of the most sincere individuals I have ever met. Her passion to do right and do good burns so strongly within her. And I am certain that she will be able to take our dynamic relationship with Japan to new heights.

So I am proud to wholeheartedly support Caroline Kennedy's nomination to be the next Ambassador to Japan, and I hope my colleagues will unanimously support her as well.

Thank you for the privilege—it is truly a privilege—to make this introduction.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Schumer.
Senator Gillibrand.

**STATEMENT OF HON. KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND,
U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW YORK**

Senator GILLIBRAND. Thank you, Senator Schumer, for those great remarks.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker. I am deeply honored to have the opportunity to introduce you today to Ms. Caroline Kennedy, a favorite daughter of New York, as Ambassador-designee to Japan. The confidence President Obama and Sec-

retary Kerry have placed in her to represent the United States in Japan and advance relations with a key U.S. ally in the Asia-Pacific region is well earned.

Ms. Kennedy has proven herself extraordinarily qualified for the position and the Nation will be stronger with her presence in Japan as the United States rebalances diplomatic engagement and resources toward the Asia-Pacific region. In addition to Ms. Kennedy's distinguished career as an author and an attorney, as president of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation and chair of the Senior Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics at Harvard University, she has dedicated much of her life to charitable and educational service. Her work has helped inspire generations of students and others to make their voices heard and to serve and strengthen our country.

I had the pleasure of visiting the Asia-Pacific region earlier this month, including Tokyo, where I was able to discuss with Japanese officials the deep and abiding relationship between the United States and Japan. This relationship has stood for decades and is a cornerstone in our efforts to bolster stability and security throughout the region amidst a rising number of challenges, including the ever-provocative North Korean regime intent on expanding its nuclear program over the objections of the international community.

Ms. Kennedy is undoubtedly the right person to advance and strengthen relationships with our Japanese ally in the face of these challenges and will play a key role in the administration's rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region.

Finally, I am pleased to note that Ms. Kennedy would be the first woman ever to serve as U.S. Ambassador to Japan. During my trip to Japan, I had the chance to speak with a number of young women regarding the importance of women's leadership there.

Through her life, her work, her intellect, and her character, Ms. Kennedy will undoubtedly serve as a shining example of Japanese and American women, showing the power and potential of women in public service and how far we can go when women lead the way.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you again for the privilege of introducing this outstanding nominee.

Ms. Kennedy, I wish you great success as you undertake this very important post. I am fully confident that your passion and dedication will make you and our home State of New York proud. I look forward to your testimony.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you both for the tremendous statements on behalf of Ms. Kennedy. We know that you have busy schedules, so please do not hesitate to move on to your next meetings whenever you need to. But you are welcome to stay as long as you wish.

Let me again welcome our nominee this morning, Ms. Caroline Kennedy Schlossberg of New York, to be the Ambassador to Japan. Let me welcome the family as well, because we always say that the families of those who make a commitment to Foreign Service are part of that commitment, and we appreciate their willingness to sacrifice and be part of that service to the Nation.

Let me take the opportunity to recognize the distinguished Ambassador of Japan to the United States, Ambassador Sasae, who is here today. Welcome, Mr. Ambassador. Thank you for being here. We appreciate you taking the time to join us.

Let me just say, Senator Rubio wanted it to be known for the record that he cannot attend today's hearing because of a death in his family, but otherwise he would have been present for this hearing. So we send our condolences to him and his family.

To all of us on both sides of the aisle, no matter our politics, the Kennedy name has been synonymous with public service for over a century, a family that has sacrificed so much in service to the Nation. Ms. Kennedy, your uncle Ted was a good friend to me here in the Senate, probably one of the best friends I had when I came here, and a good friend to many of our colleagues. His ability to express strong convictions, yet find a way to reach across the aisle, was a compelling example of what good governance is all about. Vicki, it is great to see you here today as you join in your niece's efforts here.

You represent a legacy of the best and brightest in politics in a time in our history when we were at the confluence of intellectualism and a respect for public service in government. You bring to this opportunity to serve the Nation an extraordinary range of qualifications beyond the oversimplified perceptions of your family pedigree—your own experiences, your own abilities, your own perspective, that uniquely qualify you for this position.

As an author and editor, president of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation, chair of the Senior Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics at Harvard, a trustee of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, vice chair of the Fund for Public Schools in New York City, board member of New Visions for Public Schools, honorary chair of the American Ballet Theater, board of directors of the NAACP, as well as on the Commission on Presidential Debates, you have lived a life that honors your family's history of service to the arts and education, government, and the Nation. I believe you will bring a broad intellectual curiosity and commitment to serve in your new role as Ambassador.

If confirmed, as my colleagues have said, you will be the first woman to represent the United States as our Ambassador to Japan, a post that has been held by some of the most respected leaders in our country: former Senator Mike Mansfield, the longest serving U.S. Ambassador to Japan; former Speaker of the House Tom Foley; and former Vice President Walter Mondale.

It is a post that has always been and remains of the utmost importance to this Nation and to the people of Japan. Your nomination underscores the regional importance of the relationship between our two nations.

Now, having just visited Japan and the region this past August, I can tell you that you will assume these new duties amidst the rise of the Asia-Pacific region, which may well prove to be the single most transformative geopolitical shift of the 21st century. You will arrive in Tokyo at a time when friction between Japan and China on maritime disputes is high and many other challenges lie ahead as Asia-Pacific issues become global in nature.

You will arrive as the region takes on new economic importance. In 2010 U.S. exports to the Asia-Pacific region totaled \$775 billion, up almost 26 percent from 2009. In 2011 they totaled \$895 billion, accounting for 60 percent of our exports, creating and sustaining millions of U.S. jobs in sectors across the board, from automobiles to power generation, machinery, aircraft, and other vital sectors of our industrial economy. In just 3 years we have gone from \$775 billion in exports to the region to almost \$900 billion, and we can assume that figure will be a trillion in the not too distant future.

I think it is safe to say that for the rest of this century and beyond, much of the strategic, political, and economic future of the world will likely be shaped by the decisions made in Washington and the capitals in this region over the next 4 to 5 years.

Our alliance with Japan is a cornerstone of our strategic engagement in Asia, which will put you front and center in the United States-Japan partnership, a partnership of equals that links the world's first- and third-largest economies and highlights our shared commitment to democracy and human rights. Japan is a valuable trade and economic partner of the United States. Its views on regulation, the environment, and intellectual property complement those of the United States, and your voice on these issues will be America's voice in Tokyo.

On the Trans-Pacific Partnership, we look forward to working with Japan toward a comprehensive agreement that addresses labor, the environment, currency manipulation, and intellectual property rights. For Congress to support the TPP, we need to be assured that our industries are competing with Japanese industries on a level playing field. As Ambassador, you will be part of that effort. You will be at the table on issues concerning our military presence in Japan, like Okinawa. You will be there to bridge differences on any issues that may arise between our two nations.

So let me close by quoting your father from a commencement address he gave at Syracuse University the year you were born, not too long ago, which described the nexus between education and intellectualism and the importance of public service, reminding students that, "Our Nation's first great politicians were truly our ablest, most respected, most talented leaders, who moved from one field to another with amazing versatility and vitality."

In that speech he reminded graduates that a contemporary described Thomas Jefferson as "a gentleman who could calculate an eclipse, survey an estate, tie an artery, plan an edifice, try a cause, break a horse, dance a minuet, and play the violin." Now, I do not believe your father would have expected you to dance a minuet, but his point is well taken. Your background, your experience, your versatility, your intellect, and the legacy of service your family has stood for in American history makes you exactly the kind of person we need to serve the interests of this Nation as Ambassador to Japan.

Let me turn to my distinguished colleague, the ranking member, Senator Corker, for his comments.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BOB CORKER,
U.S. SENATOR FROM TENNESSE**

Senator CORKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank our two Senators from New York, who are highly respected, for being with us today, and certainly the nominee. I enjoyed our time together a couple days ago, and thank you for your lifetime of public service in a different way. I know you are doing something, or getting ready to do something, that is very, very different and it will have its own challenges. But I very much appreciate your desire to serve in this way.

Having your family here, as I mentioned in the back room, I doubt you are going to get much of a hard time today, for lots of reasons, but having your kids here ensures that that will be the case. I am glad that they are there, and certainly enjoyed talking with Vicki a little bit about her husband and our friend, and certainly appreciate the wonderful legacy that you and your family have in public service.

I want to also thank our Ambassador to the United States from Japan for being here. I think it signifies the tremendous role that you are going to be playing in Japan. Japan—I was just there also—relishes having people of great notoriety and public acclaim, and certainly in this case they are getting that in a heavy dose. I am glad that you are willing to do this, again.

You know, there are a lot of difficult issues in Japan right now, as we talked about the other day. While the relationship is a cornerstone of stability in the Asian-Pacific region and I know you know that well—we have 50,000 troops there. There are issues with North Korea that you as Ambassador will be heavily involved in. And we have the issues of strengthening our maritime abilities in that area, and I know that again that will be something that you will be focused on.

The fact that Japan was willing to enter the TPP negotiations was a game-changer, and I know our chairman alluded to some of the challenges that you will be dealing with there to ensure that we are able to compete on an equal basis.

I know as I was there Prime Minister Abe was very concerned about Washington's ability to deliver on the relationships that we have with some of the financial issues that we are dealing with here internally in our country. I know that you are going to have to be a champion for our national interests and assuring the Japanese people that we are going to honor those commitments. I know you are going to be willing to do that.

We still have the thorny issues, as you and I talked about in the office, regarding the relocation of the troops that we have there and some of the issues that internally the people of Japan have with us right now regarding that. But I know you are going to do that well.

Mr. Chairman, I know we have a second panel that is coming. I am going to go ahead and make my comments relative to them very briefly to save time. I know we have an ambassador's ambassador, if you will, coming up, Anne Patterson. I want to thank her for her wonderful public service also. She will be looking after the areas of the Middle East and North Africa. I do not know if we have a more qualified ambassador in our Foreign Service, and I know that she is going to have to develop a coherent, comprehensive strategy for how we deal with a lot of thorny issues, including and specifically Syria and Egypt. I think the American people are

going to need to fully understand the importance of Syria to our country and what our national interests are there. I know you will articulate that well.

In Egypt, while we might not like what the military has done in every way, we have a very important relationship with them. I know you will help lead us to a very good place there, keeping in mind that we have a lot of national interests. And I know that you will help us figure out a way to balance our security interests, but also our interest in democracy and human rights.

To Greg: I appreciate you being here regarding the diplomatic piece. I was, as you know, in Libya right after the events of that time. I know our diplomatic posts are very much at risk around the world. I thank you for your commitment in that regard. I know that what happened in Iraq was heroic in many ways and shows the best of our diplomatic security. At the same time, there is a lot of money that is flowing into Afghanistan and Iraq and that is not the case in many other places. I know that you will attack this job with great fervor.

So I thank all three of you for offering yourself in this way. I look forward to your comments and questions and certainly look forward to your service.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Corker. I will have some comments to make about our other nominees when I introduce them before the full committee.

Ms. Kennedy, it is now an opportunity for you to make a statement before the committee. Your full statement will be included in the record without objection, and the floor is yours.

**STATEMENT OF CAROLINE KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK,
TO BE UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN**

Ms. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, members of the committee, Senator Schumer, Senator Gillibrand, it is an honor to appear before you this morning as the President's nominee to serve as the United States Ambassador to Japan. I appreciate the confidence that President Obama and Secretary Kerry have shown in nominating me for this important position, and I am grateful for the consideration of this distinguished committee.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to answer your questions and hear firsthand your thoughts and concerns about our essential relationship with Japan. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the committee and with other Members of Congress to advance the interests of the United States, protect the safety of our citizens, and strengthen the bilateral relationship to the benefit of both our countries.

I would also like to thank my family for their support throughout this process and their enthusiasm for this mission. My husband, Ed, is here along with two of my three children, my daughter, Tatiana, and my son, Jack, and I am so pleased that my aunt, Vicki, could be here this morning as well. She carries with her every day the spirit of my uncle, Teddy, whose devotion to this institution, to his colleagues and our country was an inspiration to all of us.

I am humbled to be following in the footsteps of some of Congress' most distinguished members—Senator Mansfield, Vice Presi-

dent Mondale, Speaker Foley, and Senator Baker. If confirmed, I will try every day to live up to the standard they set in representing the United States and advancing our relationship with Japan. I am also grateful to Ambassador Tom Schieffer and especially to Ambassador John Roos and Susie Roos for their generous advice and wisdom.

I would also like to acknowledge Ambassador Sasae from the Embassy of Japan, who is himself a distinguished diplomat and has been a steadfast friend to the United States.

I can think of no greater honor than to represent my country abroad. I have spent my career working to make American history and ideals accessible to the widest possible audience and in particular to younger generations. As President of the Kennedy Library, I am proud that my father became the first digital President when we made his papers available online around the world. As chair of Harvard's Institute of Politics, I have worked to train new generations of leaders to pursue careers in public service and expand international opportunities for students.

In my books on the Bill of Rights and the right to privacy, I sought to engage young audiences in the debate over our fundamental rights and give them the tools and understanding to advance and defend our liberties.

For the past 10 years I have been working with the New York City public schools on education reform efforts. In a school system where students speak more than 130 languages at home, I worked to increase individual literacy, cultural awareness, college access, arts education, and international exchange programs. I saw the power of public-private partnerships to leverage involvement and results, and if confirmed I look forward to building upon these experiences to strengthen the ties between young people in Japan and the United States.

And finally, this appointment has a special significance as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of my father's Presidency. I am conscious of my responsibility to uphold the ideals that he represented—a deep commitment to public service, a more just America, and a more peaceful world. As a World War II veteran who served in the Pacific, he had hoped to be the first sitting President to make a state visit to Japan. If confirmed as Ambassador, I would be humbled to carry forward his legacy in a small way and represent the powerful bonds that unite our two democratic societies.

I can think of no country in which I would rather serve than Japan. I first visited in 1978 with my uncle, Senator Kennedy, and was deeply affected by our visit to Hiroshima. Our countries are bound by deep political, economic, cultural, and strategic ties, and our partnership has a global reach. The United States and Japan share a commitment to freedom, human rights, and the rule of law. Japan is the world's third-largest economy, our fourth-largest trading partner, and the second-largest source of foreign direct investment in the United States.

Japan is home to 50,000 U.S. troops, the Seventh Fleet, and 170,000 American citizens. As the United States rebalances toward Asia, our alliance with Japan remains the cornerstone of peace, stability, and prosperity in the region, as it has been for more than

50 years. If confirmed, I will work closely with the leadership in the U.S. military to further strengthen our bilateral security relationship.

At the same time, Japan is an indispensable partner in promoting democracy and economic development in the region, as well as in global humanitarian efforts and peacekeeping. These are areas I care deeply about, and if confirmed I will work to further strengthen this critical partnership at a vital moment in its history.

This is indeed an important moment in the history of United States-Japan relations. Japan is enjoying a period of political stability and economic renewal and is eager to increase trade and investment with the United States. If confirmed, I look forward to working with American business to expand and promote American exports, trade, and support initiatives such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

In addition, I will work to increase exchanges between American and Japanese students, scholars, and citizens, so that future generations will understand our shared history and continue to bind our nations closer.

Finally, if confirmed I will meet my most fundamental responsibility, to promote and protect the welfare of all American citizens in Japan. This includes providing a safe and secure environment for U.S. Government employees and their families.

I especially look forward to benefiting from the support of the talented Foreign Service professionals, both American and locally engaged staff, at our mission in Japan.

I would like to thank this committee for your consideration of my nomination. If confirmed, I look forward to working closely with you to advance our national interests, protect our citizens, and deepen our ties with Japan.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Kennedy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY CAROLINE KENNEDY

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, and members of the committee, it is an honor to appear before you this morning as the President's nominee to serve as United States Ambassador to Japan. I appreciate the confidence that President Obama and Secretary Kerry have shown in nominating me for this important position, and I am grateful for the consideration of this distinguished committee.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today; to answer your questions and hear first-hand your thoughts and concerns about our essential relationship with Japan. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the committee and with other Members of Congress to advance the interests of the United States, protect the safety of our citizens, and strengthen the bilateral relationship for the benefit of both our countries.

I would also like to thank my family for their support throughout this process, and their enthusiasm for this mission. My husband Ed is here along with two of my three children, my daughter, Tatiana, and my son, Jack. I am so pleased that my aunt, Vicki, is here as well. She carries with her every day the spirit of my uncle, Teddy, whose devotion to this institution, to his colleagues and country, was an inspiration to all of us.

I am humbled to be following in the footsteps of some of Congress' most distinguished members—Mike Mansfield, Walter Mondale, Tom Foley, and Howard Baker. If confirmed, I will try every day to live up to the standard they set in representing the United States and advancing our relationship with Japan. I am also grateful to Ambassador Tom Schieffer and especially to Ambassador John Roos and Susie Roos for their generous advice and wisdom.

I would also like to acknowledge Ambassador Sasae from the Embassy of Japan, who is himself a distinguished diplomat and who has been a steadfast friend of the United States.

I can think of no greater honor than to represent my country abroad. I have spent my career working to make American history and ideals accessible to the widest possible audience, and in particular, to younger generations. As President of the Kennedy Library, I am proud that my father became the first "digital" President, when we made his papers available online around the world. As Chair of Harvard's Institute of Politics, I have worked to train new generations of leaders to pursue careers in public service and to expand international opportunities for students.

In my books on the Bill of Rights and the Right to Privacy, I sought to engage young audiences in the debate over our fundamental rights and to give them the tools and understanding to advance and defend our liberties.

For the past 10 years I have been working with the New York City public schools on education reform efforts. In a school system where students speak more than 130 languages, I worked to increase individual literacy, cultural awareness, college access, arts education and international exchange programs. I saw the power of public-private partnerships to leverage involvement and results, and, if confirmed, I look forward to building upon those experiences to strengthen the ties between young people in Japan and the United States.

And finally, this appointment has a special significance as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of my father's Presidency. I am conscious of my responsibility to uphold the ideals he represented—a deep commitment to public service, a more just America and a more peaceful world. As a World War II veteran who served in the Pacific, he had hoped to be the first sitting President to make a state visit to Japan. If confirmed as Ambassador, I would be humbled to carry forward his legacy in a small way and represent the powerful bonds that unite our two democratic societies.

I can think of no country in which I would rather serve than Japan. I first visited in 1978 with my Uncle, Senator Kennedy, and was deeply affected by our visit to Hiroshima. Our countries are bound by deep political, economic, cultural and strategic ties, and our partnership has a global reach. We share a commitment to freedom, human rights, and the rule of law. Japan is the world's third-largest economy, our fourth-largest trading partner, and the second-largest source of foreign direct investment in the United States.

Japan is home to 50,000 U.S. troops, the U.S. 7th Fleet, and 170,000 American citizens. As the United States rebalances toward Asia, our alliance with Japan remains the cornerstone of peace, stability, and prosperity in the region, as it has been for more than 50 years. If confirmed, I will work closely with the leadership in the U.S. military to further strengthen our bilateral security relationship.

At the same time, Japan is an indispensable partner in promoting democracy and economic development in the region, as well as in global humanitarian efforts and peacekeeping. These are areas I care deeply about, and, if confirmed, I will work to further strengthen this critical partnership at a vital moment in its history.

This is indeed an important moment in the history of U.S.-Japan relations. Japan is enjoying a period of political stability and economic renewal and is eager to increase trade and investment with the United States. If confirmed, I look forward to working with American business to promote American exports, expand trade, and support initiatives such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

In addition, I will work to increase exchanges between American and Japanese students, scholars, and citizens so that future generations will understand our shared history and continue to bind our two nations even closer.

Finally, if confirmed, I will meet my most fundamental responsibility: to promote and protect the welfare of all American citizens in Japan. This includes providing a safe and secure environment for U.S. Government employees and their families.

I especially look forward to benefiting from the support of the talented Foreign Service professionals, both American and locally engaged staff, at our Mission in Japan.

I would like to thank this committee for your consideration of my nomination. If confirmed, I look forward to working closely with you to advance our national interests, protect our citizens, and deepen our ties with Japan.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

We will start a round of questions. Here in the United States we have been closely following Abenomics, the efforts by Prime Minister Abe to economically revitalize Japan's economy. He talks about three arrows: the first two are fiscal stimulus and monetary easing—and the markets have reacted very positively to those. The

last one—structural reforms— is a tough one. It is tough here in the United States, and it is tough in Japan.

In that regard, when I met with the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan, they expressed concern about the narrowly targeted tax reform in Japan, in contrast to the broader investment and tax incentives that the U.S. business community has been calling for.

How do you envision working with our Japanese counterparts to ensure that structural reform in Japan is seen as both an internal issue there and an economic issue back here in the United States. How do you see your role as Ambassador in that respect?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, I think that Japan's entry into the Trans-Pacific Partnership provides an opportunity for our countries to work more closely economically. This agreement also provides an opportunity for bilateral talks between the United States and Japan on a number of these nontariff issues and market access issues, as well as a dispute settlement mechanism should there be issues along the way.

I know that the team in Tokyo is focused on the implementation of that agreement should it go forward, and I as Ambassador would take a deep and personal interest in working with American companies to make sure that the Japanese market is open to them and working with the Japanese Government to make sure that the accord is fully implemented.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate that. I think Prime Minister Abe looks at the Trans-Pacific Partnership as an opportunity to achieve some of the structural reforms that will be needed for accession to the agreement. I hope that, upon your confirmation as our Ambassador to Japan, you will work with our Trade Ambassador to develop the strongest TPP, which I think provides a pathway for the reforms that we just talked about.

Another significant issue is that the Abe government is in the midst of a defense policy review that will yield new national defense program guidelines by the end of the year, and may very well re-interpret the constitution to exercise the right of collective self-defense, with implications for the United States-Japan alliance. Collective self-defense means that if you have a U.S. ship alongside a Japanese ship and if, God forbid, there was a strike against the U.S. ship, collective self-defense means that the Japanese would be in a position to respond and not just simply watch.

That is important to our national security interests in the region, as well as our efforts in changing our base status at Okinawa, which has been both an opportunity for continued security, but also a challenge. Creating the space for the Governor of Okinawa to issue the landfill permit is a linchpin of our efforts to refocus our position there and is incredibly important. To a large degree, the Japanese Government will have to create the space for the Governor, but I think there is a role for the American Ambassador to help create a space for the Governor.

Could you talk a little bit about how you see that process?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, our military and national security relationship obviously has many complex issues embedded within it. But it is, as you say, the cornerstone of peace and stability in the region. I think that there seems to be some hope for progress on the

Okinawa issues and I know that Senator McCain, in particular, and other members who I have spoken to, are deeply concerned about the process moving forward involving a realignment plan and a landfill plan.

So I have assured him that I will take a personal interest. I have met and hope to meet further with Admiral Locklear, I have met with General Angelella, and military issues would be something that I would spend a good deal of time on and work hard to see those issues through.

As you say, I think the Japanese are engaged in a process of debating their self-defense and collective self-defense, and I think that is obviously a debate that they need to have within their own society. I would watch it very carefully and work with people here in Washington and people in Tokyo to make sure that we understand and are supportive of that process in whatever way that I can.

The CHAIRMAN. A final question before I turn to Senator Corker. We ask this of all of our nominees. At least since I have become the chairman, we ask it of all of our nominees. And that is that, if confirmed, will you be responsive to questions and requests from the committee about issues facing our bilateral relationship?

Ms. KENNEDY. Of course that would be one of my most important activities, and if confirmed I hope that I will get to spend even more time with all of you than I have already been fortunate enough to do.

The CHAIRMAN. You have already shown your prowess, all right. Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. I will say that the question he asks of all Ambassadors is the easiest question they get, and they all answer it the same way. Anyway, that is very good, and thank you.

Listen. We talked the other day at length and to try to get into a lot of depth on policy issues when I know that you have been wafted out of New York into this position and are preparing heavily is really not the thing to do. It would be like, candidly, asking me those questions upon my first day of arrival in the United States Senate. So I will not go down that path.

I do know that you care deeply about public service and I think that matters. I think you have a good sense of what our national interests are and will develop those even more deeply. I think you are going to be a great Ambassador to Japan and, candidly, the kind of Ambassador that they are used to having in Japan. So I am glad you want to serve in this way and your family is willing to let you do that.

I would like to talk just a little bit about, between now and then, what is happening to prep and get you ready for all the complexities that you are going to be dealing with when you get there.

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, I have had the benefit of a lot of guidance from the State Department already and I am now engaged in meeting with other agencies, and I would love to come back and meet with all of you and other Members of Congress before I leave, and I will do my best to get up to speed on all the issues, especially those affecting Tennessee and the auto industry.

Senator CORKER. Well, thank you. I know that as a matter of fact, since you have jumped to that issue of the TPP, I think it is

a tremendous opportunity for us and I think you do, too. What are some of the things—I know you met with Mike Froman the other day to talk a little bit about TPP and some of the things that we are going to be dealing with. Can you raise—do you know at present what some of the rubs may be, some of the tougher areas that we might have to overcome relative to TPP in Japan itself?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, I think the USTR is hopeful and everybody has been impressed that the Japanese have come to the table and are willing to put everything on the table. So they seem rather optimistic about the chances for success and the benefits that this would bring to both our economies.

Senator CORKER. So have they raised any issues, though, that they think might be some of the more difficult to overcome?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, I think that those are being handled in this bilateral set of talks, and they had a good session, I understand, and they are speaking about American autos entering the Japanese market and removing restrictions to that, as well as some of the agricultural products that Japan has long sought to protect, obviously. But I think that everybody is impressed by Prime Minister Abe's commitment to really a comprehensive, high quality accord.

Senator CORKER. Has there been much discussion about the East China Sea territorial issues and what role you are going to be expected to play as Ambassador in those issues, with China flexing, if you will, in those areas?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, I think our policy on the islands in the East China Sea is obviously we would like to see those issues resolved through peaceful dialogue between the nations in the region, but as far as the islands are concerned the U.S. policy has been, as you know, longstanding and very clear: We do not take a position on the ultimate sovereignty of the islands, but we do recognize they are under Japanese administrative control and are covered by article 5 of our security treaty. So it is something that I would be watching very carefully and working as many different ways as I can to encourage the nations in the region to discuss and resolve those disputes and lower the tension in the region.

Senator CORKER. We talked a little bit about the current Ambassador, and he has been able, I guess, to develop an area that he is really focused on in the public-private partnerships, and I know you alluded to that earlier. You know, the way the Ambassador's role is in Japan, it is really unique. The Ambassador has a very special role there, and the relationship between the United States Ambassador and the people of Japan or the country at large is very different than in many other cases.

I know we talked a little bit about you are going to have a tremendous opportunity, not just to deal with the United States-Japanese relationship and the things that are in our national interest, but you are going to have an opportunity really to carve out an area where you can have a real impact in Japan, just like you have done in New York and other places. I do not know if you have thought about that. I know you are just beginning to see those opportunities, and none of us really know until we arrive exactly how things are going to be.

As a matter of fact, you do not even have to answer the question. I know you are going to figure out a way of doing that. I have a

sense that you will do that very, very quickly and you will have a big impact there. I just, without pushing you to have to respond to that now, I want to thank you for your willingness to serve. I know you are going to address these issues in a serious way, and we look forward to working with you.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just say, Senator Corker said that is the easiest question; the last question I asked. I ask it for a purpose because, having had an experience on this and other committees, sometimes our nominees when they are nominees are very forthright and very helpful in sharing information; once they become the Ambassador it is a little more difficult. So I like to have it on the record to remind them.

Ms. KENNEDY. That is good.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not expect that in this case, but I have had experiences here. It may be the easiest question—

Ms. KENNEDY. I grew up under the tutelage of a great Senator, so I have the utmost respect for the position.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate that.

Senator Cardin, who is our chairman of our Asia-Pacific Subcommittee.

Senator CARDIN. Well, Mr. Chairman, you are absolutely right, it is an easy question, but when you start to hear the requests from Members of the United States Senate we hope that your respect will continue.

Thank you very much for being willing to step forward to continue in public service. We thank your entire family. As Senator Menendez said, this is a commitment of the entire family.

Vicki, it is great to see you. During my first term I was fortunate enough to have a seat on the United States Senate floor next to Senator Kennedy. It was a remarkable opportunity. What Senator Menendez said about your uncle is absolutely true. He was able to get through the partisan division here, standing up for principle and move the process forward. So we know that spirit is in your family and we thank you very much for your willingness to move forward.

Mr. Ambassador, it is great to see you here. You represent Japan very well in the United States, and we know that your presence here just underscores the importance of the relationship between Japan and the United States.

Congressman Crowley, I am glad we had a reason to get you over to the Senate side, but it is great to see you and thank you for being here.

We had a chance to talk and a lot of the issues we talked about have already been brought out. I want to mention one issue that I mentioned with Prime Minister Abe when I was in Tokyo this year. You mentioned protecting Americans. Recently Japan agreed to the Hague Convention in regards to child abduction cases. We are very appreciative of that, and the Diet's taken action to pass the necessary laws.

I have been told there is pending almost 400 cases involving Americans that will not come under the Hague Convention, but need to be resolved. I am aware of three of those cases involving Marylanders. As one of my first requests under your response to

the chairman, will you use your office, the best that we can, to help resolve these open cases?

Ms. KENNEDY. As a parent, I certainly understand the emotional aspects of this issue. I have met with the Bureau of Consular Affairs already and indicated to them my concern. I understand why these parents—I think it is a welcome sign that Japan has joined the Hague, and I hope that these cases that might not be covered can still be handled in the spirit of the Hague, and I think that everyone that I have talked to in Japan and in the State Department is really committed to making that happen and to working with the families to bring these issues forward and resolve these cases.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you. Thank you very much.

I want to follow up briefly on Senator Corker's point on maritime security issues. It is very true that Japan and China—there is tension in regards to the territorial claims to the islands. But it is also true there are many other countries involved in maritime security issues that threaten the free transport of commerce and that threatens major U.S. interests, that also could cause serious security issues. We have already seen some tension among other countries.

Will this be a priority of your mission, to further reduce the tension on the maritime issues so that we can maintain the type of policy that you said, peaceful resolution of these issues, directly negotiating through the parties, developing codes of conduct, that reduces the tension in the region?

Ms. KENNEDY. Yes. Also, I know that we spoke about the Helsinki Commission as being a sort of a model for perhaps countries working together in the region and multilaterally and exploring kind of a North Pacific dialogue that way. As you say, the code of conduct, the procedures for any kind of resolution of any kind of incidents, is something that I am committed to work through because it is in everyone's interests that those issues are resolved diplomatically.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you. We talked about—and I really do appreciate your understanding and commitment. We have many allies in the region, but two of our closest allies are Japan and the Republic of Korea. Yet the relationship between the Republic of Korea and Japan is not as strong as we would like to see it. I think your offices can help improve the relationship between two of our closest allies in the region, to the benefit of both countries and to regional security.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Cardin.

Senator Risch.

Senator RISCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Kennedy, welcome. I know you are looking forward to this and I hope and I have every confidence that you will bring the same warmth and good feeling to the people of Japan that Ambassador Sasae has brought here to America. He has done an outstanding job and I think you would do well to emulate that. I know you will make every effort to do that.

I want to talk about the East China Sea for just a moment. I would like to get your thoughts on why this controversy continues

to get worse instead of better. We of course have not adopted the Law of the Sea Treaty here in the United States, and indeed those of us that opposed it argued that we would be giving up certain sovereignty and not getting much for it. The proponents were telling us about what a great document this was and what a great protocol it was for resolving international disputes.

But it seems to me the East China Sea is a poster child for the lack of the ability of the treaty to resolve these kinds of things. Could you give me your thoughts on that, please?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, I think those issues in the East China Sea are driven by the regional countries, but that means that the United States has an interest and an obligation to do everything we can to support and continue to support the peaceful resolution, to encourage dialogue between our allies and other countries in the region. I know the Senate resolution was helpful in that, but I think it is something that we are going to continue to have to work on.

Senator RISCH. I agree with everything that you have said. Would you agree with me that the Law of the Sea Treaty has done nothing to try to ameliorate the situation there in the East China Sea?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, I would like to study that further before I speak specifically on that.

Senator RISCH. That is fair. I understand. That is fair.

I know you have been briefed on the importance of the Idaho National Laboratory, which is the home—it is the leading laboratory for nuclear energy in America. Of course, with the tragedy that occurred at Fukushima the INL is doing things as they examine what happened there and how plants can be built more safely around the world. I would only encourage you to take your knowledge in that regard to the Japanese people, to the Japanese Government, and underscore for them that we in Idaho want to be helpful in that regard and we have the expertise, and we are the lead laboratory on nuclear energy in America and indeed in the world. So I hope you will take that message when you go to Japan.

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, thank you, and I would love to learn more about the laboratory's work. I have heard already that they have been in a close partnership and have made their expertise available. So I would love to follow up on that with you.

Senator RISCH. They have that, and they are ready, willing, and able every time that there is an incident somewhere in the world to respond and to assist and to be helpful in seeing that these kinds of things do not happen in the future.

Thank you very much and thank you for your service.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Risch.

If you could have opined on the Law of the Sea Treaty, we would not let you go to Japan. We would keep you here to help us.

I also want to recognize—we have more House Members than we normally ever have here—Congressman Kennedy for joining us as well. Thank you very much.

Senator Shaheen.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think Ms. Kennedy's recognition that she should not weigh in to the Law of the Sea Treaty debate is a good indication about what a good diplomat she is going to be.

Let me welcome you. It is so nice to see you here—

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you.

Senator SHAHEEN [continuing]. And nice to welcome your family, Ed and your children. Vicki, of course always nice to have you back in the Senate.

For some of my colleagues who may not know, I had the good fortune to have had a chance to work with you at the Institute of Politics as you chaired that board. I can reassure anyone who has any doubts that once you set your mind to doing something well, you do it. So I have every confidence that you will be a great Ambassador to Japan, and very much appreciate you and your family's willingness to take on this challenge at this time, when we are really looking at, as the President says, the refocus on the Asian-Pacific region.

I think the President's choice of you as the nominee for this post is an indication of his strong interest in maintaining the great relationship that the United States and Japan have had for so many years. So I look forward to seeing what you do in this role and to having a chance to work with you in that capacity.

I want to start by following up on Senator Risch's point about Fukushima and what has happened in Japan, and really ask you a two-part question. First of all, I think all of us in America looked with horror at the tragedy that happened in Japan with the tidal wave and the typhoon and then the tragedy at Fukushima. So I would ask you if you see a role for continued support for the United States as Japan continues to rebuild in those regions that were damaged by the tidal wave; and also to ask if you would look at ways to facilitate the lessons learned from what happened at Fukushima.

As Senator Risch said, we have some technology here that is important to share with Japan. But I think there are also lessons there that are important to share with our nuclear industry here, and for all of us who have nuclear plants in our States and our regions some of the lessons from Fukushima are ones that we think it is very important for the industry to look at and to see how to respond to.

Ms. KENNEDY. I think the United States military and then the Ambassador and the team at the Embassy did a wonderful job in assisting after the tragic triple disasters in Japan. I know that I, if confirmed, would benefit from the good will that their efforts have generated. So I am deeply aware of that and I will do everything I can to build upon those efforts and sustain them. I think there are a lot of opportunities for us to continue to promote exchange programs and other kinds of efforts, and I would certainly want to learn about whatever help the United States could provide.

As Senator Risch said, I met with the Department of Energy and I have heard that they have technology, they have expertise, and they are eager to assist in any way that they can. I think that across our government there is a sense that that incident had international implications and certainly it matters, and so we

would all do well to learn everything we could from that to benefit the world going forward in the nuclear area.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

As you know, this past March the United States renewed Japan's exemption from Iranian sanctions as a result of its reduction in oil imports. Despite the energy shortfalls following Fukushima, Japan has worked hard to reduce its Iranian oil imports. Is there more that we could expect from Japan on compliance with Iranian sanctions, and what should we look for from the country as we continue to see how sanctions can hopefully bring Iran to the table to look at negotiating on what is happening in Iran?

Ms. KENNEDY. I think in the context of Japan's energy challenges, their efforts have been significant in reducing their dependence on Iranian oil in their auto industry. I think they have indicated that they are going to continue to make efforts to reduce their connections. I know that they are our partner in many humanitarian and other efforts, and so hopefully all of those put together will help bring pressure on the Iranian regime.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Shaheen.

Senator Flake.

Senator FLAKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for being here. I just want to thank you for your willingness to serve, and for your family and others who will sacrifice as well. You are going at an interesting time with the trade agreements that will be discussed and debated over the next while. These are extremely important, not just for our economies, but for those involved as well. Also the maritime issues that have been addressed and regional security issues with North Korea and other pressing issues. So I just think that you are going at a fascinating time and that you are very well suited to—that you are up for the challenges that are in your future.

So thank you for your willingness to serve.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you, and you have a lot of friends in Boston, fans.

Senator FLAKE. Thank you.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Barrasso.

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

Again, congratulations. This is wonderful. Thank you for taking the time to visit with me last week to discuss the United States-Japan relationship. This ambassadorship to Japan is a very important position. As others have said, the United States and Japan have a very strong relationship. Our nations work closely together on issues impacting our shared interests, our shared values. I am very pleased to see that you are engaged on those issues and willing to serve our Nation in this critical region.

Although there are many topics to cover, from our security alliance to Japan's need for U.S. liquified natural gas, I want to focus my time on one of our significant U.S. exports that we have discussed, soda ash. As I mentioned to you previously, soda ash is an issue that your family has spoken about in the past. Actually, the day I got sworn in to the Senate your uncle Ted told me about his

time in Wyoming, talked about soda ash—"trona," it is also known—and he told me how he stood with the Wyoming delegation in 1960 at the nominating convention and it was Wyoming's 15 votes that put your father over the top to get the nomination.

I questioned it a bit, but actually got back and found a picture of Ted Kennedy standing with the Wyoming sign at the convention, and it is a great picture.

He also talked about his rodeo days in Wyoming, which is impressive.

Also, 50 years ago almost to the day, this coming week, 50 years ago, in 1963 President John Kennedy spoke at the University of Wyoming in Laramie and 13,000 people attended, a huge day. Mike Mansfield, who you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, Mike Mansfield, who was the longest serving Ambassador to Japan, was on the stage with President Kennedy, as was Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, whose son Tom serves on this committee, all on the stage in Laramie. It was a memorable moment for many folks across my State.

At the event, President Kennedy talked about the need for ingenuity and scientific application of knowledge to develop new resources. Amazingly, he specifically mentioned soda ash in his remarks. People say he actually, using his Boston accent, called it "soda rash," and some people thought it was a skin condition for a while.

But he said—and I will quote from his speech. He said: "For example, soda ash is a multimillion dollar industry in this State. A few years ago there was no use for it." He said "It was wasted. People were unaware of it. And even if it had been sought," he said, "it could not be found, not because it wasn't there, but because effective prospecting techniques hadn't yet been developed." "Now," he said, "soda ash is a necessary ingredient in the production of glass, steel, and other products. As a result of a series of experiments, of a harnessing of science to the use of man, this great new industry has opened up." John Kennedy in Laramie 50 years ago this month.

The United States is the most competitive supplier of soda ash in the world due to the abundance of the raw material, trona, and it is in our country. U.S. natural soda ash is refined from the mineral trona. The Green River Basin in Wyoming has the world's largest known deposits. It is a key component, as we said, of glass, also detergent, soap, and chemicals. It is used in many other industrial purposes. It has long been regarded as the standard of quality.

Currently Japan has a 3.3-percent tariff, which is what we had discussed, on natural soda ash imports into Japan. So now we have formally joined—now Japan has formally joined the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations. Out of all the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries, Japan is the only country with a tariff on U.S. natural soda ash. It is important for the United States to work, I believe, to resolve this problem. Eliminating the tariff on naturally sourced soda ash would benefit Japanese manufacturers, who want it, and U.S. soda ash producers alike.

So my question is, As the negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership continue, will you commit to me that you will advocate for the elimination of this tariff on natural soda ash imports?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, I guess I would not be sitting here if it were not for the State of Wyoming, so I would definitely make that commitment. In fact, I did pass along your concerns to the USTR and they have indicated that soda ash will be an important issue in the upcoming negotiations. So I will let you know, and I look forward to working with you on this issue.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you.

Also we had talked about beef, Wyoming's No. 1 cash crop, but also I know, Senator Risch, it is a big cash crop in Idaho, MT, the Rocky Mountain West. We are looking forward to pursuing every opportunity to eliminate trade barriers and increase exports to Japan for—actually, for all U.S. industry. So I appreciate your efforts.

We also had a chance to talk a bit about liquified natural gas, where we have an ability to export. I know, visiting with the Ambassador from Japan, they have great interest in importing liquified natural gas.

Ms. KENNEDY. In terms of beef, as you know, there has been a 43-percent increase in our sales to Japan recently this year. I think that hopefully they will continue to accept more high-quality U.S. beef.

Obviously, liquid natural gas—in fact, Senator Cardin, they have just approved a project, and so it is a win for both countries. So I look forward to working on that because it is of benefit to all of us.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you very much and congratulations again.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you so much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Barrasso.

I now know more about soda ash than I ever did in my career and I appreciate the edification.

Senator Kaine.

Senator Kaine. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Kennedy, congratulations. This is an exciting, exciting hearing. I was struck during your opening comments at the poignancy not only of your personal story, but what it says about our two nations. Your father received the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism displayed and injuries suffered in a war with Japan, and yet here you are about to achieve this wonderful diplomatic post, which is a tribute not just to you, but to the deep friendship between the two nations.

That does not happen by accident. That arc of enemies to friends does not happen by accident. It happens because of diplomacy. It happens because of the magnanimity of the Japanese people and the American people. And it is an interesting thing for us to think about, that we do not have to assume that hostilities are permanent. Who are we at odds with today or who any country is at odds with today does not mean that we need to be despairing about that we might not be wonderful allies in a few decades. And that is a really hopeful thing. There is a real element of hope and optimism

because of this hearing and your personal arc and the way that it connects the lives of our two nations.

Two questions I just wanted to ask quickly. I see enormous upsides in the United States-Japan relationship because of the rebalance to Asia and because of the specific status of the TPP negotiations. But I wonder, are there any potential downsides? Is there any concern in your dialogue with folks on the Japanese side thus far or your briefings, that there is a worry that a rebalance to Asia more generally or a TPP that encompasses multiple nations, is there a concern that it would sort of deemphasize the relationship, the strong relationship between the United States and Japan? And if there are those downsides, how could we continue to make sure that Japan knows how special this relationship is?

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you, Senator, for reminding us all about the—I do think that I am conscious of the evolution of our relationship and how my family and my appointment is emblematic of that. It is something that I am very honored by.

I think from my conversations it seems that the United States and Japan are facing an important moment, but it is a moment that is full of promise. The Asia-Pacific region is the future in many ways. It is 40 percent of the world's trade. I think that with the political stability in Japan, there are many opportunities to strengthen this alliance, and hopefully I can contribute to that.

There are complexities as well, of course. But I think, as you said, there are so many people here in the United States willing to work to strengthen this alliance, as well as in Japan, so I am hopeful that whatever issues crop up, they can be worked through, as we have done so far.

Senator KAINE. Great, great. Thank you.

The last question. I think this was touched on when I was out of the room briefly, but just to connect a couple of dots, including the point that Senator Barrasso was just making. The Japanese continued purchase of oil from Iran—and there is an exemption that we have recognized—nevertheless is a troubling thing. We want to continue to do what we can. Even recent statements of President Rouhani, we are looking at those with interest. But to do what we can to make sure that Iran does not obtain nuclear weapons.

Japan's scale-down of purchases of Iranian oil, that is a notable thing. We think they could do more. Nevertheless, they have their own energy challenges, especially after Fukushima, that put some constraints on them. But there is a potential connection between their ability to go even further and this LNG issue, and I just wanted to bring that up.

I had a dialogue recently with another government official in another Asian country that does not need to be named. But I was really focusing upon this issue of how could we help you reduce your reliance on oil from Iran, and he came right back and said: Well, the main thing you could do is export liquid natural gas to us.

So the exportation of LNG has other issues. It connects to domestic pricing and things for natural gas here. Yet it is an important asset for us to contemplate, even in working with Japan, that the better we are in that the more they may be able to take additional

steps to reduce reliance upon Iranian oil and then help us with that important goal that we share of making sure Iran does not develop nuclear weapons.

So in the broader negotiation around these topics, I just wanted to put that on that table and encourage you in that regard.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you.

Senator Kaine. Thanks very much, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Kaine.

Senator McCain.

Senator McCain. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I welcome our witness and family members and our beloved Vicki. I know that Ted is very proud today to have you here continuing a long family tradition of outstanding service to our Nation.

You and I had a discussion of several issues in my office. But I think it is important to reemphasize a couple of points. One is that tensions between Japan and China are higher than at any time since the end of World War II. The issue of the Senkaku Islands, although unknown to most Americans, is very high on the agenda of both Japan and China, and there have been incidents of significant tension in that region—movement of Chinese ships there and military presence.

The new Prime Minister, Abe, is now committed to a significant increase in defense spending on the part of Japan. A lot of that has to do with their concern about the aggressive behavior of China in the South China Sea.

I am sure you are aware of those tensions and I am wondering if you share my concern about this situation.

Ms. KENNEDY. I think it is a matter of grave concern. I think that, as we spoke about, the U.S. military and the Japan alliance is a cornerstone of peace and security in the region, and the United States is committed under article 5 of our security treaty to support Japan in the Senkakus. But overall our priority is for those disputes to be resolved through negotiation and diplomacy and for all parties in the region to seek to lower the tensions as much as possible.

Senator McCain. You know that the United States position has been that we support Japanese management of the islands, but do not acknowledge the sovereignty. You agree with that policy?

Ms. KENNEDY. It is the longstanding policy of the United States, so that would be the policy that I would try to further.

Senator McCain. As part of our view of the importance of the Asia-Pacific region, there has been an announcement a couple years ago by the administration that—at first they used the unfortunate word “pivot,” but “rebalancing” of our military to the Asia-Pacific region. One of the most important parts of that that we have been wrestling with for years in the Armed Services Committee in particular is the movement of U.S. Marines out of Okinawa.

It is a very volatile issue with the people of Okinawa. It has got to be accomplished. We have watched with great frustration time after time, expenditure of billions of dollars, and we still have not achieved the movement of the Marines out of Okinawa to a suitable replacement base. We know that some will go to Guam, some will go, envisioned to a new base that's being built.

I hope you will give this issue a very high priority. One more incident in Okinawa and you will see a very serious reaction from the people of Okinawa, and they have to be assured that we are moving forward, making progress on this issue, which frankly in my view has been fraught with delays and expenditures, which is almost an embarrassment.

Ms. KENNEDY. I take that very seriously, Senator, your concerns, and thank you for expressing them to me in your office as well as here this morning. I look forward to learning as much as I can, to studying this issue very closely, and to working with you to move this forward.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, we look forward to visiting with you in Japan in the near future, at the taxpayers' expense.

Thank you for your willingness to serve.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Markey.

Senator MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Massachusetts is very proud of you today. Your mother and father, your aunts and uncles, all of your family, inspired generations now of people to public service. I am one of those people. You are really the pluperfect embodiment of someone who has dedicated her life to helping other people. And your uncle Ted and Bobby, but every member of your family just really was very special in the lives of our country.

You are continuing that story, and I think it is important for the country to actually see you giving, asking not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country. And you are doing that here today. I think our country and all of us really appreciate your following in this tremendous tradition that your family represents, sitting proudly behind you here today.

I guess what I was wondering is, are there any personal priorities that you might have going to Japan? Is there anything that you might want to share with us that might be a part of something that you might want to accomplish during your time in Japan representing our country?

Ms. KENNEDY. Well, thank you, Senator Markey, and thank you for mentioning my family. I feel that I am the most fortunate to be part of such a supportive and inspiring extended family, and I am fortunate that not only is my immediate family here, but my cousin, Timmy, is here, who runs the Special Olympics, which my aunt started, and my cousin, Joe, who is following in his grandfather and his father's footsteps serving in government. So I am very honored and happy to have their support, and I hope that I can make them proud of me.

In terms of my own priorities, I think as a woman I do have opportunities in Japan to represent the United States and the progress that we have made here on some of those issues and the dialogue about what needs to be done, both here and there. So I am looking forward to learning more about those issues as they relate to Japan when I am there if I am confirmed.

Again, I think because of my background in education and because I have worked to engage young generations in civic engagement and dialogue and public service, I am hopeful that because President Abe, Prime Minister Abe, has made education exchanges

and education another cornerstone of his reform efforts, that I would have a positive role to play in encouraging those and facilitating exchanges between our young people and the young generation in Japan, so that this alliance can continue to be strong going forward and our leaders enjoy the same kinds of friendships and connections that they have until now.

Senator MARKEY. Ambassador Roos has lamented the decline in the number of Japanese students coming to the United States. Obviously, that is a big part of creating understanding between our two nations. So your focus on that is I think absolutely on the money. It is where we have to be.

Again, I just want to tell you how—

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you.

Senator MARKEY [continuing]. Proud we are of you. I think your uncle Ted is really proud of you sitting here.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you.

Senator MARKEY. And I thank you for your service.

The CHAIRMAN. Seeing no other members, thank you very much for your answers before the committee. I think you have acquitted yourself very well.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The record will remain open until the close of business on Friday for questions to the nominee. If the nominee receives any questions, we ask you to answer them expeditiously so that we can consider you at the next business meeting.

With that, you are excused at this time. Thank you very much.

Ms. KENNEDY. Thank you, Senator. Thank you for this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. As Ms. Kennedy departs, I would like to call our second panel this morning.

[Pause.]

The CHAIRMAN. I am pleased to bring before the committee two of the Nation's most experienced career Foreign Service officers: Ambassador Anne Patterson, who is the nominee for Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs; and Gregory Starr, who is no stranger to this committee, as Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security.

Anne Patterson has spent the last 2 years serving as Ambassador to Egypt at a tumultuous and transitional time in Egypt's history, and I personally want to extend our thanks and appreciation for her service. She was in the eye of the storm as the winds of the Arab Spring began to blow across the region, and her expertise and experience served her well. She has a long record of service since the time she left her home in Arkansas and went to Wellesley. Her experience is exemplary of our Foreign Service officers, who put their lives at risk—often in places where an American presence is necessary but not always welcome.

I look forward to supporting her nomination, but I want to express several ongoing concerns in the region. As you know, Ambassador Patterson, the impact of sanctions on Iran has been significant. While I support a diplomatic solution to the crisis and hope that we can find such an opening with a newly elected government in Iran, at the end of the day we need a partner who comes to the table in good faith and with a real offer in hand and, more importantly than an offer, real actions. Until then it is my view we must

maintain and increase pressure on the regime in order to ensure the success that we want. I look forward to hearing your views on the situation in Iran.

I would also like to know your views on the next steps moving forward in Egypt to realize the promise we had hoped for from the events in Tahir Square in 2011, that has given way to an increasingly undemocratic and insecure environment for all Egyptians.

In Iraq, I have several concerns about our diplomatic relations following the drawdown of U.S. troops. I am also disturbed by Iraq's failure—and I want to underscore, Iraq's failure, from my perspective—to protect the MEK community at Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty, which most recently resulted in 52 deaths and the kidnapping of seven individuals who remain hostages. I expect the Iraqis to hold the guilty parties responsible for their actions, and I also hold the Iraqis responsible for the security of those at Camp Liberty, and I hope that the administration will send the same message.

Finally, on the peace process, I support Secretary Kerry's efforts and believe that we must continue to keep the Palestinians at the table engaged in face to face negotiations with the Israelis. I applaud Israel's courage in agreeing to the release of prisoners at the outset of negotiations and hope the Palestinians will publicly commit to remain at the negotiating table and not pursue statehood or enhanced status through any international bodies while this effort is going along. It is only through the hard work of direct negotiations that we will be able to realize a durable and realistic peace.

You are no stranger to these complex issues. You are a decorated Foreign Service officer, and I will look forward to your service.

Let me turn to Greg Star, the nominee for Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security, who appeared before the committee this summer to testify on a bill cosponsored by Senator Corker and I and other members of the committee, the Chris Stevens-Sean Smith-Tyrone Woods, and Glen Doherty Embassy Security, Threat Mitigation, and Personnel Protection Act. You provided us with insights and benefits of many years in diplomatic security, as a special agent in the Foreign Service serving in Tunisia, Senegal, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. You later served in the Secretary of State's security detail and technical security operations, as Chief of the Division for Worldwide Local Guard and Residential Security Programs, and as a senior regional security officer at our Embassy in Tel Aviv.

And now you are returning, coming out of retirement, to be considered for Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security at a time when we sorely need your experience and expertise.

Let me conclude by saying I have said in the past and will say again, the lessons we have learned from the tragedies in Nairobi, Dar es Salaam and Benghazi are emblematic of the broader issue we will increasingly face in the 21st century. It will require our full, unequivocal, unwavering commitment to fully protect our embassies and those who serve this Nation abroad, and that will be your charge as Assistant Secretary, to help strike the proper balance between sealing off vulnerabilities in high-threat areas and continuing to conduct vigorous and effective diplomacy that serves the national interest.

The fact is we can never have absolute security in an increasingly dangerous world. But security alone is not our objective. At the end of the day, we need to address both the construction of new embassies that meet security needs and we need to do what we can to secure existing high-risk posts where we need our people to represent our interests and where new construction is not an option. That is what Senator Corker and my embassy security bill seeks to do, and my hope is that we can look forward to the legislative process soon to achieve that.

So we look forward to hearing from you, Mr. Starr, about the progress we have made, what other challenges we may have, and how do we pursue it. Again, thank you both for your years of service.

I know Senator Corker had some original comments. I do not know if there is anything you wish to pursue?

Senator CORKER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. With that, Ambassador Patterson, we will welcome your statement. Both of your statements will be fully included in the record without objection, and the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF HON. ANNE W. PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

Ambassador PATTERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, members of the committee. It is an honor to appear before you today as the President's nominee for Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce, if I could, my husband David and my older son Edward and my daughter Lamin.

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a longer statement for the committee which I submitted for the record.

I am grateful for the confidence shown by President Obama in nominating me for this position. If confirmed, I pledge to work with you to advance U.S. interests across an important and complex region that is facing historic upheaval.

Mr. Chairman, the changes taking place across the region carry the promise of a more democratic political order that will benefit the region and the United States in the long term. However, the region will remain volatile and often violent for some time to come. The challenges we face are complex, but our extensive security, economic, and humanitarian interests demand our continued engagement. The region has changed in the past few years and there is no going back.

If confirmed, my top priority will be to protect our country and our allies. Doing so will require a vigorous effort to identify and disable Syria's chemical weapons. It will mean continuing to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. And we must continue to combat terrorism and confront violent extremism across the region.

Second, we will continue to promote sustainable democratic transitions. Let me stress again how hard this is going to be. The results of elections may not be to our liking, and transitions are often plagued by false starts and reverses. We will continue our efforts

to promote democracy and universal rights, and we will stand up for the rights of women, Christians, and other minorities.

Third, we need to support governments and the private sector to create economic opportunities and jobs. Many countries in the region need to fight corruption and cut subsidies to spur investment and growth. Our global economic leadership and our assistance programs both can play a role. And we must press for open business and trade environments so American businesses have fair access to growing markets.

Fourth, Mr. Chairman, mindful that our country has lost 6,757 men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, I would focus on coping with the enormous sacrifices that our colleagues in the State Department, in the international community, and other civilian agencies are making, supporting these professionals and their families as we continue to ask more of them. People working in this region have been deeply and disproportionately affected by evacuations, lengthy separations from families, and the sheer workload associated with living and working on the critical front lines of American diplomacy.

Mr. Chairman, protecting our country requires us to practice diplomacy in dangerous places. Our people understand this. Accepting calculated risks is part of what it means to be an American diplomat today. Our Bureau will work closely together with our Ambassadors, with Mr. Starr if confirmed, and our Diplomatic Security colleagues, and with all other elements of government to protect Americans overseas.

I understand fully the responsibilities arising from the attack on our mission in Benghazi that resulted in the murders of four of our colleagues. If confirmed, I will work to fulfill our obligation to bring the perpetrators of that attack to justice.

Allow me to briefly review some of your key concerns. Mr. Chairman, I know that the Secretary of State has briefed you on Syria and the negotiations under way at the United Nations and in The Hague. I will simply reiterate his point that there can be no room for anything less than full compliance with our consistent goal of deterring and degrading Syria's ability to use these weapons in the future. The threat of unilateral use of force by the United States remains on the table should Syria not comply.

Mr. Chairman, I have just completed 2 years as Ambassador to Egypt, an extraordinarily important country for the national security interests of the United States that deserves our continued partnership and support. Mohammed Morsy was elected as President of Egypt in elections that were free and fair, even though the complex constitutional and legal process that produced these elections managed to confuse and upset nearly everyone. His removal from office on July 3 followed an extended series of political miscalculations and an inability to create an inclusive democratic process.

In the end, Egyptians will be the ones to determine whether that action was correct. We have made our concerns about this method of government change and about the violence used against unarmed protesters abundantly clear. Our response to the situation in Egypt will be consistent with U.S. laws, our national interest, and our values.

At the President's direction, we have undertaken a major review of our economic and our military assistance program. As Egypt changes, so too must our bilateral relationship. If confirmed, I will continue to urge the Egyptian government to move toward an inclusive civilian-led transition that guarantees universal rights for all citizens, including women and Christians. I look forward to working with the Congress to assure that we have the flexibility to respond to and influence changing events.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is fully committed to helping Israel and the Palestinians negotiate a final status resolution to their conflict. We are also fully and deeply committed to Israel's security. Our security cooperation has in fact never been closer. Israel is our close friend and the region's only stable democracy. The United States also continues to assist the Palestinians as they build governing institutions.

As we mark 35 years since the Camp David Accords this week, the search for Middle East peace remains at the very heart of U.S. national security interests. Secretary Kerry has worked very hard for the resumption of negotiations, which has required courageous leadership by Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Abbas.

Mr. Chairman, Iran is the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism, including in Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon. It continues to defy the international community by pursuing nuclear activity in violation of its international obligations. The United States will not allow Iran to acquire nuclear weapons.

Thanks to the indispensable role played by Congress and with international support, we have put in place an unprecedented sanctions regime against Iran. Mr. Chairman, I would like to acknowledge the efforts you played in this effort along with other members of this committee. Sanctions have hurt Iran's economy badly. The people of Iran have voted for change in the recent election of President Hassan Rouhani, who has demonstrated a markedly different tone from his predecessors. But to make progress, we need to see concrete actions.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed I pledge to work with you to assure that the resources and tools you provided our Bureau are supporting activities that advance our top national interests.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Patterson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ANNE W. PATTERSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker and members of the committee. It is an honor to appear before you as the President's nominee for the Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs.

I am grateful for the confidence shown by President Obama in nominating me for this position. If confirmed, I pledge to work with you to protect and advance U.S. interests across an exceedingly important and complex region, facing historic upheaval.

I am also pleased to appear before you today with Greg Starr, whom the President has nominated to be Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security. I have known Mr. Starr for some time and look forward to working closely with him on the important task of protecting U.S. personnel, facilities and interests in the region.

A Long Transformation Underway

Mr. Chairman, despite the tremendous challenges it faces, I believe that the historic political and social transformations taking place across the region carry the promise of a more democratic, more tolerant, and more vibrant political order that ultimately will benefit both the region and the United States. However, I anticipate

that the region will remain volatile, unpredictable, and often violent for some time to come. We face complex and difficult challenges, but our extensive security, economic and humanitarian interests demand our continued involvement and active engagement.

There are some fundamental trends underway that will set the context for U.S. diplomacy. Sixty percent of the population in this region is under 25 and nearly 45 percent of young people in the Arab world are unemployed. The three most populous Arab countries, Egypt, Algeria, and Morocco, have median ages of 20, 20, and 21, respectively. The region's rapidly growing, youthful populations lack confidence in rigid and unresponsive leaders who are unwilling or unable to address their aspirations for a better life and a greater say in their own decision making.

Shockingly, across the region, statistics indicate that unemployment levels rise with the level of education, leading to deep frustration with educational systems that fail to prepare its graduates for the modern labor force. National economies are hobbled by inefficiency and corruption, unable to provide jobs. In many countries, young people and their families invest enormous resources in what turn out to be poor university educations, and are deeply disappointed when they cannot find jobs or are not properly trained for the labor market. The situation is even more dire for young women.

At the same time, in addition to more traditional forms of street protest, these young people have been empowered by new technologies to communicate and share information in unprecedented ways—and they are not shy about expressing their anger and frustration. They reject the tired and transparent excuses and efforts by authorities to avoid responsibility for their poor performances—and they thirst for leadership and solutions, even as they watch the wintering of state institutions meant to protect citizens' personal and economic security.

What will come next is uncertain, but the region's political and social trajectory has been broadly and irrevocably changed by the events of the last 2½ years. Mr. Chairman, as one of your colleagues pointed out to me in Cairo, we Americans can never go back to looking at the region in the same way as we did before.

These inherent uncertainties will also pose security, diplomatic, and economic challenges to the United States, to our allies, and to the people of the region. With both our important national security interests and our values in mind, we have much work to do to protect our interests and to help the people of the region build peace and economic prosperity.

Our Priorities

If confirmed, Mr. Chairman, my top priority will be to protect our country and our allies. This will require a vigorous effort under international auspices to identify and disable Syria's chemical weapons capability. It will also mean continuing to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

The United States must continue to do everything we can to combat terrorism and confront violent extremism. Currently, we are seeing renewed efforts by Al Qaeda in Iraq to undermine that country and an influx of foreign fighters to the Syrian civil war from other countries in the region. Such breakdowns in security in the region have allowed the growth of regional militias, threatening legitimate governments and becoming breeding grounds for extremism. The United States needs to work with the region's leaders and its national military forces to extend counterterrorism cooperation and training for law enforcement charged with providing security for their citizens.

Second, we need to continue to promote sustainable democratic transitions in the region. Let me stress again how hard this is going to be: the results of elections may not be to our liking and transitions are often plagued by false starts and reverses. Islamist and populist political parties that do not share our values can be effective in mobilizing voters. In the face of such challenges, we need to remain patient and firmly engaged in our efforts to promote democracy. Free and fair elections based on inclusive politics, effective governance, and respect for universal human rights, including freedom of expression and freedom of association, are key elements of any country's long-term stability. And we will need to stand up for the rights of women, and ethnic and religious minorities, including Christians. The broadening of political participation is a key demand of people in these changing societies; it is also a prerequisite for successful democratic governance.

I reject the view expressed by some in the region that their countries are "not ready" for democracy, that the low levels of education and high levels of poverty assure that voters will be easily led astray, or that only a traditional strongman can control these fragmented societies. If this were true, future generations in the region would be doomed to live under autocrats and dictators. Our role, and the role of the

international community, will be to assist these countries in building more democratic and tolerant societies.

Third, we need to support the private sector and governments in the region to help create economic opportunities. The region needs to create as many as 80 million new jobs by 2020 just to meet the needs of its growing population, a staggering number since the Arab world's current labor force stands at about 100 million people. The United States is uniquely positioned to help the region address its economic challenges. Many countries in the region need to fight corruption and undertake economic reforms to end subsidies that constrain investment and growth. In my view, U.S. economic assistance is only one facet of our influence. Assistance does provide tools for the United States to encourage and support reforms in needed areas, like higher education, economic growth or the reform of security forces. But our global economic leadership and the power of our economy are equally important. We also need to work with governments to assure open business and trade environments that promote sustainable growth and enable American businesses to have fair access to growing markets. Everyone will benefit because American businesses are respected in the region for training their people in global business skills and promoting employees on the basis of merit—and because much of our own business growth is projected to come from growth in overseas markets. A few months ago, Mr. Chairman, your Subcommittee on African Affairs issued a report outlining concrete steps the United States could take to both improve standards of living in sub-Saharan Africa and to lock American businesses into primary roles in these fast growing markets. I hope we can collaborate on a similar study for the Middle East.

And fourth, Mr. Chairman, mindful that our country has lost 6,757 service men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, I also would focus on coping with the enormous sacrifices that my colleagues in the State Department, in the intelligence community, and in other civilian agencies must make and are making—and supporting these professionals and their families as we continue to ask more of them. People in the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs have been deeply and disproportionately affected by evacuations, lengthy separations from families, and just the sheer workload of living in or working with posts that are understaffed and always on the critical front lines of America diplomacy. A large number of our personnel have served tours of duty without their families at high security threat posts—some of them several times—as the number of such posts has expanded beyond Iraq and Afghanistan to Libya, Yemen, Lebanon, Tunisia, and Egypt.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, I will be asking our people to serve in these and other countries, continuing the hard work of outreach and engagement on behalf of the United States. Protecting our country requires us to practice diplomacy in dangerous places. Our people understand this—accepting calculated risks is part of what it means to be an American diplomat today. Our Bureau will work together closely with our Ambassadors and with our Diplomatic Security colleagues to do everything we can to protect Americans overseas. We will maintain open channels of communication on security matters within the Department, with the intelligence community and with the Defense Department.

I would like to review with you the broad scope of American interests that involve the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs. We cannot cover them all here, but I hope it will inform our discussions in the months ahead.

Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan

The current crisis in Syria underscores the challenges we face. The authoritarianism and brutality of the Asad family toward the Syrian people has been unrelenting; the regime has maintained itself in power through fear and the pitting of one group against the other. It has also systematically manipulated and destabilized Lebanon through its partnership with Iran and its support for Hezbollah. As change swept the region over the past 2½ years, the Syrian regime has tried to maintain its power by waging war on its own people. The U.N. estimates that over 100,000 Syrians have been killed, 2 million people have become refugees and millions more have been displaced internally due to the conflict.

The prolonged Syrian crisis has attracted extremists from across the region. The regime has recruited Hezbollah fighters from Lebanon to support them in battle. Meanwhile, terrorist groups linked to al-Qaeda have worked to gain a foothold in Syria and expand their influence among elements of the Syrian opposition. The regime has violated Lebanon's sovereignty with shelling and airstrikes. On August 21, the Syrian regime again brutally and indiscriminately used chemical weapons in attacks against its own people that killed more than 1,400 civilians. The recent framework whereby we would work with Russia to transfer the regime's chemical weapons program to international control and implement its rapid elimination will require Syria to promptly declare their holdings and cooperate in steps to eliminate

them. The world will now expect Russia to hold the Asad regime accountable for its public commitments. There can be no room for anything less than full compliance with international efforts to dismantle the Syrian chemical weapons (CW) program. Clearly, the threat of unilateral use of force by the United States played a key role in propelling the Asad regime to finally acknowledge its CW program and declare its willingness to accede to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). If these efforts fail, the President has made clear that he remains willing to act.

Moving forward, we continue to believe that there is no military solution to the Syrian crisis, which should be resolved via negotiations based on the framework outlined in the June 2012 Geneva Communiqué. The United States remains in close contact with the moderate Syrian opposition about next steps. Along with our international partners, we continue to support the moderate Syrian opposition as they work toward a democratic and unified Syria that respects the universal human rights of all its citizens. Mr. Chairman, I know that members of this committee are not satisfied with the speed of delivery of equipment to the Syrian opposition or with the level and speed of humanitarian assistance to neighboring countries. Many of you have visited Syrian refugee camps in Turkey and Jordan. The United States is providing over \$1 billion in humanitarian assistance to respond to the crisis within Syria and in neighboring countries. We are also providing \$250 million in non-lethal transition assistance to the Syrian opposition, including items requested by the Syrian Military Council. Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, I will work closely with your committee on these issues.

From its base in Lebanon, Hezbollah has fully entered the Syrian civil war on the side of the Asad regime, which has long provided it with support and a reliable connection to its Iranian financial and military support. Hezbollah seeks to involve the Lebanese people in a foreign war against their will, with no concern for the destabilizing effects on Lebanon.

The United States supports Lebanon's sovereignty, independence, national unity, and territorial integrity. We support efforts by responsible Lebanese leaders to promote democratic practices and institutions that foster Lebanon's true national interests. That is why we will continue to support the Lebanese Armed Forces and Internal Security Forces with whom we work to confront the threats of terrorism and instability. We appreciate Congress' support for these important programs. We will also continue to support Lebanon and its people as they cope with the burden of assisting the nearly 730,000 Syrians and 45,000 Palestinians from Syria who have sought refuge there.

The Syrian civil war has also created severe challenges for Jordan, a key ally and partner with whom we work on important U.S. interests in the region, including Middle East peace, helping reintegrate Iraq into the Arab world, countering violent extremism and managing the Syrian refugee crisis. Politically, economically, and on humanitarian grounds, the United States must continue to demonstrate a strong commitment to Jordan and its long-term stability.

King Abdullah II's efforts to implement political reforms in Jordan underscore his leadership in seeking a better future for the Jordanian people. Moving forward with these reforms is vital to Jordan's security, stability, democratic development and economic prosperity. The U.S. continues to support Jordan with bilateral assistance—as well as loan guarantees and IMF loans—that place special emphasis on reform and growth. In the past 2 years, we have provided Jordan with significant additional assistance to ease the burden of hosting over 520,000 refugees from Syria. We appreciate the support Congress has shown for this key ally.

Egypt

I have just completed 2 years as Ambassador in Egypt, the most populous Arab country and a bellwether for trends across the region. Simply put: what happens in Egypt matters far beyond its borders. I remain convinced that Egypt is an extraordinarily important country for the national security interests of the United States—it is a country that deserves our continued partnership and support.

Mohamed Morsy was elected as President of Egypt in elections that were free and fair, even though the complex constitutional and legal process that produced those elections managed to confuse and upset nearly everyone. The Muslim Brotherhood's Freedom and Justice Party and Salafist and other Islamist parties won widespread support across Egypt, in part, because Egyptians hoped to see an end to the corruption and mismanagement of the Mubarak regime and also because other political parties were poorly organized.

During his 1 year in office, President Morsy, who entered office promising to be a President for all Egyptians, managed to anger and disappoint many people. His removal on July 3 followed a series of political miscalculations and an inability to sustain national consensus. Demands for his removal regrettably were not tested by

an electoral process, yet in the end Egyptians will be the ones to determine whether that action was correct. The United States stands for democracy. And we have made our concerns about this method of government change and about the violence used against unarmed protesters abundantly clear. But it is also clear that many Egyptians seek security and stability after the recent tumultuous period.

The interim government has announced a roadmap to seat a democratically elected civilian government. The roadmap includes a constitutional amendment process culminating in a national referendum. The failure of the Morsy government to create an inclusive democratic process in Egypt was a mistake that other governments—including the current interim Egyptian Government—must avoid. The guarantee of universal rights for all citizens, the inclusion of ethnic and religious minorities, including Christians, and the empowerment of women is the government's duty. Egypt needs inclusive processes to amend the constitution and to conduct parliamentary elections if it is to stabilize the situation and place the country on a sound political and economic footing.

The United States believes that only Egyptians can decide the future direction for their nation. As long-time friends and partners of the Egyptian people we will do our best to support them as they seek to stabilize their nation and reignite their economy. Since July 3, the President, Secretary Kerry, and Secretary Hagel have all clearly affirmed our support for Egypt's transition to that stable, democratic and prosperous future. Members of this committee have also helped to reinforce this message. Senators McCain and Graham, well-known friends of Egypt, provided the Egyptian leadership with frank advice about America's expectations for the future.

Moving forward, our response to the situation in Egypt will be consistent with our laws, our national interests and our values. Over the past weeks, at the President's direction, we have undertaken a major review of our economic and our military assistance programs. As Egypt changes, so too must our bilateral relationship evolve. As we consider how to best recalibrate our assistance, we must take account all of the events that have taken place in Egypt, including the last 2 months. The President is currently reviewing how we will proceed, consistent with the law. If confirmed, I will continue to urge the Egyptian Government to move expeditiously toward an inclusive, civilian-led, democratic transition and I look forward to working with the Congress to assure that we have the flexibility to respond to and influence changing events.

The Search for Middle East Peace

The United States is fully committed to helping Israel and the Palestinians negotiate a final status resolution to their conflict. As the President and Secretary have repeatedly stated, the U.S. is fully and deeply committed to Israel's security. Israel is our close friend and the region's only stable democracy; our security cooperation has never been closer. Meanwhile, the United States continues to assist the Palestinians as they build governing institutions. This week marks 35 years since the Camp David accords between Israel and Egypt, shepherded by the United States, lifted hopes for a permanent end to the Middle East conflict. The search for Middle East peace remains a diplomatic challenge that is also at the very heart of U.S. national security interests; it affects all of our relationships in the region.

To his great credit, Secretary Kerry has devoted many hours and many trips to the region in an extraordinary effort to make possible the resumption of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. The resumption has taken courageous leadership by Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Abbas. We all know that this is a complicated process that will require difficult choices for both Israelis and Palestinians as they work toward reasonable compromises on tough issues with our support. Consistent with the Secretary's view that the negotiators not be restricted in their search for peace by public comment or release of details of proposals on the table, I will not go into the details of those talks in public. The Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs and our posts in the region will support Secretary Kerry in every aspect of this very important mission. Everyone knows that this will not be easy, but the goal of a two state solution, with Israelis and Palestinians living side-by-side in peace and with secure borders is at the center of American national interests in the region and beyond.

Iraq

The United States has made enormous investments and sacrifices in Iraq, including the 4,489 lives lost and 32,230 wounded during Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn. The United States military departed Iraq in 2011, with Saddam Hussein gone and an elected government in his place.

Over the past decade, we have come to better understand Iraq as a country with many diverse ethnic and religious tensions and which, freed from the despotic

regime of Saddam Hussein, has struggled to find its balance. The United States must support Iraq's efforts to build a unified and stable democratic nation. We are conducting a great deal of our engagement with Iraq under the Strategic Framework Agreement. The U.S. will continue to support the increased production and export of Iraq's energy resources, because they are so very important for Iraq's economy—and the global economy.

Regrettably, al-Qaeda in Iraq continues to threaten the Iraqi Government's efforts to establish a stable government and economy with violent acts, such as vehicle and suicide bombings. It is also seeking to rekindle a cycle of sectarian violence that in the past did so much to damage relations between Iraqis. We are urging Prime Minister Maliki and all Iraqi leaders to unite and fortify the country politically against extremist trends from any group or community. We continue to provide advice to Iraqi Forces on counterterrorism issues. I share the concern of members of this committee about the situation in Iraq and, if confirmed, look forward to consulting closely on this matter.

U.S. diplomacy supports Iraq as it seeks to remain independent of regional disputes and to integrate itself in the global economy, efforts in keeping with our regional interests. This work has produced important results, and we welcomed this year Iraq's renewal of relations with Kuwait after decades of war and enmity. Iraq has been conducting a series of provincial council elections—and it will face national elections in the first quarter of 2014, elections that will be a truly pivotal moment for the future of Iraq's democracy.

Iran

The Government of Iran has for many years been the world's foremost state sponsor of international terrorism—including in Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon—and it continues to defy the international community by pursuing nuclear activity in violation of its international obligations.

The United States will not allow Iran to acquire nuclear weapons. Thanks to the indispensable role played by Congress, and with international support, we have put in place an unprecedented sanctions regime against Iran to impede its progress in prohibited nuclear activities, as well as to persuade Tehran to address the international community's concerns about its nuclear program. I would like to acknowledge the efforts you have played in this effort, Mr. Chairman, as well as the efforts of other members of the committee. Acting both through the United Nations Security Council and regional or national authorities, the United States and our partners have put in place the strongest sanctions measures in history relating to Iran's nuclear, missile, energy, shipping, transportation, and financial sectors. Those sanctions have had a serious negative impact on Iran's economy. The people of Iran, frustrated with their government's aggressive foreign policy and straining under the effects of economic sanctions, voted for change in the recent election of President Hassan Rouhani.

President Rouhani has demonstrated a markedly different tone than his predecessor and we note he has used conciliatory language since his election. However, we have made it clear that we need to see concrete actions to address the international community's concerns about Iran's nuclear program. The Iranian Government has an opportunity to reduce its isolation by resolving these concerns. The United States and our international partners remain committed to a dual track approach of pressure and engagement to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon—and we are prepared to meet with Iran as soon as possible on the matter through the P5+1.

Iran has a rich history and talented people—it is a country which could be making important contributions to the global community. Should the Iranian Government choose to engage substantively and seriously to meet its international obligations and find a peaceful solution to this issue, the United States will be a willing partner.

The Arabian Peninsula

Over many decades, the United States has built deep and mutually beneficial relationships with the countries of the Arabian Peninsula. Generations of students from the region have studied in the United States, including rising leaders we will see assume positions of greater authority in the near future. We share common interests in confronting regional threats, including the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons, and in ensuring stable world markets in finance and energy. American businesses have developed thriving partnerships in these expanding economies, which had over 100 billion dollars' worth of trade with the United States in 2011.

While we do not always see precisely eye to eye on the many challenges facing the Middle East, we have established an unprecedented counterterrorism and security cooperation. This has been a significant priority for President Obama and Secretary Kerry and will be for me, as well. Our security relationships with the Gulf countries over the past 12 years have been vital to our military operations in the region, and will continue to be strategically critical as we together confront threats from Iran and regional instability stemming from the Assad regime's oppression of its people. Qatar hosts CENTCOM Forward Headquarters and U.S. Air Force Central Command operations at Al Udeid Air Base. Bahrain is a major non-NATO ally that hosts the U.S. Navy's Fifth Fleet. Kuwait is a major non-NATO ally that hosts the largest presence of U.S. forces in the region. The UAE and Oman have been strong partners and made major contributions to regional peacekeeping security, and counterterrorism efforts.

Even as we work to strengthen the longstanding security and economic aspects of our relationships in the Gulf, we are facing new challenges. These societies have struggled over the past decades to cope with the rapid pace of modernization, population growth and the rising expectations of their young people. Our continued engagement with these countries, both government to government, and people to people, will be important in addressing key principles such as adherence to universal human rights, including equality for women and freedom of religion, as these processes continue to play out. While at times we have seen an impulse toward greater restrictions, there is a countervailing domestic pressure toward greater openness and to strengthen the bridges connecting these societies with the rest of the world. At least 77,000 Saudi students are pursuing higher education in the United States, even as King Abdullah has undertaken some initial steps toward social modernization such as improving the Kingdom's education and judicial establishments, advancing an interfaith dialogue, appointing women to the Consultative Council, and passing an antidomestic violence law.

After some early progress on reform following the Bahrain Government's 2011 response to domestic protests, the pace has slowed, particularly on accountability and freedom of expression. Bahrain's leadership needs to pursue a process of meaningful dialogue with the country's peaceful opposition that results in sustainable political reforms. The United States will support Bahrain as it undertakes these reforms and expands its commitment to the protection of citizens' universal human rights—changes that will enhance Bahrain's long-term stability. Across the region, we will continue to express our strong concerns over restrictions on religious freedom, freedom of expression and assembly, and women's issues. Our message is clear and consistent: the only way forward in responding to the demands of a new generation is increasing openness and adherence to universal human rights.

Finally, I would note that we have seen the Gulf Cooperation Council states come together and work effectively with us and other international partners in Yemen, one of the world's poorest and least-developed countries, which continues to face serious security challenges. Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula remains one of the most significant terrorist threats to the United States, and it continues to exploit Yemen's weak governance to find safe haven and to project these threats outside of Yemen's borders. Under a Gulf Cooperation Council initiative, and with the help of the United States, Yemen's Government has defied enormous odds to move from the protests that brought about an end to the three decade rule of President Ali Abdullah Saleh to a relatively peaceful and well-defined transition under the leadership of President Abd Rabbuh Mansur Hadi. The United States has provided significant assistance to Yemen's transition. Ultimately, Yemen's successful transition is a key underpinning of long term stability and security in the region, and the United States will continue work with the GCC and other international partners to support Yemen's ongoing transition.

North Africa

More than 2 years after its revolution, Libya continues to contend with the serious challenges resulting from Qadhafi's dictatorial rule, including the need to rebuild almost from scratch security forces and weak institutions, porous borders and loose weapons, and to root out militia groups and terrorists. There has been political progress: Libya held its first free and fair elections in over 40 years just over a year ago and continues taking the steps necessary to draft a new constitution. Yet recent political unrest has sharply reduced Libya's oil and gas exports, demonstrating how difficult and fragile this transition is.

There is tremendous goodwill toward the United States and a strong desire on the part of Libyans to reengage with the West after decades of Qadhafi-imposed isolation. The United States has a strategic opportunity to forge a strong and mutually beneficial relationship with Libya. Our limited, targeted technical assistance to help

Libya build the capacity to address issues of concern for our own national interests has been a welcomed part of this reengagement. We have had a good working relationship with Prime Minister Ali Zeidan and his government, and I look forward to discussing ways in which we can work together to advance Libya's democratic reforms and help it address its security concerns.

Mr. Chairman, we understand fully the responsibilities arising from the attack on our special mission facilities in Benghazi a year ago that resulted in the murders of four of our colleagues. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Justice Department and Libyan authorities to bring the perpetrators of that attack to justice.

Tunisia and the United States share over 200 years of history, resulting in rich cultural, economic, and security ties. Tunisia's January 2011 revolution, which initiated the "Arab Awakening," marked the beginning of a new phase of cooperation between our two countries. Tunisia continues to make progress in its democratic transition and has made major progress in efforts to draft a new constitution. Over the last 2 years, the United States has committed more than \$350 million in assistance to Tunisia to support its democratic transition, economic stabilization and growth, as well as its efforts to enhance security in the country and along its borders. I look forward to improving and deepening our security cooperation with Tunisia, to include urging the Government of Tunisia to bring to justice the perpetrators of the September 14, 2012, attack on our Embassy and the American school.

Algeria and the United States have built a strong bilateral relationship, with a focus on our shared interest in battling terrorism and violent extremism. Algeria's experience fighting an Islamist insurgency during the 1990s resulted in a well-equipped and battle-hardened military that constitutes one of the strongest counter-terror forces in the region. We hope Algeria will continue to assume a greater regional leadership role to help stabilize neighboring states, which are also struggling with the presence of terrorists, loose weapons, and porous borders. We are working to expand our trade relationship with Algeria and will continue to support efforts to make room for civil society and to implement other political reforms en route to Presidential elections next year.

After more than 235 years of friendship, the U.S. and Morocco continue to enjoy a strong bilateral relationship, with shared interests in promoting regional stability, countering violent extremism, and strengthening trade and cultural ties. In recent years, King Mohammed VI has initiated reforms to strengthen the role of Parliament, rule of law, and human rights. Morocco remains a key partner to the United States on regional security and counterterrorism issues. Since 2006 the United States and Morocco have had a bilateral Free Trade Agreement, which has increased bilateral trade by 244 percent. During its current term on the U.N. Security Council, Morocco has played an important role in international efforts to end the Syrian civil war.

Focused on our Highest Priorities

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am well aware that we are facing a period of difficult budgets and many competing priorities. However, we have a responsibility to protect our national interests, so many of which are tied to the Middle East and north Africa. The popular ferment, reform efforts and the transitions underway across the region highlight the need for the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs to have a well-resourced and flexible platform from which to conduct our diplomacy—with an up-to-date, secure infrastructure. Our diplomatic and consular posts are being asked to do more and must have the State Operations and Diplomatic Security resources to meet our diplomatic challenges. In my view, it is critical that our posts in the region be able to build new relationships now, in this time of unsettled transitions, in order to set the tone and direction for America's partnerships in the region for decades to come. In spite of the immense challenges, now is not the time to withdraw from the region. Instead, we must refocus our efforts in support of the many American strategic interests in the region.

If confirmed, I pledge to work with you to assure that the resources and tools you provide our Bureau are being directed to our highest priorities and are supporting activities that advance our top national security and economic interests. Under the President's leadership, I pledge to work with you to build a principled structure on which the United States can deepen our ties with the region, and to ensure that we continue to have the will, the trust, and the capability to advance our shared security and prosperity and to meet our many global challenges together.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Ambassador.
Mr. Starr.

**STATEMENT OF GREGORY B. STARR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY**

Mr. STARR. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, members of the committee, I too am honored to appear before you today. I would like to thank the committee for your continued support and the interest in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security Programs in protecting American diplomats abroad. This support enables Diplomatic Security, also known as "DS," to safeguard American diplomats and facilities for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, while maintaining our robust investigative programs which serve to protect the United States borders and our presence overseas.

As the President's nominee to become Assistant Secretary at the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, I am thankful to the President and Secretary Kerry for the confidence that they have placed in me to lead Diplomatic Security during these difficult and demanding times.

I have been a security professional for more than 30 years. My experience both within the Department and outside government has prepared me to take on the challenges of leading Diplomatic Security in the future.

The world is changing and so is the way in which diplomacy is conducted. Therefore the way in which we provide security for our diplomats must change with it. We can never truly eliminate all risks faced by the U.S. Government personnel as they advance our national interests abroad. We in the Department constantly review evolving threats and seek to mitigate risk as much as possible.

The challenges we have faced in the previous decade, over the previous year in particular, have been significant and growing. Increasingly, our people are called upon to live and work in difficult and dangerous environments. We operate in these environments out of necessity because that is where we must be to serve our Nation's interests. I have learned that we cannot shut ourselves inside embassies, embrace a zero risk posture, and forgo the work of helping build the rule of law and strengthen democratic institutions abroad. It is in just these countries where it is toughest to serve where American diplomacy pays the greatest dividends.

This is the face of American diplomacy today and it is my job and the job of Diplomatic Security to keep our people safe while still allowing the important work to continue.

As a senior leader within Diplomatic Security, I can tell you that we are looking toward the next challenges and threats. We must continue to embrace change across the spectrum of security requirements. If confirmed, I plan to focus on three broad priorities. Those are: staffing and resources; improving coordination among our investigative elements; and continuing to improve our physical security protections for U.S. personnel serving overseas.

In terms of staffing and resources, I want to ensure that we have qualified people with sufficient training and the right resources at our posts overseas in order to respond to each post's unique security environment; and we improve the training of our foreign affairs colleagues by expanding our foreign affairs counterthreat courses.

On the investigative side of Diplomatic Security, I will continue to ensure that our criminal investigators, background investigators, and cyber security personnel are working closely together, as well as with other Department offices. Under my leadership we have improved our coordination both within the Department and with our interagency partners in the Department of Defense and the international community.

Finally, we will continue to work closely with our partners in the Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations and regional bureaus to provide safe, secure, and functional embassies and consulates that represent the United States abroad.

In conclusion, I want to assure this committee that we in DS realize that our work in securing our posts and protecting our people will never be done. We take great pride in our accomplishments, but we are focused on the future. If confirmed, I pledge that through my leadership everyone in DS will understand that they must lead by example, properly delegate authority, and be committed to continually improving how we deliver security to our constituents and achieve our global mission.

Having said that, I want to be clear that I believe that responsibility for the provision of security lies with the Assistant Secretary of Diplomatic Security, and if confirmed I am committed to shouldering that responsibility.

I will be glad to answer any questions you have. Thank you very much for allowing me to appear here.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Starr follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GREGORY B. STARR

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, members of the committee, I am honored to appear before you today. I would like to thank the committee for your continued support and interest in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security's programs. This support enables Diplomatic Security, also known as DS, to safeguard American diplomats and facilities for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, while maintaining our robust investigative programs which serve to protect the United States borders and our presence overseas. As the President's nominee to become the Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, I am thankful to the President and Secretary Kerry for the confidence they have placed in me to lead DS during these difficult and demanding times.

I have been a security professional for over 30 years. My experience both within the Department and outside our government has prepared me to take on the challenges of leading DS into the future. The world is changing, and so is the way in which diplomacy is conducted; the way in which we provide security for our diplomats must change with it.

Although we can never truly eliminate all risks faced by U.S. Government personnel as they advance our national interests abroad, we in the Department constantly review evolving threats and seek to mitigate risk as much as possible. The challenges we have faced over the previous decade, and over the previous year in particular, have been significant and growing. Increasingly, our people are called upon to live and work in difficult and dangerous environments. We operate in these environments out of necessity, because that is where we must be to serve our Nation's interests. I have learned that we cannot shut ourselves inside our embassies, embracing a zero-risk posture, and forgo the work of helping build the rule of law and strengthen democratic institutions abroad. It is in just these countries where it is toughest to serve, where American diplomacy pays the greatest dividends. This is the face of American diplomacy today and it is my job, and the job of DS, to keep our people safe while still allowing this important work to continue.

As a senior leader within DS, I can tell you that we are looking toward the next challenges and threats. We must continue to embrace change across the spectrum of security requirements. If confirmed, I plan to focus on three broad priorities: staffing and resources, improving coordination among our investigative elements,

and continuing to improve our physical security protections for U.S. personnel serving overseas.

In terms of staffing and resources, I want to ensure that we have qualified people, with sufficient training, and the right resources at our posts overseas in order to respond to each post's unique security environment. We improved the training our foreign affairs colleagues receive by expanding our Foreign Affairs Counter-Threat (FACT) course. On the investigative side of DS, I will continue to ensure that our criminal investigators, background investigators, and cyber security personnel are working closely together, as well as with other Department offices. Under my leadership, we have improved our coordination both within the Department and with our interagency partners in the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community. Finally, we will continue to work closely with our partners in the Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations and Regional Bureaus to provide safe, secure, and functional embassies and consulates that represent the United States abroad.

In conclusion, I want to assure this committee that we in DS realize that our work in securing our posts and protecting our people will never be done. We take great pride in our accomplishments, but we are focused on the future. If confirmed, I pledge that through my leadership, everyone within DS will understand that they must lead by example, properly delegate authority, and be committed to continually improving how we deliver security to our constituents and achieve our global mission. Having said that, I want to be clear that I believe that responsibility for the provision of security lies with the Assistant Secretary of DS and if I am confirmed, I am committed to shouldering that responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Thank you both for your statements.

Ambassador, thank you for an in-depth statement. I know that is partly as a response to issues that I raised, so let me explore one or two of them with you. Over the last 2 months we have had over a thousand people killed in Egypt. Hundreds have been arrested for their political allegiances. The Mubarak-era emergency law has been reinstated and just extended for another 2 months.

So I look at our efforts here and I see our canceling Bright Star exercises, I see our suspending the delivery of F-16s. And it has not, at least to me, indicated changing much of the behavior of the present leadership inside of the country. So what other leverage do we have here to get back on the track to ensure a civilian government, moving toward an inclusive Egypt? What are your views on conditioning or restructuring aid to Egypt in the current environment?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me say that certainly the incidents of the past few months, the killing of unarmed demonstrators and the reinstatement of emergency law, have been quite worrisome. But let me also point to a roadmap that the government has put forward, and we will do everything we possibly can to push them along that path of reinstating a civilian government.

But this does provide an opportunity to look at the assistance program in a new way. The President has instructed us to undertake a full-scale review of our assistance programs in Egypt and to look at ways to, at the very least, to modernize those to reflect the new realities, particularly in the military assistance package. That process is ongoing, Senator, so I cannot predict what the results will be. But it is an opportunity to look at things anew in our assistance relationship.

Senator, I might add that it is not just assistance that will, I think, encourage the government to resume a democratic path. Tourism has dried up, investment has dried up. We have not seen a great deal of disinvestment for the moment, but engagement with

the West is much more widespread than the assistance relationship. I think there are many in the Egyptian Government and certainly in the business community who appreciate that they need those ties and they need that revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I would appreciate and I hope you will take back to the Department that it would be good to engage with this committee as they evaluate what the new paradigm might be for assistance. I was one of those who argued strenuously, including on the floor of the Senate, against cutting all aid or freezing all aid to Egypt. But I have to be honest with you. As I see circumstances unfold, I increasingly am concerned about whether that now at this point is the continuing right decision. I would look forward to a dialogue with the Department to share views about how we move in a direction that achieves our goals inside of Egypt.

Let me turn to Iran quickly. I know that there is a lot of bubbling expectation and hope, and I certainly share the hope, that some of the words and limited actions that are being taken are an expression of something deeper. But at the end of the day, only actions as it relates to the international community's position, not just the U.S. position but the international community's position, will lead us to believe that Iran is sincere about changing their course toward nuclear weapons.

The expression that "we will never have nuclear weapons" is not enough. If the world could just trust everybody, like Assad, who said he did not have chemical weapons, but now admits that he has them—to say that "we will never have nuclear weapons" is not enough.

You know, since the Iranian election Iran has added 2,000 centrifuges, including 300 second generation ones. It is looking at a plutonium process, which is very worrisome. And yet the administration has issued very few new sanctions.

So I would like to get a sense from you as to what more can the administration do to send a message to the Iranians that we appreciate the words, but we will only trust actions that go in line with the international community?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that is right. We have seen some encouraging signs in the past few days, the release of a limited number of political prisoners, some of the statements by President Rouhani about the nuclear program. But the fundamental issue here is that they have to comply, Iran has to comply, with the provisions of their international obligations, both to the IAEA and to the Security Council resolutions.

Let me say, Senator, as I was getting ready for this hearing I looked at the sanctions and I was surprised at how effective they have been. This is the most effect sanctions program that I can ever remember. The effect on their petroleum exports, cutting off Iran from the international financial system, the effect on inflation, the effect on the depreciation of the rial—this is what, one might hazard a guess, is what has brought them to this point.

So I think we need to see how the sanctions regime will play out. There are some targets coming up. There is the evaluation of the reduction in oil imports. So I think we need to give it a little more time. But again, I look forward, if confirmed in this position, to

working closely with you on the Iranian sanctions program, because again I think it has been very successful.

One way, one demonstration of that, I believe was the election of President Rouhani, since the Iranian people voted for change, clearly voted for change.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just close by saying, look, sanctions are a means to an end. As strongly as I have been an advocate and the author of them, if Iran were to act in accordance with the P5+1 positions, with the international community's positions, with the Security Council's positions, then upon acting in that way in a verifiable way, I will be one of the advocates of seeking to lift those sanctions, because I am sure the Iranians wonder whether the sanctions would ever be lifted if they actually comply. I for one would be ready to do so, but only if, in fact, we have compliance in accordance with the United Nations Security Council resolutions and the efforts of the P5+1.

I have a whole host of other questions for you and Mr. Starr, but I will turn to Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both again for your distinguished careers. I think both of you are very suited for the positions you have been nominated to and I look forward to working with you both.

In your case, Ambassador Patterson, you are moving from in a way a field commander's position to a strategist. Some of us have watched and feel like sometimes that our responses to what is developing in the Middle East are ad hoc, maybe especially so in Syria until recent times. I am just wondering if you get a sense as to whether there is an overarching strategy in the region or whether, in fact, our foreign policy and our relationships in these countries is more dependent on events as they evolve. I would just like for you to expand on that if you could.

Ambassador PATTERSON. Thank you, Senator Corker. Yes, I know this is a very difficult issue, because frankly I think the changes in the Arab Spring or Arab Awakening, as we now call it, came at us very, very rapidly. But I do think there is an overarching strategy toward the region and I tried a bit to lay that out in my longer written statement.

The first is to try and promote some kind of democratic transition. These societies are not going to go back to where they were. They have gotten rid of old autocrats. There is a high degree of violence. There is a lack of institutional structures throughout the region. So that I think is our first priority, and it is going to be really hard, because each country is at a different level of development.

At the same time we have these enormous security interests in the region, in Syria and Iran and Libya, and we are going to have to pursue those simultaneously. So those I would say would be the two overriding elements in our strategy, but the implementation of them is going to be extraordinarily difficult. I might hazard to say that it is going to be expensive at times. Look at the Syria situation. But I would say those would be our two priorities for the region, to, one, promote our security interests, which are going to differ from country to country, and to promote an overall broad strategy of democratization.

Senator CORKER. You know, a recent observation in the Middle East would be that democracy means to many of the folks in the Middle East that democracy is an election. It is almost a "one and done" mentality. The election occurs and then there is the consolidation of power. Right now in Iraq, one of the reasons we are having some of the security issues or they are having some of the security issues they have there is Maliki is focused on concentrating power and appealing to the base. We had the same thing with Morsi in Egypt.

Is there anything you might—is there any light you might shed to us regarding how you see that evolving over time to real governance issues?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Senator Corker, that is going to be a huge challenge, because these countries—elections obviously are not enough, because these countries have no institutional structures. I mean, in the most fundamental way they have weak structures even to support an electoral process. So we are going to have to help them develop rule of law systems, to help them develop commercial regulation, to help them develop all the things, participation by minorities, which I think is probably the most critical element throughout the Middle East, to have adequate participation by minority populations in the overall political environment.

That involves working with political parties. It involves working with civil society. And it is going to take a really long time because there is no history of this. I do not want to come before you and suggest this is going to be easy.

I think we may be aided by having the support of many of our allies in this respect, but it is going to be a long, hard slog.

Senator CORKER. I appreciated your comment about the sanctions on Iran, and I do think they have had a big effect and there is no question of the people on this committee that have had the biggest role, there is no question our chairman has, and I want to thank him for that.

I also want to say that I think the committee's actions relative to Syria a few weeks ago had a big effect on moving toward the discussions that are now under way.

Now, recently, I guess I read this morning in the paper and heard through conversations last night that maybe the Iranian issue is now being discussed. Do you have any sense of what is happening right now relative to negotiations and how the Syrian issue may lead to other conversations in Iran that we might not be aware of?

Ambassador PATTERSON. No, Senator, I do not have any information about that.

Senator CORKER. Let me ask you this. The Arab Spring or the Awakening, as you just called it, as we look, and I know the chairman mentioned something about how we look at our national interests in Egypt—I too felt like at the time of the debate it was not the time to just cut off all aid. I think at some point we will figure out a way to pursue aid in a way that does further our national interests, at the same time does send a signal to the Egyptian military.

But can you tell, with everything that has happened—we had a dictator that left, we had an election, now we have a different situ-

ation—has the Arab Awakening, as you call it, ushered in any difference in Egypt at this point? Has anything really changed? Are we back where we started a couple of years ago?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Senator Corker, I do not think we are back where we started, because the population is energized. This huge number of largely unemployed young men who have now the ability to communicate through means that they did not have even 5 years ago—the population is hugely energized and at least in Egypt believes that taking to the streets in demonstrations is the way to express yourself politically.

The trick for the international community will be to try to help countries, and not just Egypt, get past that and channel this enormous enthusiasm and, frankly, frustration of young people, which is very multifaceted, into a legitimate political structure. So I do not think it is going to go back by any means, but I do think, because of a combination of factors, we may be in for a prolonged period of instability in this region, and not just in Egypt.

Senator CORKER. I know my time is up and we have other panelists, and I do not know if we are going to have another round. If we do not, again I want to thank you both for your desire to serve in this way.

Mr. Starr, I know we talked at length about Diplomatic Security. I know that you have emphasized that the buck stops with you, and I really like that attitude. I do hope that in the State Department itself you will figure out a way to have a different degree of accountability than we now have. I hope that will be a thrust. I think the bill that we have looked at here in the Senate may help with that. But I do thank you for your willingness and I will look forward to working with you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Corker.
Senator Shaheen.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Ambassador Patterson and Mr. Starr, both of you, for your willingness to continue to serve the country and take on these important posts at a very critical time.

Ambassador Patterson, I especially appreciate the kindness you have showed to a number of us when we visited Pakistan during your tenure there and your great work in Egypt in a turbulent time.

I actually want to start, Ambassador Patterson, by asking you about the special immigrant visa program. Having served in some of the countries that have been critical to the effort in Iraq and Afghanistan, as I am sure you are aware, the special immigrant visa program was established by Congress to address those people in Iraq and Afghanistan who have been very helpful to our efforts there, who in many cases risked their lives and their families' lives to help ensure that the Americans who were on the ground were safe and able to accomplish their missions.

I am very troubled that we are here with the special immigrant visa program for Iraqis due to expire at the end of this month. I am hopeful that we are going to see a willingness on the part of the House to extend this program. I know that the Senate is very committed to this, that there is language on the defense authorization bill that Senator McCain and I have offered to address it.

But hopefully we can reassure those people who are in the queue to come to the United States to safety that they will have our assistance in doing that. I wonder if you could speak to what might happen to some of those folks if we are not able to extend this program and allow them to come to the United States?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Thank you, Senator Shaheen. Let me start off with my son, who is here today, Edward, was a captain in Iraq a few years ago. He sent me an e-mail—I will never forget this. He sent me an e-mail about one of the interpreters with his unit, who had pulled some of the injured soldiers in his unit to safety. So I feel a personal connection to this issue.

The administration is asking for an extension. I know the number has been under the cap; 2,500 people have been processed. We are trying to speed up that process and I hope we can do that. I will certainly promise you that I will do everything we possibly can to speed that process up. But we are going to ask for an extension.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, thank you. I appreciate that. As you point out, it is a two-part problem. One is to make sure that the program gets extended, that the authorization gets extended, past September 30. But the other problem is to make sure that at the State Department we are processing those special visas in a way that keeps people moving through the queue. Sadly, I think that to date the record has not been as good as I would like to see it in terms of addressing the people who are waiting. I appreciate that there are security issues and that we need to address those, but it would be tragic for us to fail to help the people who helped our men and women on the ground and as the result they and their families are at risk and threatened.

So thank you for your commitment.

Ambassador PATTERSON. Thank you.

Senator SHAHEEN. Can I also ask you if you could give us an update on where the current Israeli-Palestinian negotiations are? I think all of us have applauded the effort to restart those and Secretary Kerry's tireless work in doing that. But we are watching with great interest and some concern about whether these talks are going to go anywhere.

Ambassador PATTERSON. Senator Shaheen, I have talked to Secretary Kerry about this and he is very optimistic. I must tell you, we all admire his leadership on this issue, that he has really put an enormous amount of his personal prestige behind this.

But I frankly do not have any details to offer you, because he has said that he would like to be the one that will engage on this issue. So I will certainly convey that to him. But I think Martin Indyk is also—I think he may be back in town, and perhaps we can arrange a discussion with members of the committee.

Senator SHAHEEN. I think that would be very helpful. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will facilitate that.

Thank you.

Ambassador PATTERSON. Thank you.

Senator SHAHEEN. I am almost out of time, but I just wanted to ask, Mr. Starr, one question for you, because with the focus on what happened tragically in Benghazi, we know that security at our embassies is critical and that, despite their diplomatic role,

that anybody who is assigned overseas is in a risky position and there is the potential for danger.

At the end of the day, it is really our host countries that we depend on to address our embassy security. Can you speak to whether there is more that we can or should be doing in terms of working with those host countries on ensuring that our embassies are protected?

Mr. STARR. Thank you for that question, Senator. Yes, I think that, despite the fact that we work so closely with the international community and with the Department of Defense, others in the Federal Government, on all of these issues, in many cases it really does come down to the State Department people on the ground and the host country. We believe that programs like the Antiterrorism Assistance Program and other programs where we are trying to help host countries develop the capabilities to protect themselves and protect us at the same time and protect our presence, are critical. We need to continue those programs. They have been effective in the past.

We look for opportunities to expand those programs. Quite honestly, I think that that is an important factor. Beyond just continuing to say things like we will hold the host country responsible, we have to help them be responsible. So yes, there are ways that we can do this and we will continue. If I am confirmed, I will continue to look closely at that. The Antiterrorism Assistance Programs, Diplomatic Security is the implementer. The Bureau of Counterterrorism is the director of the programs. We will work closely toward that.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you. I appreciate that and hope you will share what happens with this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Shaheen.

Senator Risch.

Senator RISCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Patterson, I have a series of questions for you on Syria and on Egypt and others. But I am going to set those aside, because I have got to tell you, I am shocked, I am absolutely shocked, to sit here and have you describe the sanctions against Iran, after you have reviewed them, as you said, and your conclusion that they have been effective. You described them as successful.

I am one that was a sponsor of those. I have promoted them. I had reservations about them, but I have got to tell you, if this is the administration's view, that these have been effective and successful, I hope you will take the message back to the State Department that this is not a "mission accomplished" moment. I think they have been an abject failure.

You heard the chairman describe about the new centrifuges they have brought in, about the new technology they are using. I mean, I do not understand this. I am taken aback by your description of what the sanctions have done.

These sanctions were not put in place to impose some kind of pain or something like that. They were imposed to change conduct. They were imposed in order to make conduct different. They have been an abject failure in that response, and I would really hope that you and the administration, if that is their position, would rethink this.

Ambassador PATTERSON. Senator Risch, I certainly did not mean to imply that they have been successful in changing behavior. But they have certainly been very successful at causing pain in the Iranian economy, and hopefully they will be successful in bringing Iran to the table to discuss these other issues, to actually affect behavior.

I totally understand your point, that it is not just to cause pain in the economy, but also to change behavior. But causing pain in the economy is how sanctions work. The reduction in oil revenue has been dramatic. Cutting them off from the international financial system has made it almost impossible for them to export or trade. Again, the distress in the population, which we think had an impact on President Rouhani's election.

So it needs time for diplomacy to work. We think there is still time. But let me again stress, Senator Risch, the President's position that Iraq will not—Iran, excuse me—Iran will not acquire a nuclear weapon. But I certainly understand your point. Let me say that I absolutely—what matters is results and not just economic pain.

Senator RISCH. Well, as we all know, in this diplomatic business vocabulary is important. I would hope you would remove the word “success” and you would remove the word “effective” from the vocabulary when you are talking about this program, because they are not in any way, shape, or form successful or effective in making these people comply with the conduct that the world demands of them.

So I would hope you would review that and instead go back to the point that we were going to try these things first. We were going to try sanctions first, but that all options are on the table, and every day that goes by it looks more and more as if we are going to have to turn to other options, which we do not want to do, the world does not want to do, and I guarantee you when we are done the Iranian people are not going to want to do.

So I would really hope that you will revisit the language and the adjectives and the vocabulary that we are using.

Let me just finish up with something that is much more parochial. I understand this is difficult to do in an open setting as opposed to a classified setting. But I have a constituent, Pastor Abedini, that you are familiar with, who has been held now for 418 days in prison in Iran for doing nothing but being a Christian and speaking about Christian matters.

I understand we do not have diplomatic relationships with the country and we all know how difficult the relationship is. And we also understand that there are other channels that we cannot talk about here. But I hope you will take back a message again to the State Department on how important it is that this man be released from prison, for doing something that the world does not condone, and that is simply for exercising his religious freedom.

My time is up and I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Risch.

Let me just take a moment. I appreciate what the Senator had to say about how you view the word “success” or “effective.” I personally believe if we say that the end game that we want, which is Iran to deter its nuclear weapons program, have we succeeded

in that? No, not yet. But I do believe that, as I understood the Ambassador's use of the word, which I would embrace personally, that they have been effective in moving the Iranians to a point to understand the consequences to everyday Iranians in their lives, and therefore to the regime.

The regime ultimately wants to be able to stay in power. And they may think our efforts as it relates to the nuclear program is about regime change. It is not. It is about, as the international community has said, not to pursue nuclear weapons, a nuclear capacity that could ultimately turn into a nuclear weapon, not regime change, as much as I may have issues with the regime. That is not the focus.

But part of the consequences of sanctions, especially if they continue to be vigorously enforced and ratcheted up, is that the population inside of Iran will increasingly clamor against the regime to change the consequences in their lives. So the regime will have to think about regime change, not from without, but from within. In that context, I think it is very important, and I do believe they have been effective. They can be even more effective.

I would just say to all of my colleagues, having just gone through the exercise in this committee about the question of the authorization for the use of military force as it related to Syria—and each issue is different, but the absence of continuing to pursue the sanctions regime to a point that may be what we see in the election of Rouhani, may be what we see in the comments that have ensued since, is as a result of the economic pressures that they are facing and are continuously ratcheted up. But if that is not successful, then the only option left then will be a vote for a use of force. I hope that colleagues who feel, as I do, that Iran at all costs cannot have the wherewithal to achieve nuclear weapons will be in a position at that time to support the use of force, because otherwise either we have sanctions vigorously pursued, hopefully with the goal that we collectively want, or there is only one other option after that, assuming that does not yield the diplomacy we want. That is the challenge we will face.

Senator RISCH. Mr. Chairman, first of all, thank you very much for those words. Again, I come back to the fact that I think we should take out of this description of what is happening there, the words "success" and "effective," because, as you pointed out, they have not even been effective or successful in getting them to put their nuclear program on hold. Indeed, they are expanding it, as you eloquently described in your opening statement.

So I think by using in front of a committee like this, the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, for the administration to come here and say, well, you know, we are pleased that they have been effective and successful, I think back in Iran, who watches these statements very closely, they are going to breathe a little bit of a sigh of relief and say, well, you know, I guess they are not thinking about the other things that are on the table.

I think people should understand there and should understand in the international community and the administration should understand that the other options on the table we are getting closer and closer and closer to because of the ineffectiveness and the lack of success with the sanctions. So that is my view of the thing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate that, and I will not belabor it, that we have a disagreement, that the use of the word I think is in the context of having abiding economic consequence that may change part of the equation. But the gentleman and I share the same goal, and I just hope that, as he and I share the same goal, that others who have expressed the willingness to share that same goal also are going to be willing to be supportive of what the President will need if diplomacy does not yield at the end of the day.

Senator KAINE.

Senator KAINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and to the committee.

Ambassador Patterson, first thank you for being here today. I look forward to supporting your nomination and working with you in my subcommittee chairmanship capacity. I have decided to give Mr. Starr his money's worth for coming, so I am going to direct my questions at him if you do not mind.

Mr. Starr, some things have happened since we went on recess and I think it would just be helpful for the committee and all who are watching this to understand some of your recent actions. On the 4th of August the State Department ordered the closure of 22 diplomatic missions across the Middle East and North Africa due to potential terrorist threats. If you could, in the unclassified way, just quickly kind of walk us through making that decision and then how you made the decision about when to reopen those consulates and missions, please?

Mr. STARR. Sir, trying to keep this unclassified will be difficult. We had specific threat information that was credible. It was not specific to where something might happen against us. In close collaboration with all of our partners, decisions were made that closing some of our facilities would give us time to develop what that threat information was, to more adequately put protective measures in place, to work with host governments to protect us while we worked to determine and counter that threat.

I think it is important that we have the capability to do things like that.

I would like to put something on the record, which is that often-times we say, you know, an embassy gets closed. In many cases we may have to close our operations to the public, but the essential work that goes on in many of our embassies continues in many cases. We do not abandon our facilities. There is much that still goes on while we may still be closed to the public.

But you are correct, there was specific threat information. We needed a broad brush to address that specific threat information. I think it is indicative of the administration's willingness to balance the fact that, yes, we need to stay there and we need to be able to continue in the long run, with sometimes we need to take short-term steps that are effective and help us mitigate threats against us.

Senator KAINE. Mr. Starr, also within the last week there was a significant attack on the consulate in Afghanistan's Herat province. There were no U.S. casualties, I think because of a very strong response, both by embassy personnel and others. I was hoping you would just describe, again in an unclassified way, that at-

tack and how State Department personnel and others worked to make sure that it was rebuffed without any U.S. casualties?

Mr. STARR. Sir, at approximately 5:30 in the morning a group of individuals, which we now believe were probably led by Haqqani or sponsored by the Haqqani network, using Taliban personnel, attacked our facility in Herat, first with a very large truck bomb that exploded at our front gate, and then followed up with attackers that were wearing suicide vests, carrying automatic weapons, a large variety of mines and antipersonnel devices, and RPGs.

That Post is one of our posts where it is not protected by the Department of Defense. It is Diplomatic Security along with a cadre of very experienced contractors. It is a post that benefited from the fact that the nondefensive personnel that are assigned there, the regular Foreign Service officers, had gone through what we call our FACT—Foreign Affairs Counter Threat—training beforehand. At the moment that attack commenced, every one of them donned their protective gear. They had been drilled to make sure that they got immediately to the safe havens, which is exactly what they did.

The drilling on the part of the regional security officers and the defensive personnel that we had was incredibly effective, and in fact we neutralized the threat. I believe the total number was eight attackers that our personnel neutralized.

I would like to go on record saying that it was not without casualties to our side when we look at the Africa National Police and guard force members that were killed in that attack, some of our own Afghan national employees that were translators and security personnel, and some other personnel that were wounded. It was significant, but the defense of the facility was effective. Our personnel were not injured.

Senator Kaine. A very grim reminder of the challenges of the job, but it sounds as if it was a job effectively done.

Finally, Mr. Starr, we have talked before, most recently in July at a hearing, about future embassy training needs for State Department personnel. Is it still the position of the State Department—I know there is additional dialogue on this. Is it still the position of the State Department that the best option for the training of embassy personnel in the future is a FASTC Center at Fort Pickett, VA?

Mr. STARR. It is certainly my position, sir. We very much understand that our world has changed, and with that world it is not just a question of training Diplomatic Security agents, but it is the entire Foreign Service that needs to be prepared for the places that they work.

We believe the equities of having a consolidated training center in the nearby area to all of our other equities—the Foreign Service Institute, the Department of Defense, the intelligence community, the Marine Corps bases at Quantico—is still the most effective solution.

Senator Kaine. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chairman. Thank you, Senator.

I have just some final questions. First of all, Ambassador Patterson, will you commit to me that, upon confirmation, that you will make an effort with the Iraqis to make it very clear to them that

they are equally as responsible for the security of those individuals at Camp Liberty and also to do all that they can to both pursue the attackers at Camp Ashraf and to return the hostages; the seven hostages that were taken out of Camp Ashraf?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Yes, sir, I will.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask both of you what I ask every witness: If confirmed, will you be responsive to questions and inquiries from the committee?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARR. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Then finally, Mr. Starr, how often does State now plan to review presence at high-threat, high-risk posts through the High Threat Board mechanism?

Mr. STARR. We did the first review earlier this spring, sir. We have just finished a worldwide review of our threats against all of our posts overseas. It is something we call the Security Environment Threat List. Once we have that out—and it will be out by the end of this month—I intend to conduct another review in October of our high-threat, high-risk posts in conjunction with the regional bureaus, the other sections in the Department that are critical, with USAID, with our intelligence partners, and with the Peace Corps and others. It will be this October.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Now, the Department's six-person panel to, "thoroughly review the Diplomatic Security organization and management structure" concluded its work on May the 3rd, as I understand. I am not aware that this report has been released publicly. Is there an intention to release it to the Congress?

Mr. STARR. It is an unclassified report, sir. I believe it will be released to Congress. I believe at the moment what we are doing is going through our responses and trying to line up what we are doing in regard to the recommendations. But yes, I believe that ultimately this report is releasable.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I would ask the Department to release it upon its completion.

I understand 4 of the 35 recommendations were not accepted by State. Is that a final determination?

Mr. STARR. More or less, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you speak to why those four were not accepted?

Mr. STARR. One was a specific reference to putting a chief of staff position for the Director of Diplomatic Security. We do not usually have chief of staff positions in the Department. It is just a technical response.

The other was about whether Diplomatic Security's Intelligence and Threat Analysis Section should be part of the intelligence community. There are plusses and minuses in our minds to being "part of" the intelligence community when in fact what we are is users of intelligence. Over the past year, one of the things that we have done best is to increase our reach and depth into the intelligence community and expanded our collaboration with the intelligence community.

We at the moment do not necessarily believe that it is the best answer to try to become "part of" the intelligence community, but

to expand our contacts and make sure that we are getting the international that we need.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any obstacles in getting the intelligence that you need?

Mr. STARR. No, sir. We are linked very closely.

The CHAIRMAN. Then finally—well, two last things. The August 29 report of the “Independent Panel on Best Practices for Security at High-Risk, High-Threat Posts,” of which the committee has not received an official copy, but has had to rely on Al-Jazeera America’s leaked copy, which says a lot, recommends that a new position be created for an Under Secretary of Diplomatic Security and the responsibility for diplomatic security be shifted from the Under Secretary of Management to this new position.

Do you have views on that recommendation?

Mr. STARR. Sir, as I am up here trying to hopefully become confirmed, if your committee concurs, as the Assistant Secretary, I think that is my first hurdle. Looking at that larger question of whether or not my position should be an Under Secretary position, I think that is a larger issue that the Department needs to look at holistically.

I will tell you that one of the reasons I think that recommendation was made was to ensure that the head of security, whatever the rank, had access to the Secretary of State and other senior officials if they needed it. I think it will be a long process to determine whether or not we need an Under Secretary of State for Security. It needs to be closely looked at.

What I would like to do is assure you that I have the access that I need so far, and should I be confirmed I absolutely believe I will have the access that I need to have to the Secretary when necessary, to the Deputy Secretaries, to the Assistant Secretaries and the Under Secretaries in this Department. I think that is the critical issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I would expect you to have that access, and in the absence of it, should you be confirmed, I would expect you to, upon review of this committee, to let us know if you are not.

Then finally, with reference to the Marine Security Guards, which I applaud, but my understanding is that two such detachments of the 35 new Marine Security Guard detachments are in place, with another expected by the end of September. That is 3 of 35. How long is it going to take to get the full complement?

Mr. STARR. I hope to have another six or seven activated by the end of this calendar year. We believe that is possible. There are issues that we have to undertake, such as leasing the facility for the Marines to live in and making sure it is safe and secure and altering the embassy or consulate profile so that they have the right place to work out of. That does take a little bit of time.

Ultimately, we believe this will be a 3-year process to put all 35 detachments out there. But as I say, by the end of calendar 2013 I hope to have 6 or 7 more, for a total of 9 or 10 activated this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the 3-year process because of the physical aspects that you have just described as part of the process? Or is it resources, or what?

Mr. STARR. It is not resources, sir. Well, first we have to have the facilities. We have to lease the facilities. We have to alter the

embassy property or the consulate property so that we can have the post and the electronics in it. That takes a while.

Second, the Marine Corps is upping the numbers of Marines that they can provide for us, and this activation plan is in accordance with how many Marines can be turned out of the system and given to us in a timely fashion. Thirty-five detachments is a lot of detachments. I believe it was the nineties, sir, when we increased from about 112 to about 150 detachments. We have done this before and there are problems—not problems. There are issues that come up that we must solve. We think that the 3-year timeframe is a realistic timeframe.

I would also note, sir, that there are other programs, such as increasing the number of Marines that we have at our existing detachments at our highest threat posts, which are also a very high priority for us. And in some cases, instead of activating another detachment, we are taking the Marines that could be available for that and increasing the number of Marines that we have at an existing facility to improve the protective capabilities that we have.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, obviously the committee wants to work with you to ensure that we can effectively, but as quickly as possible, achieve these goals.

Let me just finally say, we appreciate the men and women who serve in the Diplomatic Security. Having traveled many places in the world, we see firsthand their efforts and we appreciate that.

Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. Yes, sir, very briefly. I appreciate your patience in being here today and your service.

Mr. Starr, we talked a little bit about one of the positions that you need to fill, the Deputy Assistant for high-risk, high-threat posts. I guess we passed a piece of legislation out of committee that will go to the floor that has some recommendations about the qualifications for that person. I know you had some concerns about that.

For the record, would you briefly state what those are?

Mr. STARR. Sir, I want to thank the committee for all of the work that has been done on the embassy security bill. I think it is an excellent opportunity. It gives us resources and gives us guidance that helps us go in the right direction.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary position for high threats, which reports directly to me, is a very good position. It is something that we need and it works very closely. I think that the committee was trying to ensure that that position met the highest of requirements, but I think in trying to do that some of the requirements were very prescriptive, and I have some concerns whether or not I can meet some of the prescriptive requirements that were put down for the Deputy Assistant Secretary position.

In the final analysis, I believe what I need to be able to do is pick the most qualified person that I have within my organization to fill that position. That is just my concern, that some of the prescriptive requirements were put down, which with the best of intentions were to ensure that this person met the highest level of qualifications, may be difficult for me to fulfill.

Senator CORKER. I think the committee worked very well under the chairman's leadership to produce I think a good piece of legisla-

tion. My sense is that to make it work is also a goal, and I have a sense we will be able to resolve that issue.

We also talked a little bit that there have been some concerns about you narrowing down or shortening the training program down to 10 weeks. I know we had thought maybe that had been done solely for monetary purposes, but you really do believe the length of the training and what is being implemented or what is being put forth in that training program is exactly what you need for the folks that are moving into Diplomatic Security posts?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir. At the current time, the 10 weeks that we are putting our agents through for high-threat training is what I believe we need. I will submit to you, though, sir, that what I have committed to is to run two iterations of that training, two classes of it, and then do a review of the training to determine whether or not we got exactly out of it what we needed to do. So we will be doing a review after we run it twice and make sure that that is exactly what we need.

Senator CORKER. If you would share with us after those two iterations your sense of what the shortcomings and plusses are, we would appreciate it.

Just one last question. We will have a debate soon about aid to Egypt. I do not know when it will occur, and I know that you are trying to think through the best way to handle that. We talked a little bit about that yesterday or the day before. A lot of times people go down to the Senate floor and they talk about our influence on Egypt regarding the aid, and I think on the other hand some of us talk about our national interest relative to aid. Would you just, for the record, talk a little bit about the influence component with other countries supplying other types of aid and whether that is what we should look at or whether it is our national interest in how that aid is flowing?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Senator Corker, let me talk about our national interest, particularly vis-a-vis the relationship with the Egyptian military. Let me say that I have been deeply influenced by some of these issues by my experience in Pakistan, where we cut off assistance to the Pakistani military for 12 years, with in my view disastrous strategic consequences, because now we have a generation of people that have no contact with the American military and no exposure to our values because of their training here.

So I think we have some very difficult political issues to work through. But I think our relationship with the Egyptian military and in turn their relationship with their counterparts in the Israeli military on the very important issues of Camp David implementation and on border issues and on the situation in Gaza, is really a cornerstone of peace in the region.

So I think we have to look very closely at the role of our assistance in preserving our national security interests in Egypt, and particularly in protecting and working with our ally Israel.

Senator CORKER. So sometimes countries do not do things exactly the way we wish for them to do them, but we still have an interest in preserving the relationship; is that what you are saying?

Ambassador PATTERSON. Yes, sir. Often they do not do what we tell them to do, frankly. But we have conflicting interests in many cases, and we have to balance our interests. In this particular case,

the Camp David Accord and its implementation has been really the cornerstone of peace in this region for decades. So it is very important to sustain that.

And it is very important to sustain the ties, the ties with the officer corps, not just in Egypt, but in other countries throughout the region.

Senator CORKER. Well, my sense is after your experiences you will help shape a policy that both helps us influence Egypt in a positive direction, but at the same time maintains our national interest.

I thank you both for your testimony and for your willingness to serve and, as I have mentioned before, I look forward to working with you both.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Corker.

I am sure what we do is we urge countries to consider a course of action that we believe shares both our interests as well as theirs as well. I am not sure we tell them what to do.

In any event, we appreciate your answers to the questions. The record will remain open until the close of business tomorrow. If there are any questions that come to you, we urge you to answer them expeditiously so that we can consider you for the next business meeting.

With thanks to both of you and to your family who is here, this hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:36 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF GREGORY B. STARR TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR ROBERT MENEDEZ

Question. Establishment of a DAS for High Threat Posts: After the Benghazi attack, the Department made a number of internal organizational changes, the most conspicuous of which was the creation of a Deputy Assistant Secretary (DAS) for High Threat Posts. Please provide your assessment of how well these changes have served to better secure U.S. personnel and facilities abroad.

Answer. On November 29, 2013, the Department of State announced the appointment of a Deputy Assistant Secretary for High Threat Posts. In January 2013, the Directorate of High Threat Posts, subsequently renamed to High Threat Programs (HTP), was created. Under the guidance and direction of one of our most senior and experienced Diplomatic Security (DS) Officers, DS/HTP has been providing strategic policy direction and program support focusing specifically on those posts deemed to be operating under especially high threat and high risk. For example, DS/HTP was instrumental in the coordination of the recent temporary closing of a number of posts and several that went to reduced staffing. Conversely, DS/HTP will be intimately involved in reviewing the specific security situations at each post and contributing directly to the decision to reopen or increase staff, as appropriate, and prepare those posts for the secure resumption of diplomatic activity.

Domestically, DS/HTP is the focal point for directing resources and program support to the diplomatic missions in the countries falling under its responsibilities. DS/HTP is also the central point of contact for the interagency community when an emergency or crisis or other situation arises requiring an immediate response. DS/HTP is responsible for ensuring that our most high-threat and high-risk diplomatic missions are better protected, better equipped, and better informed than ever before.

Question. The Department has announced plans to hire and field 151 new Diplomatic Security Personnel by the end of the next fiscal year. What progress has been made toward this goal? What factors will influence whether you meet this timeline? How do you foresee deploying these agents? What is the retention rate for Special Agents? What challenges, if any, exist to retaining the Agents you hire and train, and how can those challenges be addressed?

Answer. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) plans to hire and field 151 new employees by the end of fiscal year (FY14). A total of 75 will be DS Special Agents. The remainder consists of 15 Security Protective Specialists, 15 Security Technical Specialists, 4 Security Engineering Officers, 9 Office Management Specialists, 14 Intelligence Research Analysts, and 19 other Civil Servants. To date we have hired 113 individuals and the other 38 will be hired by the end of FY14. The locations for the 75 DS Special Agents have been determined based on input from the Regional Bureaus and the Regional Security Officers and the DS agents have begun arriving at their respective posts.

Every year the Department sets our hiring goal based on attrition. For FY14 it was set at 72 for DS Special Agents. Our agent population is about 2,000, with an attrition rate of about 3.5 percent per year. DS faces the same retention challenges that are faced by the rest of the Foreign Service (FS). For example, the strain on employees and their families at having to serve in overseas assignments and at unaccompanied tours to high or critical threat posts. Some employees' family situation changes after they join the FS and serving overseas becomes a challenge.

Question. Ensuring that a sufficient number of Diplomatic Security Special Agents are deployed to high-threat posts has been a key concern. Have there been difficulties in filling these high-threat positions? If you have met the full staffing needs of the high-threat posts, how will that affect DS staffing in the rest of the world, if at all?

Answer. The State Department completed a worldwide security assessment in March and designated 27 high-threat, high-risk (HTHR) posts. DS is taking steps to ensure HTHR posts are correctly resourced:

- In FY 2013, DS hired 113 new security professionals, including 75 special agents and 15 security protective specialists. Many of these new employees will directly serve at or will provide regional or Washington-based support to HTHR posts.
- An additional 38 DS personnel will be hired in FY 2014.
- New Marine Security Guard detachments are in the process of being established and staffing levels for a number of detachments located at posts designated as ITHIR are increasing.
- Based on the work of the Interagency Security Assessment Teams (ISAT), we are directing considerable physical security resources to HTHR posts to enhance their capability to withstand an attack.
- We are providing increased training for personnel to better prepare them for their assignments to HTHR posts.

However, we are not just focused on high-threat, high-risk posts. We apply the lessons learned from previous attacks to all of our facilities. Although there are unique conditions at each of our posts which guide how we provide security each facility and its personnel, there are a number of programmatic commonalities that apply worldwide, regardless of threat level and local security environments including:

- The construction of hardened, secure facilities;
- The use of appropriate technical and physical security technologies and countermeasures;
- Development and maintenance of a well trained, well equipped and flexible cadre of security professionals across a variety of disciplines;
- The training of the entire foreign affairs community to deal with enhanced-risk environments;
- The deployment of the equipment needed to protect our facilities and people;
- Close cooperation with interagency partners and host country security agencies to detect, deter, and disrupt threats directed against U.S. interest abroad.

Managing resources and ensuring that our Regional Security Officers have the resources they need in order to carry out their mission is vitally important. This issue will have my full attention and be of the highest priority for both me and my senior management team.

Question. One problem identified with respect to the facility in Benghazi was that DS does not have a floating pool of agents that can provide a surge capacity when the need arises. To what extent has that problem been addressed? Will any new Special Agents be used to create such a surge capacity?

Answer. The 75 Special Agents hired under the Increased Security Proposal (ISP) will fill gaps left in domestic offices so more experienced agents can fill newly established overseas positions. All newly hired agents will be provided some basic "high-threat" training during their Basic Special Agent Training (BSAC). Diplomatic Security

urity recently added 2 weeks of high-threat training to BSAC. The newly hired DS Special Agents will also undergo the full 10-week high-threat training course, as time permits, during their first tour in a field office so they can be deployed to field to assist posts in crisis.

We will continue to work with Congress as we determine how we can meet the evolving security needs to include additional staffing requirements.

Question. In order to ensure critical continuity and institutional knowledge at high-threat posts, the Benghazi Accountability Review Board (ARB) recommended that key officers—including security officials—should be deployed to these posts for a minimum of 1 year (with assignments of no less than 4 months for lower level officials). What progress has the Bureau of Diplomatic Security made on this recommendation? What challenges, if any, exist in implementing this recommendation?

Answer. All high-threat posts now have a minimum of a 1-year tour of duty. Diplomatic Security (DS) is planning to ensure overlap between incumbent and incoming positions to facilitate continuity of operations at high-threat posts. Temporary duty assignments are set at a minimum of 120 days. With congressional support, we have been able to hire 113 additional DS personnel, of which 75 are DS agents in fiscal year 2013 and 38 additional personnel in fiscal year 2014. These additional personnel will provide direct support to high-threat posts and well as improving embassy security at other overseas posts around the world.

Question. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security analyzes threats to U.S. diplomatic facilities in order to determine what security measures need to be taken to mitigate those threats. How has DS's ability to analyze and disseminate information about those threats to key security management officials improved since the Benghazi attack?

Answer. The Department, including the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS), is working more closely with the Intelligence Community (IC) than ever before to identify and analyze credible threat information. DS has established liaison positions at various IC elements to improve the flow of threat reporting and analysis. DS has also undertaken an effort to provide highly classified threat reporting directly to regional security officers at high-threat, high-risk posts by improving our computer infrastructure at all classification levels. This effort has improved the timeliness of threat warning. Within the Department, DS has expanded the distribution of threat reports and analysis by vastly expanding the readership of the DS daily threat publication.

Question. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security is responsible for defending the Department of State's global network of information technology systems and information assets. Please describe the Department's strategies for defense against network intrusion and other cyber threats.

Answer. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) coordinates closely with the Bureau of Information Resource Management (IRM) and other offices to protect the Department's global network of information technology systems and information assets. DS has established a comprehensive "defense-in-depth" cyber security program which enables the Department to detect, react, analyze, and respond to sophisticated malicious cyber activity from foreign intelligence services and computer criminals. DS provides this operational security capability through an interdependent set of cyber security teams, tools, and programs including network intrusion detection, compliance verification, vulnerability assessment, incident handling, threat analysis and the Regional Computer Security Officer program. This fully integrated program capability enables rapid coordination and action on a number of issues involving global cyber threats and network security vulnerabilities.

In functional terms, the DS programs address the following cyber threat issues:

- The Network Monitoring Center maintains a 24/7 watch on the Department's global network traffic, which checks for anomalous and/or suspicious activity and reports on events.
- The Computer Incident Response Team (CIRT) reviews events and keeps operational managers, law enforcement and US-CERT informed about incidents and coordinates incident response actions with all stakeholders.
- The Cyber Threat Analysis team delivers daily and topical all-source reports on pressing threat issues and works closely with law enforcement and counterintelligence agencies to develop a comprehensive threat picture and remediation measures. This unit also performs proactive penetration testing and network forensic analysis to detect and resolve major threat issues.

- Regional Computer Security Officers (RCSOs) are the Department's "boots on the ground" performing cyber security assessments at overseas sites and reporting findings to DS.
- DS also works closely with the Department's virus detection and other security programs to stay abreast of any problems affecting the confidentiality, integrity, or availability of the Department's networks.

In addition, DS uses its expert cyber security teams to address and improve the Department's cyber security posture abroad through these initiatives:

- Providing customized cyber security support to the Secretary and other senior officials during major diplomatic events.
- Detailing DS personnel on a full-time basis to other federal cyber security operations centers to ensure the timely sharing and analysis of threats, cyber intelligence and technical developments. This includes DS personnel assigned to:
 - National Security Agency/Central Security Service Threat Operations Center (NTOC);
 - Department of Homeland Security's U.S.-Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT);
 - DS Special Agent assigned to the Federal Bureau of Investigations National Cyber Investigative Joint Task Force (NCIJTF).

DS can provide a briefing in an appropriate setting that will provide a fuller understanding of the threats affecting the Department and our cyber security program's ability to mitigate risk.

Question. The Department of State has faced well-publicized challenges in monitoring and overseeing contracts of all types in high-risk areas such as Afghanistan and Iraq in recent years. Please describe your view of DS's performance in this area. Specifically, please outline what measures have been put in place from an organizational standpoint (recruitment, training, retention, etc.) to improve the State Department's performance in this area.

Answer. The Department, including the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS), strives to ensure adequate government oversight of contracts and will continue to seek to improve that oversight going forward. Maintaining the appropriate security posture at our missions is a continually evolving effort. The use of contractors has been important to permitting the Department to quickly deploy personnel with multiple skills to operate in nonpermissive environments. Civilian agencies do not always possess the necessary personnel for such deployments, and contracting allows agencies to quickly deploy personnel with the necessary skills where needed. Security programs operating in contingency environments, such as Iraq and Afghanistan, require layered, multifaceted approaches that incorporate redundancies in capabilities, resources, and services.

As part of its effort to improve oversight of security contractors, the Department institutionalized many additional control measures as part of the Worldwide Protective Services (WPS) contract awarded in September 2010. This contract incorporates important lessons learned to ensure that Private Security Contractors (PSCs) retained by the Department perform their activities in a professional, responsible, culturally sensitive, and cost-effective manner. Diplomatic Security's management and oversight of PSCs includes:

- DS Special Agents at each post manage and oversee the Static Guard and Personal Protective Security programs;
- DS Special Agents at each post serve as Contracting Officer's Representatives (CORs) and Assistant CORs (ACOR) for the direct management and oversight of the WPS contract;
- DS personnel at each post are assigned as Government Technical Monitors (GTMs) to assist the COR and ACOR in the oversight of the WPS contract; Direct-hire DS personnel (DS Special Agents or SPS) provide direct operational oversight of all protective motorcades;
- Revised mission firearms policies further strengthen post's rules on the use of force, and new less-than-lethal equipment has been distributed to the field as a means to minimize the need to employ deadly force;
- All incidents involving a weapons discharge or other incidents are required to be reported by PSCs and thoroughly investigated by the Regional Security Officer;
- The Office of Acquisitions Management has a dedicated, qualified team of contracting officers and contract specialists assigned to administer PSC contracts. They make regular field visits to each post to conduct reviews of PSC contracts.
- Improving the image of the security footprint through enhanced cultural sensitivity:

- Mandatory country-specific cultural awareness training for all security contractors prior to deployment;
- Revised standards of conduct, including a ban on alcohol;
- Interpreters included in protective security details.
- Achieving greater efficiencies through new contract terms:
 - One set of terms and conditions enhances the ability to provide uniform, appropriate, and consistent oversight;
 - Reduced acquisition timelines;
 - A larger number of qualified base-contract holders, thereby increasing competition while controlling costs;
 - Timely options in the event a company fails to perform;
 - More efficient program management compared to multiple, stand-alone contracts;
 - Computerized tracking of contractor personnel to aid in reviewing personnel rosters used to support labor invoices.

Despite all of these changes, certain contracting challenges remain. The Department is currently seeking the permanent authority to use Best Value contracting for local guard contracts. The Department would use this authority at a limited number of posts, which face challenges in delivering adequate security using the lowest price, technically acceptable model. While the Department does not anticipate using this authority broadly, we do seek to use this authority in those countries where traditional contracting models have proven inadequate.

Question. As I understand it, New Embassy Construction is prioritized on the basis of security. If confirmed, what are the criteria by which you think it is important to assess a facility's overall security? How will you prioritize projects?

Answer. The prioritization process to build new embassy and consulate compounds that has been in place has proven to be effective, but we can and will do better. Since 1999, the Bureau of Overseas Building Operations (OBO) has completed over 100 projects to construct new facilities, providing a safe and secure work environment for over 29,000 U.S. Government employees. Still, approximately 158 facilities do not fully meet current security standards. If confirmed, I will continue to work closely with OBO to ensure that the U.S. Government has safe, secure, and functional facilities to support the implementation of U.S. foreign policy.

In keeping with U.S. national security considerations, our foreign policy goals, and the provisions of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act (SECCA) and the Overseas Security Policy Board's (OSPB) standards and policies, the Department prioritizes new diplomatic construction based on a risk analysis process that ranks overseas facilities on a variety of security threats, including vulnerability. This analysis informs OBO's Capital Security Construction Program schedule, which prioritizes the top 80 posts ranked most vulnerable, taking into consideration location and site availability, and schedules construction based on anticipated contract award dates. With the creation of the high-threat, high-risk post list, the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) has requested that, when feasible, OBO prioritize projects from the Department's high-threat, high-risk list.

Question. The Benghazi Accountability Review Board, in recommendation number 17, recommended expanded counter threat training. Right now, the Department is at capacity with respect to its ability to provide security training and diplomatic security training is conducted at up to 19 different, geographically separated, leased, and contracted facilities nationwide. If confirmed as Assistant Secretary would you feel comfortable in your ability to prepare DS agents and Foreign Service officers for positions in high-threat high-risk posts without a consolidated security training center?

Answer. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) currently trains at 19 leased or use-fee facilities. Utilizing all of these facilities, DS currently does not have the capacity to train everyone going to high-threat posts in the Foreign Affairs Counter Threat course. Without a dedicated, consolidated hard-skills training center, the Department is not able to offer systematic, efficient hard-skills security training. Without this training, I do not believe personnel are sufficiently prepared to counter the violent actions they face abroad.

Working since 2009, the Department of State (DOS) developed plans for construction of the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center (FASTC). The attacks on U.S. diplomatic facilities last September—in Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, Yemen, and Sudan—emphasize the need for a dedicated hard-skills security training center to ensure the foreign affairs community and other agency personnel serving in overseas are well-prepared. The evolving overseas mission mandates a stronger emphasis on the Department of State and the Department of Defense coordination and collaboration.

Strengthening this partnership in areas of training, planning, contingency support, transportation, logistics, emergency response, and evacuations is among the Department's highest priorities.

The purpose of the consolidated hard-skills training center is to efficiently conduct security, law-enforcement, and antiterrorism training within the Department of State for the protection of diplomats and U.S. embassies abroad. FASTC will primarily train U.S. Government employees, most of whom work for the Department of State. They will include Foreign Service officers assigned to high-threat posts abroad, DS special agents, and other DS personnel, such as security engineers and technicians. A limited number of police and security professionals from countries that are partner nations in fighting terror will also receive training. FASTC will also be the site for training of personnel from other government agencies assigned to specifically designated high-threat posts to prepare them for those environments.

If confirmed, I am committed to constructing FASTC to maintain and strengthen synergies with our State Department and interagency partners training facilities within a "half-day" driving range from these facilities.

Question. What is your understanding of the role and how the Interagency addresses security needs at facilities where a facility is shared—or is used principally by a U.S. Government agency other than the Department of State? What role do you see for the Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security in helping to lead the interagency process and forge a coherent interagency approach to these issues?

Answer. The Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (SECCA) requires that all newly constructed/occupied overseas U.S. diplomatic facilities possess a 100-foot setback from their perimeter, and that all U.S. Government operations be collocated on one chancery or consulate compound. Any deviation from these SECCA provisions requires a waiver from either the Secretary (all newly constructed chancery and consulate buildings that do not meet SECCA requirements) or the Assistant Secretary of Diplomatic Security (all other requests).

In addition to SECCA's requirements for collocation and setback, security standards are established by the Overseas Security Policy Board (OSPB), an intergovernmental board comprised of representatives from all agencies that operate in an overseas environment under Chief of Mission authority. The Board is chaired by the Department of State's Bureau of Diplomatic Security. It is through these authorities that the Assistant Secretary for DS leads the interagency process on facility security. This process however, involves an interagency approach.

The Department works very closely with the Intelligence Community, Department of Defense, and the National Security Staff. The Assistant Secretary of Diplomatic Security coordinates holistically on security matters and threats facing our embassies. Regular interaction with our interagency partners and Department of State officials, at both the senior and working levels, allows the Department to share information and coordinate on security. Similarly, at every post, the Emergency Action Committee, a group of subject matter experts appointed by the Chief of Mission, meet regularly to discuss threats, emergencies, and manage crises.

For High Threat/High Risk (HTHR) posts, the Department has created a High Threat Review Board to conduct an internal review of the HTHR post list every 6 months. The High Threat Post Review Board will review the U.S. official presence annually, and on an ad hoc basis if required (e.g., if the security environment deteriorates at a post). Critical elements for discussion in the designation process include: the regional bureau's assessment of the political/economic situation, the ability and willingness of the host nation to protect U.S. interests, known and perceived threats against the United States, and the vulnerabilities of U.S. personnel, facilities, residences, and outlying structures.

Question. Recommendation number 23 of the ARB noted that "the Board is of the view that findings of unsatisfactory leadership performance by senior officials in relation to the security incident under review should be a potential basis for discipline recommendations by future Accountability Review Boards, and would recommend a revision of Department regulations or amendment to the relevant statute to this end." We included a provision in the Embassy Security and Personnel Protection Act that aims to satisfy this recommendation.

- ◆ In your estimation, does the Secretary currently have the authority to fire individuals identified to have exhibited "unsatisfactory leadership in relation to a security incident"? Are there additional authorities necessary? How do you view the role of Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security in assuring that there is senior-level management accountability and oversight—and responsibility—for security incidents?

Answer. Section 202 of Senate Bill 1386 would provide that unsatisfactory leadership by a senior official with respect to a security incident involving loss of life, serious injury, or significant destruction of property at or related to a U.S. Government mission abroad may be grounds for disciplinary action, and authorizes future ARBs to recommend disciplinary action on this basis. The Department also is amending its internal regulations to provide for disciplinary action based on unsatisfactory leadership by a senior official in relation to such incidents. These provisions will enable the Department to take disciplinary action, up to and including separation, with respect to future incidents of unsatisfactory leadership in relation to a security incident, even in the absence of some other misconduct. It should be noted that career Foreign Service employees receive an automatic hearing on separation before the Foreign Service Grievance Board.

With regards to the ensuring senior leader accountability and responsibility for security incidents, the Assistant Secretary of Diplomatic Security (DS) has a shared responsibility with other senior Department officials to support Chiefs of Mission in protecting U.S. personnel and facilities, exercising judgment to balance U.S. interests and policy priorities, evolving security threats, and mitigation of security risks. Ultimately, the provision of security for the Department lies with the Assistant Secretary of DS. However, that also means instilling a culture of responsibility and accountability within the DS leadership at all levels and better communication within the State Department, including the Regional Bureaus, and also with the inter-agency, as was implemented following the independent Benghazi Accountability Review Board.

RESPONSES OF CAROLINE KENNEDY TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BOB CORKER

Question. Our alliance relationship with Japan is one of the strongest and, indeed, the most critical security relationship in the Asia-Pacific. It also is complex and nuanced in ways that are not obvious to the casual observer.

♦ How do you propose to navigate the hidden complexities of the bilateral relationship, particularly in light of your lack of foreign policy experience in the region?

Answer. As the United States rebalances toward Asia, our alliance with Japan remains a cornerstone of peace, stability, and prosperity in the region, as it has been for more than 50 years. If confirmed, I look forward to working to advance the interests of the United States, protect the safety of our citizens and strengthen the bilateral relationship for the benefit of both our countries. I will coordinate closely with the Department of State and the interagency to continue our strong partnership with Japan. I will also work closely with the leadership in the U.S. military to further strengthen our bilateral security relationship. I especially look forward to benefiting from the support of the talented Foreign Service professionals and locally engaged staff at our mission in Japan. I will also consult closely with Members of Congress on important issues concerning the relationship between the United States and Japan.

I believe that a key to understanding and operating within a foreign context is to maintain an openness to people and to ideas within that culture while advancing the interests of the United States and the American people. Through meaningful interaction with Japanese officials, civil society, and average citizens, I hope to build a stronger bilateral relationship and partnership between our two countries. If confirmed, I will seek advice and guidance from many quarters to serve my country.

Question. What areas do you see as having the most potential for improvement in our relationship with Japan, and how do you plan on approaching them?

Answer. Japan is an indispensable regional partner in promoting democracy and economic development and in global humanitarian and peacekeeping efforts. These are areas I care deeply about, and if confirmed, I will work to further strengthen this critical partnership at a vital moment in its history.

In addition, I will work to increase exchanges between American and Japanese students, scholars, and citizens, so that future generations will understand our shared history and continue to bind our nations closer. The United States-Japan relationship remains so strong because it stands on the shoulders of our people-to-people ties, and the continued strength and vitality of the United States-Japan relationship will support our efforts to deepen the connections between the people of Japan and the United States. Throughout my career I have worked to expand educational opportunity and empowerment, and I look forward to dedicating myself to expanding exchanges and educational ties between our two countries.

Question. During my visit to Tokyo earlier this year, Prime Minister Abe expressed concern over the effect of sequestration on U.S. security commitments to Japan and about the overall staying power of the United States in the Asia-Pacific.

◆ In your capacity as Ambassador, how do you intend to reassure the Japanese public that Washington will continue to fulfill its security commitments to Tokyo? Are you concerned that the administration's focus on the Middle East will contribute to Japanese skepticism of the U.S. "rebalance" to the Asia-Pacific? Why or why not?

Answer. The stabilizing presence of U.S. forces in the Asia-Pacific region has never been more important than it is today. If confirmed, I will work with the Departments of State and Defense to reassure the Japanese people that the United States stands fast in our obligations under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. One way to do this is to continue the close cooperation between the United States and Japan to address common security challenges, both in the region and globally; Japan's contributions to our security alliance, including bases in Japan, are an important component of our shared efforts to promote peace and stability throughout the world.

Japan is an indispensable partner of the United States at international fora such as the United Nations, and in responding to global issues such as the Syria crisis and advancing Middle East peace efforts. I do not believe the "rebalance" is an either/or decision between Asia and the Middle East. The Obama administration's rebalanced approach shows its commitment to work with Japan on the global stage, including in the Middle East.

Question. If confirmed, how will you approach the sensitivities regarding territorial issues in the East China Sea? How should the United States respond to Chinese admonitions that Washington refrain from taking a position on the peaceful resolution of maritime disputes in the East China Sea?

Answer. U.S. policy on the Senkaku Islands has not changed. The United States does not take a position on the ultimate sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands. The Senkaku Islands have been under the administration of the Government of Japan since they were returned as part of the reversion of Okinawa in 1972. As such, they fall within the scope of Article 5 of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. The United States calls on all parties to avoid actions that raise tensions and to prevent miscalculations that could undermine peace, security, and economic growth in the region. The United States opposes any unilateral or coercive actions that would seek to undermine Japanese administration. The United States is fully committed to our alliance with and security obligations toward Japan. If confirmed, I will publicly and privately continue to assure the Japanese of our long-standing position.

The administration has engaged in sustained, intensive, and high-level diplomacy with China and Japan on easing tensions in Northeast Asia for many months now. The United States has clearly stated our position to all parties both privately and publicly, most recently by Secretary Kerry while in Japan. The State Department and other agencies repeatedly encourage all parties to adopt a peaceful approach and pursue dialogue with each other to resolve this issue. If confirmed, I intend to continue emphasizing this message. Both Japan and China understand that Northeast Asia is an engine of global economic growth, and miscalculations have the potential to undermine peace, security, and economic growth.

Question. Japan's economic revitalization plan or "Abenomics" includes monetary, fiscal and structural reforms. If confirmed, what role do you expect to play in resolving issues that may arise in the economic relationship between the United States and Japan, including in the context of the parallel bilateral negotiations to TPP?

Answer. Prime Minister Abe has specifically referred to TPP as a key element in his overall "Abenomics" growth strategy, including implementing domestic reforms. TPP is an important economic opportunity for the United States to spur regional growth and expand our exports to Japan as well as throughout the region—this comprehensive and high-standard agreement will benefit the U.S. economy and advance the United States-Japan trade relationship.

The ongoing parallel bilateral negotiations are addressing specific bilateral issues of concern, including those faced by the automotive and insurance industries and their workers. If confirmed, I and the team at the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo will work closely with the U.S. Trade Representative, the State Department, other U.S. Government agencies and the Government of Japan to achieve the strongest outcome from these negotiations. In this and other instances, I intend to play a strong personal role in working with American companies to make sure that the Japanese market is open to them.

Question. In advance of President Obama's visit to Japan in November 2009, there was speculation that he might visit either Hiroshima or Nagasaki, particularly on the heels of his August 2009 remarks in Prague calling for a world without nuclear weapons. Indeed, President Obama has expressed the desire to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

- ♦ Having noted in your testimony that you visited Hiroshima in 1978, would you recommend that President Obama be the first sitting U.S. President to visit Hiroshima and/or Nagasaki? What impact would such a visit potentially have on the credibility of U.S. extended deterrence commitments to Japan?

Answer. As I noted to the committee during my hearing, I was deeply affected by my 1978 visit to the Hiroshima with my uncle, Senator Kennedy. The Hiroshima Peace Park provides an important message to all nations to avoid the horrors of nuclear war. If confirmed, I would be honored to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki as United States Ambassador to Japan.

Although I do not want to speculate on what specific recommendation I might make to President Obama should he visit Japan in the future, I would consider ways that a Presidential visit could highlight mutual United States-Japan interests in arms control, nuclear disarmament, and nonproliferation. The Japanese people warmly welcomed the President's Prague speech and his call for a nuclear-free world. Nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation are two areas in which Japan and the United States can accomplish much by working together and at the United Nations General Assembly First Committee. Over the past few years, for example, the United States has cosponsored Japan's nuclear disarmament resolution. The United States and Japan also work together in the context of their security alliance, whereby the United States has consistently reassured Japan of U.S. extended deterrence commitments in robust dialogues on this topic.

The United States-Japan commitment to nuclear disarmament in no way diminishes the strength or capacity of the U.S. extended deterrence commitments to Japan, which are a cornerstone of our security relationship.

RESPONSES OF GREGORY B. STARR TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BOB CORKER

Question. You mentioned during your testimony that the Bureau of Diplomatic Security has procedures for closing embassies that are either attacked or under threat of potential attack.

- ♦ What governs such closure decisionmaking and procedures?
- ♦ Please inform the committee about what the State Department does to ensure mission or facility continuity of operations in the wake of a closure.

Answer. When the widespread closure of about 20 U.S. embassies and consulates occurred in August, we had specific threat information that was credible and noncounterable. In the event we receive such threat information, we weigh these threats against the host government capabilities and willingness, and the state of our facilities and security presence. The decision was made with input from the post on the situation on the ground; the Bureau of Diplomatic Security on security generally; as well as threat analysis; the Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations on facilities; as well as input from Consular Affairs, the applicable Regional Bureau, Intelligence and Research; Counterterrorism, and other Bureaus, and the Under Secretaries, the Deputy Secretary, and the Secretary of State. We also seek information from the interagency.

In the event that an embassy closes, operations such as routine visa issuance are closed to the public but the essential work that goes on in our embassies continues in many cases. American Citizen Services are still provided, as are emergency visas for medical purposes or death of a family member, etc. The facility is not abandoned. We rarely totally suspend operations, but will do so in a situation where we can no longer operate safely, such as when we ceased operations in Damascus, Syria. We then would make arrangements for one of our allies to serve as the U.S. protecting power so that U.S. interests are protected.

Above all, the safety and security of mission employees is paramount in the conduct of foreign affairs. Certain situations require a mission to reduce the number of employees at the post, including authorized and ordered departures.

Authorized Departure allows for Voluntary Departure of all family members and selected employees, while Ordered Departure requires Mandatory Departure of all family members and designated employees.

An embassy can close to the public, without having an authorized or ordered departure. However, if an authorized or ordered departure is necessary, the post

must plan to keep a sufficient amount of staff available at post to maintain certain operating functions until a decision is made to lift the departure or suspend operations completely. In preparing for a drawdown of mission personnel, the post must ensure the following programs have sufficient resources:

- (1) Security and logistics for the remaining mission;
- (2) Communications with the Department;
- (3) U.S. citizen and other consular services;
- (4) Communication of U.S. foreign policy; and
- (5) Public affairs.

Prior to an emergency and in accordance with the Department's Emergency Planning Handbook, post determines the number of employees for each of the following three categories:

- (1) Current staffing;
- (2) Emergency staffing (to remain under authorized departure); and
- (3) Minimal staffing (to remain under ordered departure).

The Department would be glad to provide more detail on post closures and draw-downs in a briefing.

Question. You mentioned during your testimony that you had either sought or would be seeking additional detachments of U.S. Marine Corps (USMC) guards to supplement Diplomatic Security resources and personnel at volatile posts.

- ◆ How many USMC guards you have been seeking?
- ◆ If you have already made a specific request for additional detachments, what has been their response?

Answer. Answer: The Department requested funding to support an additional 35 Marine Security Guard (MSG) Detachments in the FY 2013 Increased Security Proposal. The Department is responsible for providing the housing for the MSGs, constructing "post ones," the command post for the MSG and equipping "post ones." With the support of the Marine Corps, we will have three new MSG detachments activated by September 30, 2013, and are working with the Marines to have the remaining detachments activated by the end of FY 2014. In addition, the U.S. Marine Corps has been sending extra guards to augment the existing detachments at some high-threat posts. The U.S. Marine Corps is working to identify and train more Marines for this program and our efforts have been closely coordinated.

Question. You mentioned during your testimony that Diplomatic Security provides a 10-week program for relevant training.

- ◆ Is Diplomatic Security providing, or planning to provide, any additional training for agents who are tasked with high-risk, high-threat posts, or does the baseline training program already offer this specific training?

Answer. Based on the Benghazi Accountability Review Board (ARB), a panel of Senior and Supervisory Diplomatic Security (DS) Special Agents was established to revise high-threat training and raise the standards for the High-Threat Tactical Course (HTTC). From January to March 2013, the panel worked in conjunction with the Diplomatic Security Training Center to develop over 170 enhanced operational requirements and associated proficiency levels needed for high-threat environments. Training plans based on these operational requirements were created and approved for DS Special Agents at the basic-, mid-, and executive-level.

A new High-Threat Training Strategy was approved on May 15, 2013. The training strategy envisions a career-long cycle of high-threat operations-related instruction and ensures that all DS Special Agents receive an increased level of training to support Department objectives in high-threat, high-risk areas.

The training strategy calls for three new, intensive high-threat training courses for basic-, mid-, and senior-level agents permanently assigned, or going TDY to any of the designated high-threat, high-risk posts. The foundation of these three courses is the new 10-week High Threat Operations Course (HTOC), which will replace the former 5-week High Threat Tactical Course (HTTC). Additionally, a new 4-week High Threat Operations Mid-Level/In-Service Course (HTOC-IS), and new 4-week High Threat Operations Executive-Level Course (HTOC-EX) have been developed.

Further, fundamental high-threat precepts and orientations are now included in existing basic and in-service training courses: Basic Special Agent Course (BSAC), Basic Regional Security Officer (BRSO), Regional Security Officer In-Service (RSO-IS), Special Agent In-Service (SA-IS), and the Basic Field Firearms Officer Course (BFFOC). The integration of high-threat material across multiple levels of DS training acknowledges that threats are not limited to high-threat, high-risk areas and better prepares DS Special Agents to function effectively if called upon to provide emergency support. Furthermore, it provides an introduction to material that will

support DS personnel who may later attend the new operations-specific courses. Overall, the strategy is a long-term plan that will replace previous High-Threat Tactical Courses by approximately 2018.

- ◆ Does Diplomatic Security conduct periodic assessments of the effectiveness of its current 10-week program?

Answer. DS plans to conduct periodic reviews of the new high-threat training. Not only will the 10-week High Threat Operations Course, 4-week High Threat Operations Mid-Level/In-Service Course, and the High Threat Operations Executive-Level Course have student and instructor feedback assessments as part of each individual iteration, but the Diplomatic Security Training Directorate in conjunction with the newly established Directorate for High Threat Programs will be conducting an overall review of course effectiveness in April 2014 (following the first two iterations) and again in October 2014 (after 1 full year of delivered coursework). The goal of these reviews will be to answer whether or not DS is meeting its established goal of achieving operational proficiency in 170 enhanced operational requirements. Following these evaluations, recommendations will be delivered to the Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security for any necessary additions or deletions from the curriculum.

- ◆ What was the cost of Diplomatic Security for fiscal years 2004–2013?

Answer. The total cost of the relevant high-threat agent training during fiscal years 2004–2013 was \$37.8 million dollars.

Question. Please describe, in your own words, what you think it means for a government official to be held accountable for poor decisionmaking.

Answer. Accountability means taking responsible measures before things happen. Accountability includes being the advocate for security within the Department and as part of the interagency process overseas. Accountability means working with the Regional Bureaus, overseas posts, and the interagency to ensure that a pragmatic balance is struck between security and the need to carry out the diplomatic mission of protecting America's National Security. Accountability also means that if, despite our best efforts, there is a security failure, that the Assistant Secretary of Diplomatic Security takes responsibility and that we all work to learn lessons that can help us prevent similar failures in the future. While risk can never be completely eliminated from our diplomatic duties, regardless of the threat level, we must always work to mitigate it.

Question. Do you think the standard for accountability should be one of gross negligence or a lesser standard? Should be different in a situation where there has been loss of life?

Answer. First and foremost, it should be clear that the Department believes that no one should be excused for gross negligence. Leaders at all levels of the organization should take both responsibility for the duties of their position, and they should be held accountable for the decisions they make. It is also clear that we can never truly eliminate all risks faced by U.S. Government personnel as they advance our national interests abroad. We can only seek to mitigate those risks to the extent possible. Despite our best efforts, we may still suffer losses of our diplomats overseas. Our recent decision to temporarily suspend operations at about 20 of our embassies and consulates demonstrates the steps we are willing to take to ensure the safety of our personnel abroad.

Question. During the recent attacks on the U.S. facilities in Herat, Afghanistan, please describe the safeguards, including host nation protection, that were in place that prevented the attack from successfully taking U.S. casualties.

Answer. The security elements of the U.S. consulate in Herat are supervised by the Regional Security Officer and are comprised of Diplomatic Security Special Agents, Security Protective Specialists, Security Engineers, and a private security contract force of Americans, third country nationals, and locally employed Afghan nationals. Outer perimeter security is augmented by a small contingent of Afghan National Police who were present at the time of the attack.

Safeguards protecting the consulate included an increased setback from the main highway which provides additional protection for the main access control point from a potential improvised explosive device blast. A setback waiver was originally processed for Herat in March 2011. The consulate building has ample setback on the south side of the property, the side that was attacked. Setbacks on the remaining sides of the property were less than the 100-foot requirement, and therefore granted a waiver. Through the field expedient mitigation efforts, setback was effectively increased on these three sides.

The Regional Security Officer regularly conducts drills with the entire consulate community, and recently conducted a joint evacuation drill with U.S. military and Afghan participation. Physical security safeguards at the consulate include: first floor Forced Entry Ballistic Resistant (FE/BR) windows and doors; surface mounted antivehicle planters along the outer perimeter; and steel plates on outer walls to form anticlemb surfaces. In addition, there are antiram drop arm barriers at the outer perimeter, which prevented the vehicle borne improvised explosive device (VBIED) from reaching the Compound Access Control facility and barriers on September 13.

Question. What, if any, were the security waivers that were granted for the U.S. facilities in Herat?

Answer. On March 30, 2011, a waiver for the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (SECCA-Public Law 106-113) statutory requirement for setback of U.S. Consulate Herat was granted.

Question. Was there any U.S. military response to the attacks? If so, approximately how long after the attack started did the U.S. military response arrive?

Answer. On September 13, 2013, at approximately 0532 local hours, insurgents conducted a complex attack against the U.S. consulate in Herat. For approximately the next 35 minutes, Diplomatic Security (DS) Agents, Security Protective Specialists, and security contractors engaged and neutralized the threat. At 0655, the first U.S. military units arrived at the consulate to augment the consulate guard force, establish a cordon around the facility, and conduct a search of the consulate grounds.

Question. Approximately how long after the attack started did the Afghanistan National Police (ANP) and Security Forces (ANSF) arrive on the scene?

Answer. Afghanistan National Security Forces personnel arrived at the scene at 0558, approximately 26 minutes after the attack was initiated.

Question. When the ANP and ANSF arrived, were the attackers still engaged in their attack?

Answer. Responding Afghanistan National Security Forces reported receiving fire from insurgent positions located across the road from the consulate when they first arrived on scene.

Question. Were any of the Afghan casualties a result of friendly fire and if so, how many?

Answer. No, there were no friendly fire casualties.

RESPONSES OF ANNE PATTERSON TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BOB CORKER

Question. A recently released Zogby International poll found that 65 percent of Egyptians believe that the United States was too supportive of President Morsi, and 82 percent of Egyptians believe that U.S. policy toward Egypt under President Morsi was harmful to Egypt. Another 62 percent believe that the United States has little or no understanding of Egypt and the Egyptian people.

◆ What went wrong with our policies toward Egypt to create such strong negative views? How can we correct these policy failures?

Answer. Polling data stretching back many decades have consistently reflected Egyptian mistrust of U.S. policy and intentions in Egypt and in the region. Egyptians express similar sentiments about most other Western countries. In recent years, polls have also reflected deep dissatisfaction with Egypt's successive leaders, including the Mubarak, Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) and Morsi governments. Our widely reported role in convincing President Mubarak to leave office has fueled speculation that the United States has been a force behind every subsequent government. In fact, we have been attacked by all sides in Egypt, alternatively being accused of supporting the Muslim Brotherhood or organizing its removal from power on July 3.

Our policy in Egypt has been premised on the need to protect core U.S. interests in the region, including its implementation of the Peace Treaty with Israel, countering terrorism, promoting a more inclusive, democratic Egypt that reflects the will of the people, and encouraging fundamental economic reform. We will continue to support Egypt's democratic transition, offering our partnership on the Egyptian people's priorities.

Where possible, we will continue and expand outreach programs and exchanges, including programs to help prepare young Egyptians for the jobs and the economy of the future. We will also support Egyptian Government efforts to undertake needed economic reforms and fight corruption. I believe that views of the United States will begin to realign as Egyptians begin to experience the benefits of democracy, development, and open markets. If confirmed, I will work with our Ambassador and Embassy in Cairo to underscore our support for, and shared goals with, the Egyptian people.

Question. The media—especially Western media—has focused on the situation in Egypt as a fight between the military and the Muslim Brotherhood disregarding—or at least not analyzing deeply—the opinions of the millions of people that turned out, nationwide, in the streets to protest the undemocratic actions of the Muslim Brotherhood.

♦ How does the United States take into account the views of the Egyptian citizens? Where do the opinions of the Egyptian public fit into U.S. policymaking?

Answer. Following the July 3 events in Egypt, President Obama clearly articulated the United States support for a set of core principles—opposing violence, protecting universal human rights, and meeting the legitimate aspirations of the Egyptian people. We also acknowledged the role of public opinion leading up to the events of July 3.

As Ambassador, I regularly met with a wide range of Egyptian society, including political groups and parties, business leaders and civil society organizations to better understand their desires, motivations, and aspirations for their country. We heard substantial criticism of the Morsy government as well as the growing sense of personal and economic insecurity that Egyptians have faced in recent years. Secretary Kerry devoted substantial effort during his first visit to Cairo last March to talking with Egyptian civil society, business and government leaders about these problems.

If confirmed, I will continue to work with our Ambassador to Egypt to ensure that we solicit a broad range of views from the Egyptian public on the direction of Egypt's transition to democracy, using these views to identify our priorities for assistance and engagement.

Question. Libya is at its most violent and precarious state since the conflict that toppled Gaddafi. Foreign investors are now growing wary as security costs stifle business growth.

♦ What specifically can the U.S. Government do to help make Libya a safe place to do business, particularly in the neglected eastern part of the country?

Answer. Libya seeks to enter the global economy and community of democracies after 42 years of isolation under Qadhafi. Improved security is a precondition to expanded trade and investment in Libya. If confirmed, I plan to make Libya one of my top priorities. Since the revolution, the United States has provided the Libyan Government with targeted technical assistance in a number of critical areas to help establish security sector institutions appropriate for a democratic state and to develop the capacities needed to control loose weapons, counter terrorism, and improve border security management.

We responded positively to a request this spring from Prime Minister Ali Zeidan that we help train a new, professional General Purpose Force which could form the core of a new Libyan Army. We are still working out the details of the arrangement, but the cost will be fully paid by the Libyan Government. Moreover we are working together on a \$14 million border security program to assess, train, and equip Libyan border security forces in securing and management of their land borders and points of entry (POE) including land, sea, and air. We are particularly focused on programs intended to prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Additional targeted assistance includes support for professionalization of security and justice sector institutions, including the police, demobilization and reintegration of militias, detention and prison reform, control of conventional weapons, and chemical weapons destruction.

Question. What is the Department of State currently doing to help the vetted, moderate opposition in Syria, and what do you plan to do with such programs if confirmed?

Answer. Over the last 2 years, the United States has committed to providing a total of \$250 million in nonlethal support to the Syrian Opposition Coalition (SOC) and the Supreme Military Council (SMC). Of this assistance, approximately \$167 million has been obligated to support the following lines of effort, while the remain-

der will be notified to Congress shortly. Assistance already obligated and expended includes:

- Approximately \$90 million in small grants and in-kind assistance to support the SOC, Assistance Coordination Unit (ACU) and Local Councils' ability to provide basic services for impacted communities. Examples of support include over \$2.5 million in grants to 15 local councils and civil society organizations to be able to respond to community needs and improve governance in liberated areas. In addition, the Liberated Areas Initiative is providing \$10 million worth of generators, cranes, trucks, ambulances, and water bladders to areas under opposition control. This support is designed to increase the linkages between local and national-level opposition groups and improve service delivery and governance in areas under opposition control.
- Approximately \$26.6 million in nonlethal equipment to the SMC to enhance its logistical capabilities on the battlefield. We have provided 330,000 MREs, 529 medical kits, and over 3 tons of surgical and triage medical supplies to support field clinics. Over the next several months we plan to deliver additional equipment consisting of vehicles, satellite access equipment, laptops, radio communication equipment, and medical kits.
- Approximately \$26 million in training and equipment for civil society groups and local councils to help build the capacity of nearly 1,500 grassroots activists, including women and youth, from over 100 opposition councils and organizations to mobilize citizens, share information, provide community services, and undertake civic functions.
- Approximately \$9.5 million in support for independent media, including assistance to community radio stations providing information for refugees about available services; training for networks of citizen journalists, bloggers, and cyber activists to support their documentation and dissemination of information on developments in Syria; and support to enhance the information and communications security of activists within Syria.
- Approximately \$9 million for support of interreligious and communal dialogues, encouraging citizen participation in shaping the Syrian transition and supporting human rights documentation and transitional justice efforts to lay the foundation for future accountability efforts.
- Approximately \$5 million in equipment, training, and stipends for local police and judges in opposition-controlled areas. This assistance includes efforts to help local communities maintain public safety, extend the rule of law and enhance the provision of justice to improve local stability and prevent sectarian violence.

This assistance is in addition to the now \$1.3 billion in total U.S. humanitarian assistance for the Syrian people. In addition to our efforts to aid the Syrian opposition, the United States remains the single largest contributor of humanitarian assistance for the Syrian people.

If confirmed, I plan to continue providing assistance—with the goal of reducing delivery times—to support the Syrian opposition both from the top-down by supporting national groups like the SOC and SMC as well as from the bottom-up by strengthening capable local councils and civil society groups in Syria. This strategy is helping build an ethnically and religiously diverse network at the national and subnational level. I plan to work closely with the committee on these issues.

U.S. assistance remains a crucial component of our multidimensional campaign to support a peaceful political transition in Syria, and the emergence of a stable, responsible government.

Question. How is the conflict in Syria affecting what is seen as a larger conflict between Sunni and Shia states?

Answer. The Asad regime has worked to stoke sectarian divides and many among Syria's minority communities, including Alawis, Druze, and Christians, now fear what the future holds. The Sunni majority is divided, fractious, and likewise anxious about its role, as it seeks to assert the rights long denied them by the Asad regime. Some factions are using these divides to position regional players against one another, working to lure in Saudi Arabia and Qatar on one side and Iran and Iraq on the other. The complexity of this conflict, and particularly its regional dimensions, makes it clear that there can be no military solution for the conflict. A negotiated transition, as laid out in the Geneva Communiqué, is the only way to resolve this conflict and put an end to the devastating loss of life. If confirmed, I will continue the administration's work with the U.N. and the international community to bring both parties to the negotiating table.

RESPONSES OF CAROLINE KENNEDY TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

Question. On May 30, 2009, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States, Ichiro Fujisaki, delivered in person a long-sought formal and official apology to the former American POWs from the Japanese Government. In September 2010, Japan's Foreign Ministry initiated a visitation program to Japan for American former POWs and their families. The many Japanese companies that used the POWs as slave labor in their mines, factories, and on their docks have never, however, acknowledged the POWs nor apologized. There have been three visits of seven former POWs or family members. The fourth program will be this October. Japanese politics and budgets threaten to end this program of reconciliation and friendship.

◆ How do you plan to encourage the Japanese Government to continue the POW visitation program and to encourage Japanese companies to follow their government's example of contrition? It goes without saying the members of America's Greatest Generation will not be long among us.

Answer. I echo your praise of former American Prisoners of War (POWs). Their contributions and heroism should never be forgotten or minimized. The U.S. Government appreciates the Japanese Government's words and actions to express remorse for the treatment of American POWs, especially the yearly visit invitations to POWs to Japan. I am aware that several Japanese companies have expressed contrition to U.S. POWs, and many have welcomed meetings with the POWs in an attempt at healing and reconciliation. If confirmed, I will continue efforts to build friendship and trust between POWs and Japan, while cognizant of the fact that the declining number of POWs and their poor health makes future trips to Japan challenging. I will emphasize that reconciliation will not only help to ease the suffering of the POWs, but also will promote healing within Japanese society.

RESPONSES OF GREGORY B. STARR TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

Question. I recently visited China, Korea, and Japan, and although those missions certainly have different physical security needs than high-threat posts, there is a keen interest in ensuring adequate language capabilities for their personnel. This is especially true in China.

◆ Can you explain the importance of, and your priorities for, language training for our security personnel?

Answer. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) has made significant strides in increasing language abilities over the past several years. DS endeavors to ensure DS agents have sufficient time to learn the language they will need when required for overseas posts. It takes up to 2 years or more in some "hard" and "super-hard" languages like Mandarin to become proficient enough to carry on an in-depth conversation with counterparts. Unfortunately, DS sometimes must send someone to post without the necessary language skills when the security conditions at post require the immediate dispatching of personnel and such language skills are not essential to the performance of duties.

In early 2014, the Director General of Human Resources will request that all Foreign Service positions be reviewed as part of the "triennial language review" process. At that time, DS will make adjustments to positions that may need to have language requirements changed—either increased or decreased.

DS is committed to ensuring that positions that require hard languages, such as Chinese and Arabic, are filled with DS Agents qualified to speak that language.

Question. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security is responsible for defending the Department of State's global network of information technology systems and information assets. The Embassy Security bill which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed rightly addresses our physical security needs; however, our cyber security posture is increasingly under attack. In China, for example, our consulate's social media page was shut down by the Chinese Government, and the Chinese also heavily monitor cell phone and other communications.

◆ Please describe the Department's strategies for defense against network intrusion and other cyber threats.

◆ How are we working to improve our cyber security posture abroad?

Answer. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) coordinates closely with the Bureau of Information Resource Management (IRM) and other offices to protect the Department's global network of information technology systems and information assets. DS has established a comprehensive "defense-in-depth" cyber security pro-

gram which enables the Department to detect, react, analyze, and respond to sophisticated malicious cyber activity from foreign intelligence services and computer criminals. DS provides this operational security capability through an interdependent set of cyber security teams, tools, and programs including network intrusion detection, compliance verification, vulnerability assessment, pen testing, incident handling, threat analysis, and the Regional Computer Security Officer Program. This fully integrated program capability enables rapid coordination and action on a number of issues involving global cyber threats and network security vulnerabilities.

In functional terms, the DS programs addresses cyber threat issues as follows:

- The Network Monitoring Center maintains a 24/7 watch on the Department's global network traffic checking for anomalous and/or suspicious activity and reports on events.
- The Computer Incident Response Team (CIRT) reviews events and keeps operational managers, law enforcement and US-CERT informed about incidents and coordinates incident response actions with all stakeholders.
- The Cyber Threat Analysis team delivers daily and topical all-source reports on pressing threat issues and works closely with LE and CI agencies to develop a comprehensive threat picture and remediation measures. This unit also performs proactive penetration testing and network forensic analysis to detect and resolve major threat issues.
- Regional Computer Security Officers (RCSOs) are the Department's "boots on the ground" performing cyber security assessments at overseas sites and reporting findings to DS.
- DS also works closely with the Department's virus detection and other security programs to stay abreast of any problems affecting the confidentiality—integrity—availability of the Department's networks.

In addition, DS uses its expert cyber security teams to address and improve the Department's cyber security posture abroad through these initiatives:

- Providing customized cyber security support to the Secretary and other senior officials during major diplomatic events;
- Detailing DS personnel full-time to other federal cyber security operations centers to ensure the timely sharing and analysis of threats, cyber intelligence, and technical developments. This includes DS personnel assigned to:
 - National Security Agency /Central Security Service Threat Operations Center (NTOC);
 - Department of Homeland Security's US-Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT);
 - DS Special Agent assigned to the Federal Bureau of Investigations National Cyber Investigative Joint Task Force (NCIJTF).

DS can provide a briefing in an appropriate setting that will provide a fuller understanding of the threats affecting the Department and our cyber security program's ability to mitigate risk.

RESPONSES OF ANNE W. PATTERSON TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

Question. Secretary of State Kerry has facilitated the resumption of substantive negotiations between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in Jerusalem in mid-August at the negotiator level. Many observers are skeptical that the negotiations will lead to meaningful resolution on core issues of the dispute, citing ongoing turmoil in neighboring states as one of many factors influencing both parties' domestic constituencies away from substantive compromise. Some observers have asserted that time may be running out for a two-state solution.

- ◆ What are your expectations for Israeli-Palestinian negotiation over the next few months? How likely is an Israeli-Palestinian resolution on core issues of dispute? What are the main signs of hope and the main obstacles?

Answer. Thus far negotiations between the two sides have been substantive and serious. The parties have engaged on the core issues in good faith and we expect that to continue in the months ahead. But we do not expect that we will be announcing any major breakthroughs, both because the parties have agreed to keep the content of their discussions private and because, as has been the case in the past, the basic premise of the negotiations is that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.

We remain optimistic because in Prime Minister Netanyahu and Palestinian President Abbas, we believe we have two leaders who are serious about pursuing peace. Both leaders have stepped up to resume negotiations despite significant domestic political pressure, and we don't believe they would have paid that political price if they were not serious about following through.

We know that this will not be easy and that the negotiators will need to make difficult compromises on issues that have created major obstacles in the past. They will also face skeptical publics and numerous spoilers on both sides who will try to sabotage any progress. However, we believe that with courageous and bold leadership of the parties, and the commitment by Secretary Kerry and President Obama to peace, these challenges can be overcome. I know Ambassador Indyk is happy to come up and brief you in further detail on this very important subject.

Question. What are we doing to help Israel maintain and enhance its qualitative military edge?

Answer. As President Obama stated during his March visit to Israel—and several Israeli leaders have reiterated—the security relationship between the United States and Israel has never been stronger. We continue to ensure that Israel maintains its Qualitative Military Edge so that it can counter and defeat any credible threat from any state, coalition, or nonstate actor. This is the cornerstone of the United States-Israeli security relationship.

Through both our government-to-government Foreign Military Sales program and Direct Commercial Sales, we are able to provide Israel with advanced defense articles and services available only to our closest allies and partners.

Additionally, we have strengthened our military-to-military cooperation with Israel and now conduct more joint exercises and exchanges of our political, military, and intelligence officials than ever before.

We are in the fifth year of a \$30 billion, 10-year MOU with Israel on Foreign Military Financing (FMF). In FY 2013, Israel received just under \$3 billion in FMF funds, slightly lower than MOU levels, due to sequestration. Additionally, the United States has separately funded development of several Israeli missile defense programs, including the Iron Dome rocket defense system, which helped defend Israeli communities against rockets launched from Gaza by Hamas and other terrorist groups in November 2012.

In April 2013 the United States announced it would make available to Israel a number of new advanced military capabilities, including antiradiation missiles and advanced radars for its fighter jets, KC-135 refueling aircraft, and most significantly, the V-22 Osprey, which the United States has not released to any other nation. When combined with the Joint Strike Fighter and major advances in our cooperative missile defense efforts (e.g., Iron Dome, Arrow Missile Defense Systems), these capabilities will ensure Israel's qualitative military edge and air superiority for decades.

Question. What is the timetable for concluding a new Memorandum of Understanding with respect to security assistance to Israel?

Answer. Our current 10-year, \$30 billion MOU expires at the end of fiscal year 2018. As part of our long-term commitment to Israel's security, President Obama announced during his March visit to Israel that the United States would begin discussions with Israel on how we will extend assistance for the years beyond the current MOU.

At the President's direction, we and the Israelis have already begun discussions about an MOU for the period beyond FY 2018, given Israel's security needs and the complex technical issues involved. These discussions between our two governments are at an early stage and are ongoing. As the talks progress, we will consult closely with members of this committee.

Question. As you know, in Geneva, unlike in New York, Israel is not a part of any regional grouping. It will take a significant amount of U.S. effort and support to get Israel included in the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) in Geneva.

- ◆ Will you commit to making such an effort in Geneva, as we did in New York? In your opinion, what can be done to ensure that Israel is treated more fairly at the U.N.?

Answer. Normalizing Israel's participation across the U.N. and ending its institutionalized unfair treatment in Geneva remains a top priority of this administration and of mine.

If confirmed, I will support the continuing work to promote full and equal Israeli inclusion in international bodies, including the consultative groups in the U.N. sys-

tem that act as organizing venues for determining candidates and coordinating policy approaches.

The United States has helped gain Israeli membership in the Western Europe and Others regional group (WEOG) for several U.N. committees in New York, and the ultimate goal is Israeli membership in all WEOG groupings, including in Geneva. The United States believes it is essential for Israel to be included, as it is the only country not to belong to a regional group in Geneva, and I share that belief.

If confirmed, I will support my colleagues in coordinating closely with Israel and with WEOG members to press for Israel's membership in the group.

Further, as I did as Deputy PermRep in New York when I worked closely with the Israeli delegation, I will support the administration's continuing efforts to normalize Israel's status at the United Nations, including vigorously opposing one-sided, biased resolutions, fighting efforts to delegitimize Israel, and supporting Israel's positive engagement with the UN. I will also work with my colleagues to explore new opportunities for Israel to engage in the U.N., whether it is supporting the participation and selection of Israelis for leadership roles in U.N. programs and agencies, or backing Israeli initiatives at the General Assembly, like this year's entrepreneurship resolution.

RESPONSES OF CAROLINE KENNEDY TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR MARCO RUBIO

Question. What is your assessment of the Asia pivot/rebalance and its effect on United States-Japan relations?

Answer. I believe President Obama made a strategic commitment to rebalance our interests and investments in Asia. As a Pacific nation that takes our Pacific partnership seriously, the United States will continue to build on our active and enduring presence in the region. Secretary Kerry has traveled to the region twice since assuming office and will be traveling to Asia again in early October, underscoring his commitment to the rebalance and to close ties in the region.

The specific objectives of the rebalance are to strengthen U.S. treaty alliances, deepen economic and political partnerships in Asia, increase trade and investment, and promote democratic development. People-to-people engagement underpins all of these goals.

The United States-Japan alliance is the cornerstone of U.S. security interests in Asia and is fundamental to regional stability and prosperity. The United States and Japan are committed to promoting peace and stability—both regionally and globally.

The rebalance represents comprehensive engagement in the region, including trade and investment ties. The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is the economic centerpiece of the rebalance, and a critical initiative to promote U.S. exports, growth, and jobs. Japan is an important partner in the ongoing TPP negotiations. If confirmed, I will coordinate closely with USTR, the Department, and the interagency, as appropriate, to work with Japan to achieve a high standard, comprehensive agreement and meet the TPP Leaders' goal of concluding the negotiations this year.

I would like to reiterate the importance of people-to-people ties. If confirmed, I will work to invigorate educational and cultural exchanges in order to enhance understanding and affection between the Japanese and American peoples. These grassroots ties benefit both our nations tremendously, as an important investment in even closer partnership and cooperation with Japan into the future.

Question. What new measures would you take to encourage greater trilateral United States-South Korea-Japan security cooperation? Do you agree that such cooperation strengthens U.S. interests in the Asia-Pacific region?

Answer. The United States treaty alliances with Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK) have been the foundation for peace, stability, and prosperity in Asia for decades. The United States shares with these two allies many strategic interests: improving regional security and stability, fostering economic prosperity and open trade, and promoting our shared values of democracy and the rule of law. Increased trilateral cooperation not only strengthens U.S. interests, but also benefits Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the rest of the Asia-Pacific region.

Our three countries meet regularly at senior levels in a trilateral format and enjoy close cooperation on a wide range of regional and global issues, particularly on North Korea. The United States, Japan, and the ROK seek the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and are working together to stress to North Korea that it must abide by its commitments and comply with relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions, which obligate it to denuclearize, among other things. The three countries are actively strengthening efforts to reinforce regional mechanisms including

ASEAN, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), and the East Asia Summit (EAS) and working to strengthen cooperation on counterpiracy, disaster response, maritime security, and peacekeeping. In addition to cooperating on Middle East issues, all three countries are actively providing assistance toward the humanitarian crisis in Syria.

If confirmed, I will make it a priority to continue and expand United States-Japan-Republic of Korea trilateral cooperation.

Question. Given the pattern of increasingly aggressive harassment and incursions by Chinese aerial and naval assets into Japanese-administered territory, what will you personally do to reassure the Japanese Government and public about the steadfastness of American commitments to Japan's security?

Answer. The United States is fully committed to our alliance with and security obligations toward Japan. If confirmed, I will publicly and privately continue to assure the Japanese of our longstanding position. In terms of specific territorial issues between China and Japan, U.S. policy has not changed: the United States does not take a position on the ultimate sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands. We call on all parties to avoid actions that raise tensions and to prevent miscalculations that could undermine peace, security, and economic growth in the region. The Senkaku Islands have been under the administration of the Government of Japan since they were returned as part of the reversion of Okinawa in 1972. As such, they fall within the scope of Article 5 of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. The United States opposes any unilateral or coercive actions that would seek to undermine Japanese administration.

But I would note that the administration has engaged in sustained, intensive, and high-level diplomacy on easing tensions in Northeast Asia for many months now. The State Department and other agencies repeatedly encourage all parties to do the same and to pursue dialogue with each other to resolve this issue. If confirmed, I intend to continue emphasizing this message. Both Japan and China understand that Northeast Asia is an engine of global economic growth, so of course we are very concerned that miscalculations have the potential to undermine peace, security, and economic growth.

And I will continue to remind the Japanese that the United States-Japan alliance is the cornerstone of our Asia-Pacific strategy, and our shared values and ideals provide a broad scope for bilateral cooperation with a global reach. Japan and the United States also share common objectives in working with China on a wide array of issues, including increasing military transparency, strengthening rule of law, making progress toward denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, combating climate change, and strengthening the protections for intellectual property.

Question. In May 2013, the Japanese Diet approved Japan's accession to the Hague Convention on International Child Abduction, an important and commendable step that could lead to Japan's ratification and implementation of the Convention by March 2014. I have been assured by Japanese officials that ratification of the Convention would immediately cover existing cases of parental abduction as far as the rights of left-behind-parents to visit their abducted children. However, I am deeply concerned that implementation of the Convention does not seem to protect left-behind-parents' rights to see their children returned to the country in which he/she habitually resided.

♦ What steps would you take to work with Japanese officials in finding a compassionate solution to these cases?

Answer. The United States Government looks forward to Japan's ratification of the Hague Abduction Convention. One of the Department's highest priorities is the welfare of U.S. citizens overseas. This is particularly true for children, who are our most vulnerable citizens and who cannot speak on their own behalf.

As a parent, I am deeply concerned about those children not covered by the Hague Convention. The left-behind parents, of course, want to know what the U.S. Government is doing specifically to help their cases when the Convention is not an option for them to seek their child's return. In those cases, options for seeking the return of a child are far more limited, thus underscoring why Convention membership is critical as we move forward.

If confirmed, I will work hard to resolve the existing cases of international parental child abduction to Japan by raising this important issue through diplomatic channels and continuing to use every appropriate opportunity to raise all existing cases with the Japanese Government. I will reexamine efforts taken in the past and discuss views with Japanese officials in order to try to develop a workable approach to resolving this important issue.

The Department of State currently works closely with these parents to provide information about domestic and foreign resources that may help parents to resolve their children's cases. Department officials raise individual cases with foreign governments, requesting through diplomatic channels that they return abducted children to the United States. They assist parents to obtain access, confirm their children's welfare, and understand their options. The Department monitors legal proceedings as the cases unfold in the court, attends hearings when appropriate, engages child welfare authorities, advocates for consular and parental access, coordinates with law enforcement authorities when parents choose to pursue criminal remedies, and works day-to-day to explore all available and appropriate options for seeking the children's return to their countries of habitual residence.

RESPONSES OF ANNE W. PATTERSON TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR MARCO RUBIO

Question. Please clarify the administration's understanding of the specific violations and timelines that would trigger the use of military force in Syria under the September 14, 2013, bilateral agreement with the Russian Federation.

Answer. The Geneva Framework for Elimination of Syrian Chemical Weapons specifies a target date by which the Syrian regime is to submit a comprehensive listing, including names, types, and quantities of its chemical weapons agents, types of munitions, and location and form of storage, production, and research and development facilities. The Framework also sets target dates for the completion of initial inspections by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), the destruction of production and mixing/filling equipment, and the complete elimination of all chemical weapons material and equipment. The Framework also stresses that Syria must provide the OPCW, the U.N., and other supporting personnel with the immediate and unfettered right to inspect any and all sites in Syria.

The Framework does not specify that missing these target dates or other violations of the Framework would automatically trigger United States use of force. However, the President has said that the credible threat of the use of force is important both in maintaining pressure on the regime and as a means of holding the regime accountable for its use of chemical weapons against its own people.

Question. Upon announcing the agreement with Russia, Secretary Kerry was confident in the possibility of getting access to Syria's chemical weapons, because the Syrian regime had maintained area and access control to these weapons.

- ◆ Please explain how the administration would prioritize between supporting the opposition's ability to pose a credible challenge to the Assad regime versus the regime's desire to maintain unchallenged control and authority over Syrian territory.

Answer. We believe that a negotiated political agreement, rather than a military solution, is the preferred outcome of the conflict in Syria. A negotiated political agreement provides the opportunity to separate the regime from the institutions of the Syrian state—institutions that are key to ensuring national stability into the future. Yet the Assad regime is unlikely to negotiate political compromises without feeling genuine pressure on the battlefield.

The regime has lost control over substantial portions of Syria, but we do not believe it is yet ready to engage seriously in negotiations. Therefore we and partner countries are increasing our support to the Syrian opposition.

Question. U.S. law requires the suspension of our direct foreign assistance to "the government of any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by military coup d'etat or decree in which the military plays a decisive role."

- ◆ In your opinion, does the removal of President Morsi on July 3 in Egypt constitute a coup under this definition?

Answer. We appreciate the complexity of the situation, but we do not believe it is in our national interest to make a decision as to whether the events of July 3 in Egypt were a coup. Following the events of July 3, the President directed a review of U.S. assistance to Egypt to reflect our top priorities; that review is ongoing.

The interim government announced a roadmap that it says will conclude in the seating of a democratically elected civilian government. This roadmap includes a constitutional amendment process conducted by two government-appointed committees, culminating in a national referendum. We have made clear to the interim government that this process should be fully inclusive and that the constitution should respect the universal rights and freedoms of all Egyptians. We also continue to

make clear the importance of holding inclusive, free and fair elections for an early transition to a representative, democratically elected, and civilian-led government. We will support robust observation of those elections so that we can assess their fairness.

Our response to the situation in Egypt will be in line with our values and our national interests. Maintaining flexibility to influence changing events on the ground in a better direction will be critically important. We will urge the Egyptian Government toward an inclusive, civilian-led, democratic transition. As the President and Secretary have said, we want to see Egypt's transition succeed, and we support a path for a stable, democratic, and prosperous Egypt.

Question. What was your message to General el-Sisi and other military leaders in the runup to the events of July 3? Did you or any other U.S. official raise the possibility that U.S. assistance could be cut off in the event of a military takeover?

Answer. We have been clear publicly and privately since the beginning of the Arab Spring changes that events in Egypt have implications for our bilateral relationship, including our assistance. We raised these points with the Egyptian military leadership as well, including in the runup to the events of July 3. Just as we urged Egypt's military leadership to let the democratic process proceed without interruption, we also urged the Morsy government to be more inclusive and to appoint more competent ministers, particularly in the economic fields.

The review of our assistance ordered by the President on July 3 and the subsequent suspension of certain military assistance deliveries and the Bright Star bilateral military exercise are in response to Egyptian actions.

Question. Over the past year, the administration worked hard to provide about \$450 million in direct cash transfers to the Egyptian Government, even as the country failed to take steps toward adopting a fiscal stabilization program as prescribed by the International Monetary Fund and it continued to prosecute 43 American, Egyptian, and German NGO employees working for democracy organizations and block these organizations' activities in Egypt.

◆ Please provide the committee a full account of your role in advising the U.S. Government on these decisions as U.S. Ambassador in Egypt.

Answer. In May 2011, President Obama promised Egypt \$1 billion in assistance toward managing the debt accumulated by the Mubarak regime, in an effort to help prospects for a successful democratic political transition. The program was tied to Egypt's commitment to make progress toward an internationally accepted set of economic reforms under the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We planned to offer \$450 million in cash transfers—about half of the promised assistance—with tranches of funding tied to a series of Egyptian Government promised reforms ending in an IMF agreement. In March, the Secretary announced that \$190 million of the cash transfer program for the Egyptian Government would be transferred; however, the \$260 million second tranche remains on hold since conditions have not been met.

Throughout my tenure in Cairo, I repeatedly outlined to Egyptian officials and the public international concerns about the economy and the need for fundamental reform, because economic collapse in Egypt is in nobody's interest: not America's, not Israel's, and not Egypt's. I consistently reminded Egyptian officials that political and economic stability go hand in hand. I had many conversations with the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF), with the Morsy government, and then with the interim government about the need for economic reform, a message that was conveyed repeatedly by other members of our government. We urged the interim government to use the space provided by the substantial gulf assistance since July 3 to undertake these reforms, improve the business climate, attract investment, and reconcile with business elites.

Regarding the NGO issue, I sought a resolution of our differences with the Egyptian Government over the status of American nongovernmental organizations (NGO) working in the country—both with respect to the unfair trial and the larger issue of pending legislation under the Morsi government that would have further restricted civil society. I engaged frequently with the Egyptian Government on this matter, both immediately after the December 2011 raid, as the trial progressed, and with the Morsi government after the trial verdict on June 4, 2013. I was told by the Morsi government that the matter would be handled bilaterally after the trial was complete. Since July 3, we have repeatedly called on the Egyptian Government to demonstrate its commitment to defending the universal rights of expression, association, and assembly. The steps taken against NGO workers were an important element in the decision to postpone some of our assistance programs. My team and I closely monitored and spoke out on the NGO trial, legal actions against NGOs, and

broader civil society issues in Egypt. As Ambassador, I met with the Egyptian Government and the Presidency on several occasions since legal actions began with raids of the NGOs offices in December 2011, with subsequent charges filed against the 43 employees alleging they were operating a foreign NGO and receiving foreign funding without permission. I consistently pointed out to the government that we considered the trial to have been politically motivated.

On the NGO trial verdicts, I, along with senior U.S. officials in Washington, strongly deplored the decision of the court. The charges, trial, and verdict discourage the exercise of the freedom of association. The court's decision to shut down several NGOs and seize their assets contradicts the Egyptian Government's stated commitments to respect and protect universal rights and freedoms and to support the role of civil society in Egypt. We have made clear that we want to see the trial verdict redressed for the sake of all the defendants, and we will continue to press for that.

More broadly, we continued to urge the government to meaningfully consult with Egyptian civil society organizations to draft an NGO law that conforms to international standards. We have repeatedly called on the Egyptian Government to demonstrate its commitment to ensuring the universal rights of expression, association, and assembly that Egyptians aspired to during the revolution. As Ambassador, I repeatedly conveyed to the Egyptian Government that NGOs continue to play a significant and positive role in Egypt's society and economic development and an essential role in ensuring that Egypt's Government fulfills the aspirations of its citizens for dignity, justice, and political and economic opportunity.

Question. If confirmed, what will you do to get these verdicts wiped from the books and for these important groups to be allowed to reestablish operations in Egypt?

Answer. The administration has consistently made clear since the trial was launched that it views the charges as politically motivated. As Secretary Kerry said, the verdicts run contrary to the universal principle of freedom of association and are incompatible with the transition to democracy. I frequently raised our objections with the Egyptian Government as Ambassador, and, if confirmed, I will continue our efforts to redress these verdicts and allow U.S. support for Egyptian civil society to continue unimpeded.

Alongside our efforts with the Egyptian Government, we have sought to minimize the impact of these verdicts on the defendants and their organizations. We have supported the legal costs associated with the trial through existing grants. We have worked with INTERPOL to ensure that it declared invalid Egypt's pursuit of international red notices against the defendants, due to the trial being politically motivated and not in compliance with INTERPOL's constitution. The Department is providing each defendant with official letters for use in the pursuit of employment or other matters indicating the U.S. Government's view that the convictions were politically motivated, without merit, and invalid.

Question. Does the administration plan to provide remaining FY13 FMF or ESF funds to Egypt prior to the end of the fiscal year and what conditions, if any, will be placed on those funds?

Answer. The President's assistance review is still ongoing. We do not have any updates on that review beyond what the administration has already announced. We plan to take the administrative steps necessary to prevent funds from expiring. These administrative actions are not an indication of any broader decision about our assistance to Egypt, but preserve the availability of funds for use in the future. Regardless of the outcome of the ongoing review, it is important to retain this flexibility.

Question. What specific actions did you take as Ambassador to Egypt to raise persecution of Coptic Christians and treatment of women with the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF), the Morsi government, and the current Egyptian leadership?

Answer. The treatment of religious minorities and women has consistently been one of the highest priority issues in our engagement with the Egyptian Government, and I raised these issues with Egyptian officials at all levels throughout my tenure as Ambassador. One particular focus of our engagement was ensuring that Christians and women be included in government committees, political party leadership, and all national institutions in order to give voice to their oft-neglected demands. We also strongly pushed for investigations into crimes against Christians and women and accountability for those found guilty of violence against these groups.

President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and the administration strongly denounced the recent attacks on Christian churches, homes, and businesses and called on the interim government to protect the rights of all religious minorities. The interim gov-

ernment has arrested a number of individuals suspected of attacking churches, and it has committed itself to investigating these heinous crimes. The interim government needs to do more, however, to protect Christians before such attacks occur, and we will continue to work with the Egyptian authorities to stress the need to protect all Egyptians from hateful attacks on themselves and their institutions.

In response to a wave of despicable sexual assaults against women, the Department and our Embassy in Cairo initiated a program to help train Egyptian police to combat all forms of sexual harassment. This was in addition to our public and private efforts to ensure the government held the perpetrators accountable for their crimes. We also launched a Department-wide effort to bring together our assistance programs and direct them more efficiently to support women's empowerment. If confirmed, I would continue those efforts to ensure women, Christians, and all Egyptians, have a voice in determining their future.

Question. What will you personally do to address the growing persecution of Christians in Iran and across the Middle East?

Answer. I am very concerned by the increasing reports of threats and violence against religious minorities in Iran and across the Middle East. I am committed to protecting freedom of religion for all. I am also dedicated to protecting Christians and other religious minorities around the world. Freedom of religion is critical to a peaceful, inclusive, and thriving society, and supporting it is a critical component of U.S. foreign policy.

The administration has raised its concerns about the persecution of Christians in Iran and across the Middle East on numerous occasions, and in multiple international fora. If confirmed, I will continue to speak out and highlight cases of religious persecution, work with our international partners to shine a spotlight on abuses, urge governments to provide these minorities the requisite rights and protections, and encourage accountability for acts of violence directed against religious minorities. I will also press for the release of U.S. citizen Saeed Abedini, who was sentenced to 8 years in prison in Iran on charges related to his religious beliefs.

Question. What new measures would you adopt to ensure that the State Department more openly prioritizes human rights and democracy in its relations with Bahrain, and what leverage points would you use to encourage progress on these issues?

Answer. Human rights and democracy are core U.S. values that will remain a priority in our relationship with countries in the region, including Bahrain. Last week, we publicly expressed our concern over the Government of Bahrain's recent decrees restricting the rights and abilities of political groups to assemble, associate, and express themselves freely. If confirmed, I will make a strong case to the Government of Bahrain that meaningful dialogue between the government and the peaceful opposition, political reforms and the protection of human rights are vital both to Bahrain's long-term stability and to its relationship with the United States. Moreover, I will ensure that we continue to review all credible information documenting human rights violations and to press for investigations into and accountability for these violations. In addition, I will support advocacy and programming efforts to expand the space for civil society in Bahrain.

The U.S. Government continues to withhold the export to Bahrain of lethal crowd control items and other items that have a potential internal security use due to the Bahraini Government's response to protests and concerns about ongoing unrest. If confirmed, I will continue to work to ensure our arms transfer policy continues to take into account any human rights issues.

**NOMINATION HEARING OF DWIGHT BUSH,
SR., MARK CHILDRESS, THOMAS DAUGHTON,
MATTHEW HARRINGTON, EUNICE REDDICK,
JOHN HOOVER, AND MICHAEL HOZA**

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2013

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

Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco
Mark Bradley Childress, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania
Thomas F. Daughton, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to Namibia
Matthew Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Lesotho
Hon. Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Niger
John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to Sierra Leone
Michael S. Hoza, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Cameroon

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:06 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Christopher A. Coons presiding.

Present: Senators Coons, Kaine, Murphy, Markey, and Flake.
Also Present: Senator Durbin.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER A. COONS,
U.S. SENATOR FROM DELAWARE**

Senator COONS. I am pleased to call to order this hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Subcommittee on African Affairs as we consider the following nominations: Dwight Bush to be Ambassador to Morocco; Mark Bradley Childress to be Ambassador to Tanzania; Thomas Daughton to be Ambassador to Namibia; Matthew Harrington to be Ambassador to Lesotho; Eunice Reddick to be Ambassador to Niger; John Hoover to be Ambassador to Sierra Leone; and Michael Hoza to be Ambassador to Cameroon.

As I have discussed with our nominees, before we begin more formally I would like to just say a few words about the horrific attack in Nairobi in Kenya. My deepest condolences go out to the families of those injured or killed in this senseless violence. My prayers are with those who have been lost with the security forces and the people of Kenya and with all who have been touched by this event.