

**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. HRC. 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

98-305 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 HEATHER HIGGINBOTTOM,
SARAH SEWALL, AND RICHARD STENDEL**

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2013

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

Hon. Heather A. Higginbottom, of the District of Columbia, to be
Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources
Dr. Sarah Sewall, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State
for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights
Richard Stengel, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for
Public Diplomacy

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:03 a.m., in room
SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Robert Menendez
(chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Menendez, Corker, Rubio, and Johnson.

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

The CHAIRMAN. This hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations
Committee will come to order.

Today, we have three nominees before the committee: Heather
Higginbottom to be Deputy Secretary of State for Management and
Resources; Dr. Sarah Sewall as Under Secretary of State for Civil-
ian Security, Democracy and Human Rights; and, Richard Stengel
to be the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

One thing these three nominees will have in common, should
they be confirmed, is responsibility, in one way or another, for the
development and implementation of policies that touch on who will
be in a position to represent America and how American values
will be reflected around the world.

Our first panelist is Heather Higginbottom who, if confirmed,
would play a key role with respect to two priorities of mine: deter-
mining who represents the United States abroad and our policies
to protect them. For 20 years I have been pressing the Department
on the issues of diversity and minority recruitment and retention.
In my view, our Foreign Service personnel should mirror the diver-
sity of the Nation. It is our strength as a country and we should
capitalize on it.

Last year the State Department completed a 3-year hiring effort
to increase the workforce. For a department that ranks near the

bottom when it comes to diversity, one would have expected a focus on doing more to diversify the workforce. Instead we saw only some gains by Asian-Americans and African-Americans and virtually no gains for Hispanic-Americans. In fact, their overall numbers decreased in terms of percentage. So, I will look forward to hear your assessment of where we are and what the future holds in terms of recruitment policies.

On embassy security, as Deputy Secretary, you will be responsible for how the Department's security programs and apparatus are integrated with policy-level decisions. And I would like to know how you plan on remaining intimately involved in, and transparent about, security issues around the world. Attacks are against our personnel and facilities are likely to continue as al-Qaeda, its affiliates and other terrorist groups continue to wage a global war against us. The recent military-style suicide attack in Herat against our consulate, although successfully repulsed by diplomatic security and Afghan personnel, is evidence of the resolve and resources of these groups.

These concerns, in additions to your views on how, as Deputy Secretary, you would help steer the State Department through a period in which resources are likely to be scarce and will require careful management are issues that I hope to hear your thoughts on today.

With that, let me turn to our Ranking Member Senator Corker.

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

Senator CORKER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for having the hearing.

Ms. Higginbottom, thank you so much for taking the time to come by our office and being willing to serve in this way. I think we would be much better off listening to you than me, and we will do that and have some questions. But thank you for being here.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

With that, your full statement will be included in the record. I will ask you to summarize it in around 5 minutes or so, so we can enter into a dialogue. If you have any family or friends here, we recognize that service is an extended service of family. And we appreciate their willingness and their sacrifices as well. Please be free to introduce them. The floor is yours.

**STATEMENT OF HON. HEATHER A. HIGGINBOTTOM, OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF
STATE FOR MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES**

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, and the distinguished members of this committee.

It is a great privilege to appear before you as the nominee for Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources.

I am humbled by the confidence that President Obama and Secretary Kerry have placed in me. And I am honored to be nominated to follow in the footsteps of Jack Lew and Tom Nides, two extraordinary public servants; and to have the opportunity to serve alongside one of our Nation's finest diplomats, Deputy Secretary Bill Burns.

If I may, I will introduce some of my family who are here today: my parents, Ann and George Higginbottom, who inspired in me a desire pursue a career in public service; my brother and sister-in-law, Eric and Stella Higginbottom; and, my husband Danny Sepulveda, who has been my steadfast supporter. We had wanted to bring along our 1-year-old daughter, but thought it best to respect the regular order of this committee and let her watch from home. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. We are child friendly here.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. I am not sure she would have made it sitting still this long.

As someone who began her career working for then Senator Kerry, I start out with a deep respect for this institution and its prerogatives. I welcome the Congress' shared responsibility for American foreign policy. And, if confirmed, I pledge to work with you to help make both our diplomacy and development more effective, more modern, and more agile.

The only professional path I have ever known has been public service: from my time in the Senate, to my service as Deputy Director of both the White House Office of Management and Budget and the Domestic Policy Council, to my most recent appointment as counselor of the State Department. Over the course of my career I have learned how to get results in government. I have seen that it takes a determined effort to seek out and reward innovation, the willingness to make tough budgetary tradeoffs, the drive to build and inspire a strong, diverse workforce, and open, honest outreach across the interagency and across the aisle.

Those are all the skills and experiences that the President and Secretary Kerry thought were essential in a Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources. If confirmed, I will share in the global responsibilities for U.S. foreign policy and have broad management and programmatic oversight responsibilities for both State and USAID. I welcome especially the insight and input of this committee.

I would like to share five areas where I plan to focus, if confirmed.

First, my top priority will be ensuring the safety and security of our people and our posts. President Obama has made it clear that we need our diplomats fully engaged wherever our vital national interests are at stake. That is why, if I am confirmed, I will work to make certain that our processes, our organization, and our culture keep pace with the rapidly evolving threats facing our diplomats and development professionals. And I know Congress shares this commitment to security and I look forward to working with you to make sure that we have both the resources and the tools to deliver on it.

Second, if confirmed, I will work to better prioritize the resources and programs of State and USAID. I will see to it that our limited resources are going where we need them most and being used responsibly and effectively. This is especially important as we continue our efforts to right-size our presence and engagement in key places like Afghanistan and Pakistan.

My third area of focus will be management, reform, and innovation. We must do a better job of aligning our planning budget and

management function with our foreign policy and national security priorities. I will also work to ensure that the remarkable men and women at State and USAID have the training, tools, and skills they need to succeed. If confirmed, I will oversee the second Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, which will identify important policy shifts, areas for innovation and management reforms required to address the challenges that we face today and in the future.

Of course, Secretary Kerry is personally determined to effect lasting change, so I look forward to partnering with this committee and the whole Congress on authorizing legislation for the State Department and USAID.

My fourth area of focus will be better targeting and coordinating our development efforts. These investments are not just the right thing to do, they are the smart thing to do because helping to promote stability and creating opportunities for future trade and shared growth is in America's interest.

Finally, if confirmed, I will build on the great work that has been done to strengthen the State Department's economic impact. As Secretary Kerry has said, "Today, foreign policy is economy policy." If confirmed, I will work to help our embassies and consulates abroad, do even more to fight for American companies and promote foreign investment that leads to jobs and opportunities at home.

Throughout my 20-year career in public service, I have had one overarching objective: to ensure that our government delivers and that we make it work for the American people. Our foreign policy investment, at about 1 percent of the Federal budget, is really national security insurance. It is one of the very best investments that we can make for our country's future. But, I believe we can and must do everything possible to increase the return on that investment. If confirmed, I will work each day to make good on that promise and partner with all of you to make sure our diplomacy and development help contribute to the kind of world we all want to see, one that is more peaceful and more prosperous.

Thank you and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Higginbottom follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HEATHER A. HIGGINBOTTOM

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, and distinguished members of this committee.

It is a great privilege to appear before you as the nominee for Deputy Secretary of State for Management & Resources. I am humbled by the confidence that President Obama and Secretary Kerry have placed in me, and I'm honored to be nominated to follow Jack Lew and Tom Nides, two extraordinary public servants, and to have the opportunity to serve alongside one of our finest diplomats, Deputy Secretary Bill Burns.

I would like to introduce my family members, who are here today: My parents, George and Anne Higginbottom, who inspired me to pursue a career in public service; my brother, Eric Higginbottom; and my husband, Danny Sepulveda, who has steadfastly supported me every step of the way.

We wanted our 1-year old daughter, Gisele, to be here as well, but decided it was in the interest of the committee's regular order to let her watch from home.

As someone who began her career working for then-Senator Kerry, I start out with a deep respect for this institution and its prerogatives. I recognize and welcome the Congress' shared responsibility for American foreign policy and, if confirmed, I pledge to work with you to help make both our diplomacy and development more effective, more modern, and more agile.

The only professional path I've ever known has been public service—from my time in the Senate, to my service as Deputy Director of both the White House Office of Management and Budget and the Domestic Policy Council, to my most recent appointment as the Counselor of the Department of State.

Over the course of my career, I have learned how to get results in government. I've seen that it takes a determined effort to seek out and reward innovation; the willingness to make tough budgetary tradeoffs; the drive to build and inspire a strong, diverse workforce; and open, honest outreach across the interagency and across the aisle. I have a track record of finding innovative, data-driven, and cost-effective ways of wisely managing public dollars to achieve a greater good.

Those are all skills and experiences that the President and Secretary Kerry thought were essential in a Deputy Secretary of State for Management & Resources. If confirmed, I will share in the global responsibilities for U.S. foreign policy, and have broad management and programmatic oversight responsibilities for both State and USAID. Partnering with you, I will work to position State and USAID for success in the decades to come.

I welcome especially the insight and input of this committee. I would like to share five areas where I plan to focus, if confirmed.

First, my top priority will be ensuring that our people and posts are safe and secure. President Obama has made it clear that we need our diplomats fully engaged wherever our vital national interests are at stake—from Colombia to Indonesia, and Kenya to Yemen.

That is why, if confirmed, I will work to make certain that our processes, organization, and culture keep pace with the rapidly evolving threats facing our diplomats and development professionals.

State Department and USAID personnel are on the front lines of U.S. national security endeavors and there is constant and inherent risk in what they do every day. We owe it to these public servants to do everything we can to protect them as they promote U.S. interests and values in some of the world's most challenging places. To get this job done, we must complete implementation of the Benghazi Accountability Review Board recommendations; regularly review our presence and posture at all high-threat posts; and annually review the status of any outstanding recommendations made by any Accountability Review Board—not just the one convened for Benghazi. We must also ensure that the State Department works more closely with the Intelligence Community to understand the threats to our personnel and with the Defense Department to ensure that we are coordinating efforts to provide our diplomats overseas with the best protection possible. And, if confirmed, I will work with Congress on embassy security legislation and funding to ensure that we have the authorities and resources needed to keep our people safe.

I know Congress shares this commitment to security and I look forward to working with you to make sure we have the resources and tools to deliver on it.

Second, if confirmed, I will work to better prioritize the resources and programs of State and USAID. I will see to it that our limited resources are going where we need them most and being used responsibly and effectively.

This is especially important as we continue our efforts to right-size our presence and engagement in key places like Afghanistan and Iraq. In particular, I will work to align resources with policy as we carry out the planned transition in Afghanistan.

We have made substantial progress in building an international coalition committed to supporting a stable and sovereign Afghanistan—that will never again be a safe haven for terrorists. Working closely with the Afghan Government and people, we intend to ensure that these gains are maintained. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Ambassador Jim Dobbins and with Congress on this issue.

As the transition progresses, the military continues to draw down, and the Afghan Government takes on full responsibility for providing security for its people, we are pursuing a framework to carry out our basic missions beyond the 2014 security transition: Training, advising, and assisting Afghan forces, and continued limited counterterrorism efforts against al-Qaeda and its affiliates, as well as continuing our diplomatic and consular efforts there. Our diplomatic and development efforts are also lined up with this security mission. Supporting preparations for Afghanistan's 2014 Presidential election is a key priority. A peaceful transfer of power following a credible election will bolster the legitimacy of the government, in addition to sending a message to all parties their interests can be better advanced through political participation than violence. And making sure Afghanistan has the resources and revenue to sustain the gains we have made this past decade will be critical for promoting regional stability.

My third area of focus will be management, reform, and innovation. We must do a better job of aligning our planning, budget, and management functions with our foreign policy and national security priorities.

I will also work to ensure that the remarkable men and women at State and USAID have the training, tools, and skills they need to succeed.

If confirmed, I will oversee the second Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, which will identify important policy shifts, areas for innovation, and management reforms required to address the challenges that we face today and in the future.

Of course, Secretary Kerry is personally determined to affect lasting change, so I look forward to partnering with this committee on authorizing legislation for the Department and USAID.

If confirmed, I will also bring new focus to innovation at the State Department and USAID. Innovation in what we do, as well as the way we work, is critical to deliver on our foreign policy and development priorities. There are tremendous opportunities to improve how we operate and to better use technology—information-sharing and relationship management systems could dramatically increase the productivity of our staff; video-teleconferencing and other technologies could reduce travel costs and improve collaboration. I will also champion the use of technology to improve program transparency, and our monitoring and program evaluation. Data driven decisionmaking, increasing transparency of how we invest resources and ensuring timely, usable data on performance and results will be central elements of this reform agenda. Foreignassistance.gov is an important start, but we can and must do more.

My fourth area of focus will be better targeting and coordinating our development efforts. These investments aren't just the right thing to do—they are also the smart thing to do, because helping to promote stability and creating opportunities for future trade and shared growth is in America's interest.

I will make certain that our key development initiatives like global health and food security deliver results and are sustainable. We must align our business model and investments to have maximum impact. This means investing in economic growth, aligning our workforce with changing needs, and working more closely with local governments and civil society. We must also ensure that our development agencies are coordinated across government and do a better job of working in partnership with the private sector.

Finally, if confirmed, I will build on the great work that has been done to strengthen the State Department's economic impact. At his own confirmation hearing earlier this year, Secretary Kerry said that today "foreign policy is economic policy." More than ever, our prosperity at home depends on our engagement abroad—opening markets, expanding exports, and attracting foreign investment. If confirmed, I will work to help our embassies and consulates abroad do even more to fight for American companies and promote foreign investment that leads to jobs and opportunity here at home.

Throughout my 20-year career in public service, I have had one overarching objective: to ensure that our government delivers and that we make it work for the American people.

Our foreign policy investment—at about 1 percent of the federal budget—as others have said is really "national security insurance." It's one of the very best investments we can make for our country's future. But, I believe we can—and we must—do everything possible to increase the return on that investment.

If confirmed, I will work each day to make good on that promise, and partner with all of you to make sure our diplomacy and development help contribute to the kind of world we all want to see, one that really is more peaceful and more prosperous.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you for your statement.

Let me start off with a few questions. I appreciate the priorities that you listed. I think they are appropriate. But, let me start off with the embassy and diplomatic security, which has been a concern of mine since our experiences in Libya and continues to be a concern with high-risk, high-threat posts throughout the world.

So, the 1999 Booz Allen and Hamilton Report, which is a byproduct of the 1999 ARB Report in the wake of the bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, recommended that diplomatic security be removed from the longstanding Under Secretary for Management reporting structure and place diplomatic security either in a separate Under Secretary along with the Bureau of Counterterrorism and

the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement or report directly to the Secretary of State.

The recent Best Practices Panel, consisting of five distinguished security and law enforcement officials, recommended the creation of an Under Secretary for Diplomatic Security. Underscoring, "the Department's present direction of expeditionary diplomacy operating with an increased number of temporary and permanent posts in complex, high-risk environments requires an organizational paradigm change with an Under Secretary for Diplomatic Security as the linchpin necessary to safely enable the Department's mission," that was their quote.

So, my question is—there are those who may agree with that, there are those who may have a different view. But, heightening the importance of our people abroad, as they take the risks that inevitably they will, but minimizing those risks is incredibly important to me. Have you met or do you intend to meet with the members of the Best Practices Panel? And have you had an opportunity to review their recommendations? And, if so, what is your views on their recommendations?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you, Senator, very much.

As you know, I have had the opportunity to be at the Department now for the past several months and can say that everyone is united in the effort to ensure that the tragic attack that occurred in Benghazi will never happen again. It is the top priority for me, if I am confirmed. And I have reviewed the Best Practices Panel and the other independent reviews, obviously the ARB and the Inspector General Report and are taking all of those recommendations very seriously.

As it relates specifically to the recommendation for an Under Secretary: I think, first, it is important that the Deputy Secretary Office establish the appropriate processes and accountability mechanisms, as one of the two top officials reporting to the Secretary at the Department. And I intend to do that. One of the objectives I will have, if confirmed, is to look beyond—certainly work to implement the remaining ARB recommendations, but look beyond the Benghazi ARB at our processes, our organization, our culture. Look at all of the recommendations that have been made in the wake of Benghazi and figure out how we are best organized to mitigate the threat and the risks to our people and places around the world.

I have not yet met with the Best Practices Panel. I look forward to doing that, if I am confirmed. I have had the opportunity to look across the spectrum of recommendations and also look at some of the recommendations from previous ARBs, which I know has been pointed to, in the wake of Benghazi. And I think we need to have an annual report where we get progress each year that would come to me to say where are we on this and where are we, not just on the ARB recommendations as it relates to Benghazi, but for all of them. So this is something I will take very, very seriously.

The CHAIRMAN. How do we ensure, structurally within the State Department, that there is a clear line of communication and authority and responsibility? Because my sense is that that was lacking before, the sense of it. And so that, when someone at one of our missions abroad or embassies abroad feels that there are concerns and we look at intelligence a different way, not just a specific

threat, but the nature of the environment of all threats to make a calculus as to what we should be doing. How are we going to ensure that there is a structural line that goes directly to the Secretary, if necessary, in order to get action?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you. It is a very good question.

First, I would just say that our nominee to be the Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security—Acting Secretary Greg Star has said on many occasions, I know I can pick up the phone and talk to the Secretary whenever I need to. And I think that is important, whatever our structure is that if there is a real concern that he or someone else in that position has—they have that direct line.

I think one of the most important recommendations from the ARB and that we have to execute on is to establish a process that—particularly when we have a national security or a national interest to be in a particular place and we have a difficult threat environment, that we are bringing those together in a regular process that feeds up the chain so that we are not just having one side or the other decide what the answer is. And that process is being developed right now. That is something that I would be engaged in and I think, you know, and those very difficult calls need to go to the Secretary and be discussed and made—make a call in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me turn to the question of diversity at the State Department, something you and I spoke about. You know, it is pretty alarming to me to see the largest, fastest-growing part of America's population, what is the next America, you know, dismally represented at the State Department. Not just as a question of participation, but as a question of promoting American values abroad, as is evidenced by who we are as a Nation. When I was in China recently, it was great to have met with dissidents and attorneys struggling to represent human rights activists and others. And our person in charge of that there was an African-American, incredibly qualified but also created a whole historical perspective of a struggle for civil rights. It was a powerful message.

I think about the realities that the State Department has one of the most dismal records of having Hispanic representation in it. And I think there are arbitrary and very subjective measures by which it impedes the opportunity for Hispanic-Americans to participate. So, where the State Department recruits—I mean, the Fletcher School is a great school. I do not argue with that. But, that is not going to get the most diverse population, you know by way of example.

And the question of oral capacity is incredibly subjective. And I have met some great people from the State Department who clearly have the powerful ability to communicate orally and I have met some people who may not quite reach that standard. Yet, Hispanics seem to consistently get filtered out in that respect.

So, I would like to hear from you because this comes from the top. We are never going to achieve progress if, from the very top, there is not a comment and a position in which measurement for reviews of people below. I know we have a whole host of promotions that are pending before the committee. You know, part of that has to be that management gets the message that creating the ability to have people enter into the Foreign Service that is more

diverse is a measure of judgment as to how well they are performing. If not, it will never move forward.

So, I would like to hear what you would do, if you were approved by the Senate, both as to recruiting a more diverse workforce in the Foreign Service; as well as how would you go about to ensure—for example, would you support a fellows program similar to successful Pickering and Rangel fellowships? And would you meet with the—in a consistent basis with the new Director General that is before the committee, for the Foreign Service, which I hope at some point we will confirm this year, as all efforts of creating a process that would change this reality at the State Department?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity that we had to discuss this issue prior to this hearing. And, as I said to you then, I appreciate that you have a focus on this and that you are holding us accountable. I do not think anyone would agree that we are in the place that we want to be on this. It is a particular passion and commitment of mine that I will bring into the position, if confirmed. And I know that Secretary Kerry cares deeply about this as well.

You mentioned the nominee for the Director General, Ambassador Chacon. I have spoken to him about this and we have begun to share ideas about how to really take this on in a more systematic way, but also think creatively about ways to expand our ability to recruit at different institutions of higher education, thinking about how to reach students when they are younger, before they get to college with some thinking about what a career in the Foreign Service would be. And there are a lot of best practices from the private sector I think we can try to bring into our efforts.

But, I think it does have to be a priority at the highest levels. We do have to do more to create an environment, once people enter the Foreign Service or the civil service, at the State Department that is supportive and meets their needs and interests. And I think there is a lot of work we can do.

Linda Thomas-Greenfield, who was the Director General until she was nominated to be the Assistant Secretary recently, did a lot of good work on this and has really established, I think, some very good programs within the Department. But, I really do believe there is more we can do. I look forward to working with you on it. And I think it is really important that we have a dialogue about this. I think there is a lot of opportunity for us to really build on what the foundation is that we have now. The fellowship programs are one tool, but I think there are a lot of different tools we can avail ourselves of.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you again for being here and your willingness to serve in this capacity. And appreciate you having family members here. I will say, usually when people bring their children, they get dealt with in a much easier way. But I think—

[Laughter.]

Senator CORKER. I do not think that is going to be an issue with you today anyway.

We talked a little bit in our office about the fact that you have certainly done some very, very distinguished—contributed in a very

good way in the public arena. And, you know, one of the questions, I guess, people have had is with your years of experience, if you will, coming in the State Department. It is a place where change happens very, very slowly, if at all. That many of the bureaucrats there, as you and I both know, when someone like you comes in they say, "Well, you know, Heather will be here for 3 or 4 years and we can wait her out."

How do you expect to overcome the culture that you know and I know and everybody at this dais knows exists within the State Department to really put in place some of the reforms and changes that you would like to see put in place?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you very much, Senator Corker.

I think it is really important to be clear-eyed about what the challenges are. And I have a lot of enthusiasm and commitment to the opportunities that we have at the Department, if I am confirmed into this role. But, that is not enough. And I need to bring into it my experiences as well as the support of the senior leadership, and that starts with the Secretary.

So, if I were confirmed, I would sit down right away with the Secretary, with Deputy Secretary Burns, with our Under Secretaries and say, "This is where I think we need to go, this is what I need from you to enable us to get there, and this is how we are going to be held accountable." I have managed an agency, I have been in government, I have worked across the interagency, and I am familiar with what you referred to as this sort of, you know, "We'll be here a long time and you'll only be here a short time." And I have worked through that. When I was at OMB, I was part of a leadership team with, you know, 500 staff and about 40 political staff, and I was the COO of that agency. And I was there at a time of very low morale that we turned around. And I understand how to breakdown some of those barriers.

But, I do think it really requires the commitment from the senior leadership. And I have had conversations with the Secretary, of course, as well as senior leaders at the Department and they believe in the opportunities to really bring our diplomacy into the 21st century and avail ourselves of innovations and make some of the reforms that are necessary. So, I am confident about it. But, I recognize it is a challenge and I am eager to take it on, if I am confirmed.

Senator CORKER. One of the things we talked about that would be helpful, and I think you agreed and you mentioned, I think, briefly in your written testimony, we have not had a State Department authorization since 2003, which is beyond belief. In other words, the United States Senate has not taken the time to do an authorization of the many programs and activities that are taking place within the State Department for 10 years; a decade.

We mentioned that—we discussed that, you know, that would actually be something that would be a tremendous asset to you. That, if the Senate so chose to take the time and do the diligence and do the work that we were hired to do relative to the State Department, that that would be an asset to you in putting in place many of the reforms and changes that you would like to see take place. And I wondered if you might respond to that.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. It is my pleasure. Thank you, Senator.

I worked in this body. I am a believer in regular order. I think there is real value to be gained from a regular authorization process, a regular appropriations process something that drives our consultation that allows us to update our authorities. I know this committee and, under the leadership of the chairman and yourself, there has been a very important discussion around embassy security. There is an effort right now to update our PEPFAR authorizations. These are really important dialogues for us to have. And a regular State authorization bill would provide that. I am fully supportive of it and would look forward to working with you on it.

Senator CORKER. Thank you.

And I agree with you, we may have an opportunity to have the PEPFAR piece done. And I know the chairman and myself and many members of the committee worked together on the embassy piece. But an overall look would certainly be helpful too. And I thank you for those comments.

I know that the issue in Libya, and I know the chairman spoke to it also, has in some ways become a political football. At the same time there is a lot of substance there too. And one of the things that has been pretty shocking to me—I was in country right after, you know what happened, just a few weeks later. And sat down with our team there and have since talked to a lot of folks.

And I think it has been pretty shocking that, when you read the cables and you see everything that happened during that time, there just has not been any real accountability. I mean, four Americans were killed and, to my knowledge, not a single person at the State Department has even been reprimanded. So, that is odd to me. Very different than what happens in military operations, very different than happens in companies all across our country.

And I wonder if you might speak to some of the same issues that, I know the chairman raised, just about accountability. And is there a way for you to change that culture where, you know, the bar for your job or your employment is set at such a level that, you know, whether you perform or do not perform it just does not matter?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you, Senator.

I know this is an issue that you have been very focused on and I appreciate that it is a difficult set of circumstances. As you know, Secretary Kerry, not long after he came into office, initiated a review of the performance of the four individuals who were identified by the Accountability Review Board; reviewed their performance, both as it related to Benghazi, but also their overall performance at the Department; and concluded that all should be reassigned from the positions that they held into positions of lesser responsibility. None of them have responsibility for worldwide security today. I think that was appropriate.

I understand also that the ARB made a recommendation that they would, in future—like their statute changed and future ARBs be able to make recommendations about discipline when there are management failures or weaknesses. And I think that is important. I think the Department is updating its Foreign Affairs manual to guide that. And we have worked, obviously, with this committee to try to get that ARB provision changed as well. Those are important steps. But, I think we have to set up processes that make clear where decisionmaking lies and who is accountable. I hope that, in

the wake of the incident in Benghazi, with all of the review of our processes and procedures that are taking place and all the reforms that we are really getting at that issue.

And when I say, as I did in response to the chairman, that I will look at the processes, the organization, the culture, that is part of what I am talking about. We need to really step back and understand how decisions are made and who is accountable. So, I am committed to that and look forward to engaging with you on it.

Senator CORKER. Well, I know one of the things that you are going to be highly involved in is helping establish the balance between engagement and security. And, you know, it is obviously that particular incident highlighted that, I think, more than any that we have seen. And I look forward to your work in that regard. I do look forward to working closely with you.

And, on the issue of the ARB, it seems like to me that is something that we ought to be able to resolve really, really quickly and easily. So, I do look forward to talking with you a little bit more.

But thank you for your desire to do this. We look forward to you doing really good things at the State Department. And I am glad you are willing to do this.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Corker.

Before I turn to Senator Rubio, I would just say I appreciate the ranking member's desire to have a State authorization. And there isn't anybody who would want to see that more than the chair. And I hope that maybe we can get there. But, what we will need from members of the committee is a commitment to an authorization that is not a Christmas tree of seeking to have their foreign policy views inserted as to the policy of the State Department.

If we want broad, thematic approaches for the State Department, in terms of how its structure might be and what we ultimately would want to authorize, in terms of its resources and its missions, those are great and I totally support that. But, the reason that we have not had a State Department authorization in nearly a decade is because it became the vehicle for members to try to pursue their individual foreign policy desires in different parts of the world and it went far afield from an authorization. And, if we can get there, I would love to be able to do that.

Senator CORKER. If I could respond, since there is editorial comments being given.

I can tell you there are none of the folks on this side of the dais that even were here in 2003. So, I think we ought to give it a try. So, thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the good news is I was not here in 2003 either so—

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. Senator Rubio.

Senator RUBIO. So, I am going to make a statement and I think your answer is going to be yes, but—because it leads to my next question. Do you agree that our foreign assistance should reflect two things: No. 1, is our interests, first and foremost, but also our values?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Yes, Senator.

Senator RUBIO. How do we tie both, our interests and our values in our foreign assistance programs?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you, Senator, for raising that question.

It is a balance that we have to strike. We must ensure that our assistance is directed to those places where we have a national security or a vital national interest. And then we need to assess, when we have concerns about a particular activities or statements of a country, what we are doing with our assistance. Are we directing it to civil society groups? Are we promoting democracy? You know, what are we really doing with that? And I think that is an important tenet and principle that we need to work through.

Senator RUBIO. You mentioned it as a balance. I would argue, and you probably would agree too, that oftentimes they are actually not mutually exclusive that, in essence, oftentimes our interests are our values. Whether it is the issues of modern-day slavery or religious liberties or any other human rights causes.

Do we have or do you have an example that we can look at and say this is a place where we have found the right balance; where we have been able to use foreign assistance and foreign assistance programs and engagement as an opportunity to, in essence, do both to further our interests and our values simultaneously?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, you are right. They are certainly not mutually exclusive. And I think that there are many places around the world where we have been able to utilize our assistance to promote our values and address issues that we have concerns about. I would be happy to follow up with you and go through some of those.

[An additional written response for the record follows:]

We owe it to the American people to use their resources wisely and that means using foreign assistance in ways targeted to advancing our national interests, while honoring our values. At times there are perceived tensions regarding how the United States can pursue both short-term gains and long-term interests simultaneously. But, in fact, as we have pursued engagement on economic, security, and other issues, with governments around the world, we have pressed the same governments bilaterally and in multilateral fora to protect religious freedom and other human rights and to combat trafficking. In parallel with these efforts to change government policy and practice, we have directly aided civil society groups promoting those rights and our values.

For example, as I understand it, the State Department since 2009, has been supporting the Alliance of Iraqi Minorities, a network of 62 Iraqi individuals and organizations that work to protect Iraq's minorities and promote their inclusion in the political process. By working directly on community development projects throughout the country, in the communities from which they originate, Alliance members reinforce and uphold the status of Iraq's diverse ethnic and religious minorities as members of Iraqi society. At the same time, the United States continues its support for the Minority Parliamentary Caucus, which convenes minority members of the Council of Representatives (COR) who work with their civil society partners to represent and advocate for minority issues within the Iraqi Government.

The State Department also implements a program that combats discrimination and religious intolerance, while protecting the freedoms of religion and expression in various countries in all regions of the world. The program assists governments in training local officials on cultural awareness regarding religious minorities and on enforcing nondiscrimination laws. The training, shaped by the needs of the host country, includes topics such as legislative reform; best practice models; prosecuting violent crimes motivated by religious hatred; metrics; and discrimination in employment, housing and other areas.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. It is important that we understand what we are trying to achieve with our assistance and what outcomes we

are looking for. And I think that is an important thing to bring into the equation.

Senator RUBIO. Now, I also wanted to point out I introduced a bill along with Senator Cardin and Representatives Poe and Connelly in the House. It is Senate Bill 1271. What it is designed to do is to improve monitoring and evaluation of U.S. foreign assistance programs, including security sector assistance. So, I do not know if you are familiar with it or not. But I would encourage you to look at it and see how we can gain some traction on that idea because we live in a time where everybody wants to balance the budget. But the only thing they are in favor of doing is cutting foreign aid. Which, of course, you cannot balance our budget by doing that. It is just not enough money and, quite frankly, would be counterproductive.

So I do think we have to increasingly be able to justify to the American people why, at a time when we have such extraordinary challenges domestically, we are still engaged globally. And part of being able to make that argument is having programs that have clear measurable results, clear goals. Obviously, any instances where that money's being misspent or unwisely spent undermine that argument.

So, this is a real challenge that we face moving forward. And I think it is critically important and I would urge you and others to get behind the idea that we need to do that as, not just the right thing to do in terms of responsible stewards of the public tax dollar, but also as a way to ensure the long-term viability of our international engagement.

I would also note that unfortunately, over the last 10 years, so much of our foreign policy has been viewed in the lens of military engagement as if that is the only tool in our toolbox. When, in fact, our most powerful tool is proactively engaging around the world with assistance programs that further our values and our interests and prevent these situations from arising and helping our allies transition to more sustainable pathways.

My last question is, in January of this year, the State Department's International Security Advisory Board recommended, "Implement a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation process for its security capacity-building programs, measuring effectiveness against defined goals in terms of basic national objectives, not just value for money or inputs provided. In April, the President issued a policy directive pledging to inform policy with rigorous analysis assessments and evaluations." Can you provide to us any sort of explanation about what measures have been taken thus far to implement rigorous analysis assessment, et cetera, as it relates to security sector assistance?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, thank you very much for raising this issues.

I have a great deal of interest in enhancing the capacity of the Department to use our analysis and evaluations to inform our budgeting, to inform our policy. I would really like to work with you on the legislation that you have introduced, if I am confirmed. When I was working at the Office of Management and Budget, I was working as part of a team to ensure we were doing more data and analysis across the entire Federal Government to inform our

budgeting. And I think it is a very important tenet of the work that we can do together.

It is also, as you point out, incredibly important in justifying the investment. One percent of the Federal budget is in our Foreign Affairs space. Secretary Kerry believes that we need to make the case for this investment. And I think these tools are important for us to do it. It is also important for us to understand what programs are not working and why. So, I am very supportive of that.

I would be happy to follow up with you, Senator, on the specific question you have raised about the security assistance programs. I think that there have been some good steps taken, but we can follow up with some more detail on that.

Senator RUBIO. And I actually did have one more, and I think it will save us some paper here. The 2010 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review process acknowledged that the State Department has a shortage of key skills necessary for modern-day diplomacy. If you could just briefly describe what that gap is and what steps we can take to develop the professional skills of our Foreign Service officers?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you.

I think that there are a set of skills that we really need to hone in on to align what our policy objectives are today with the skills and training that our Foreign Service officers get. I mentioned in my testimony, our economic impact or economic diplomacy. We do not necessarily, right now, train our economic officers in the Foreign Service, in how to engage with U.S. business and with the folks that they deal with overseas at their posts about how to make those connections. That is clearly an area that we need to do more and better in. There is also some discussion around our language training and some skills like that.

But, I would like to—and I have talked with the Secretary about this—really evaluate where our gaps are in training and look for ways to fill those. And I think that one of the most obvious places to begin that is with the economic development work.

Senator RUBIO. Thank you.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator JOHNSON.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ms. Higginbottom.

I would like to welcome you and your family here. And also say that I appreciate your willingness to serve. I also appreciate that your top priority will be ensuring that our people and posts are safe and secure.

I come from a manufacturing background. So, it is just sort of in my DNA a process of continuous improvement. And I really think the vital step in any kind continuous-improvement process really is taking a look at what went wrong and try and get the root cause of it and truly evaluating that. So, we have to learn lessons from the past.

So, with that in mind, I guess I would just kind of like to ask, you know, how much have you delved into what happened in Benghazi? I mean, which of the reports that have been issued have you read? Let us start there.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Sure, Senator, thank you.

I have certainly read the ARB, the unclassified and the classified version. I have read the State Department's Inspector General Report. I have read the Best Practices Report. I have read the Management Review that was recommended by the ARB. And one other I cannot think of right now. But, I have reviewed most of the major reports that have come out about the incidents in Benghazi and the response to it.

Senator JOHNSON. I know the Committee on Homeland Security issued a report with Senators Lieberman and Collins. Did you read that one?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. I have not read that one.

Senator JOHNSON. OK. And then, I know there are five committees in the House that also issued a report. Have you reviewed that?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. I have.

Senator JOHNSON. Have you also received other secure briefings on Benghazi?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. I have not received secure briefings on the events of Benghazi. I have, obviously, been engaged in conversation around implementation of the recommendations from ARB and the other reports.

Senator JOHNSON. OK. So, again, you are pretty thoroughly briefed in terms of what happened. So, I just kind of want you to put into your own words, what went wrong there? What was the breakdown?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, I think it is clear that there—the security was insufficient to deal with the attack that occurred. That there were insufficient—the use of fire as a weapon and other tactics that were used overwhelmed the Regional Security officers and officials who were there. And that it was a breakdown in security.

Senator JOHNSON. Well, why was the security insufficient? I mean, what was the breakdown in the State Department, because there were cables going back and forth? The deterioration in the security situation seemed to be pretty well known. And there are actually verbal requests basically denied. You know, people within the State Department said, do not ask for additional security. I mean, what went wrong within the State Department?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, the Accountability Review Board, when looking at this, I think, found that the requests that came up the line for security measures and personnel in Benghazi were largely granted. But, there was clearly a problem and it was insufficient. And, Senator, I am committed to ensuring that going forward we have the right processes in place—

Senator JOHNSON. Let me just stop you. Are you saying that you really believe that the requests for security were granted by the State Department? Is that your understanding of it?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, many of the requests for security that were granted were—I am not an expert on every cable that was written. I am being nominated for a position moving forward looking at security. I am looking at how we will continue the implementation of the ARB recommendations and the other reports that are out there to ensure this does not happen again. I am not an

expert on everything that happened in the Department before I got there.

Senator JOHNSON. OK. Well, if your top priority is going to be to ensure that our people and posts are safe, I think you need to fully understand what went wrong in the State Department. Because those security requests were not granted. They were denied. And not only was security not beefed up, security was ramped down. I think that you need a very thorough understanding. Quite honestly, the American people need a more thorough understanding of what is happening. Which leads me to my next point.

Assuming—for my constituents, they continue to demand to know what happened. I am, as a United States Senator, incredibly frustrated that we have been denied access to the survivors to get the information. Do you believe, as the United States Senate, at this point in time—what is it, 14 months after the attack, do you believe the Senate should be briefed by the survivors of the Benghazi attack?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, I know that there are ongoing discussions right now with Congress about access to the survivors. The Department of Justice has raised concerns about their testimony and their briefing of Congress as it would relate to prosecution of the criminals in this case. The State Department has raised some concerns about the security of our professional security officers. And I am confident an accommodation can be reached. But I think there are legitimate questions that are being worked through now.

Senator JOHNSON. Do you think 14 months is a little bit long in terms of gaining access to those survivors?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, there has been an enormous amount of accommodation and coordination between the State Department and Congress. Secretary Kerry said before this committee and others he was committed to working with you to answer any legitimate questions, respecting the oversight responsibility. I feel the same way. I look forward to working with you going forward. And I am confident, in the case of the survivors, that we can work through an accommodation here.

Senator JOHNSON. So, obviously, that is a balancing act. Prosecuting individuals that we do not seem particularly interested in picking up or identifying or finding versus the American people's right to know and Congress' oversight responsibilities. Can you just kind of give me your evaluation of the balance between those two?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, I think that the Congress' oversight responsibilities are important. I worked in this body for a long time. I respect its prerogatives. I think that the Department has worked very hard to provide 25,000 documents, many hearings, lots of briefings. That cooperation will continue. Obviously, we have to take into consideration, when we are having a discussion about accommodation, what the impact could be on the prosecution of the criminals who perpetrated this terrible crime. We have to think about the safety of our officers at the State Department. But, I do not think that those things mean we cannot come to some agreement or work together on this issue.

Senator JOHNSON. Now, I am not a lawyer, I am not a prosecutor, I am not assuming you are a prosecutor either.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. No, sir.

Senator JOHNSON. How would Members of Congress, maybe even a secured briefing, getting information and being able to interview survivors, how could that possibly effect some future prosecution where we might have these perpetrators on video tape and we know exactly what they did? How is that going to harm a prosecution?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, I do not want to speak for the Justice Department. But, in the communications that they have had with Congress they have indicated that, should the identities become known, it would be possible for the defense to do research on them, that their safety and security—

Senator JOHNSON. So that—

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM [continuing]. Could be at risk.

Senator JOHNSON [continuing]. That speaks to maybe we should do this in a secured setting.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Senator, this is not my decision. I do not want to speak for the Department of Justice. But I look forward to working with you on this and other issues, if I am confirmed.

Senator JOHNSON. OK.

I just want to go on the record. I think the whole smoke screen of having prosecutions be the reasons that we are not able to gain access to the survivors is strictly that. I think that it has no basis, it is just an excuse. It is a very poor excuse.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I think that our colleague might very well want to direct himself to the Justice Department on that question to pursue it as well. But, I think that the nominee has limited capacity in that regard to give a legal analysis of where the Justice Department's views are. But, I understand your concern. And that may be an appropriate way to try to get to an accommodation.

One final question. You know, international affairs spending has gone from 2½ percent of the overall Federal budget in 1965 to less than 1 percent today. Which means, as the challenges that we have faced globally have dramatically multiplied, we are doing active diplomacy with far less in relative terms. So, one of the most significant challenges I think you have and one of the assets I think you can definitely bring to this job. But I would like to hear your thinking about how do you allocate international affairs spending most effectively and efficiently in the context of what is our stated foreign policy initiatives?

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Mr. Chairman, thank you for that question.

It is an important investment of just 1 percent of the Federal budget. Our mission is not getting smaller, it is not getting less complicated. And so, we have to look at both sustaining that investment, but also how to do more with less. When I was at OMB it was at a time when the overall discretionary appropriations were coming down. We had to look across the entire Federal budget and figure out how to make difficult tradeoffs in priorities in order to fund our priorities and to make cuts and tradeoffs in programs. And that experience and perspective is what I would bring into this position, if I were confirmed.

First, I think the QDDR gives us a good opportunity to really look strategically at what our policy, programs, and operations should look like. And that can help set a roadmap for how we should structure our budgets. I think that we also have to, as I was saying to Senator Rubio, we have to do more in terms of our evaluation and analysis to inform the efficacy of our programing.

And we can also look for efficiencies in the system, when we are evaluating them and find out where there are duplications and where things are not working. We have to make difficult tradeoffs in some of our programing when we find ourselves with reduced overall appropriation. But, we need to do that smartly. We need to ensure it is consistent with our policy and it reflects our values. So, the experiences that I had at OMB, I think, are very relevant to the moment we are in today in living with sequester and also looking at discretionary caps for the next several years.

The CHAIRMAN. That should be the title of a book: Living with Sequester.

[Laughter.]

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. I hope it is an old book soon.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you for that answer.

One of the areas I hope you will look at, upon confirmation, is that alignment with some of our programs with AID and there is a view that some of that is duplicative versus coordinated. And that may be a rich opportunity for some significant advancement.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Seeing no other members before the committee who want to ask a question. The record is going to remain open until the close of business tomorrow. There may be questions for the record for you. I would urge you to answer them expeditiously in order to try to move your nomination forward to a business meeting.

And with that, with the thanks of the committee, you are excused now.

Ms. HIGGINBOTTOM. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Our second panel today are Dr. Sarah Sewall and Richard Stengel. And I would ask them to come up to the witness table. And, as we bring them up, let me introduce them briefly.

Dr. Sewall is nominated to be Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights. She will have a significant portfolio responsible for five Bureaus, overseeing Conflict and Stabilization Operations; Counterterrorism; Democracy, Human Rights and Labor; International Narcotics and Law Enforcement; and, Population, Refugees and Migration.

The new mandate of this position is to build and oversee a coherent capacity in the Department that promotes stability and security in conflict-affected and fragile states, and to support democratic practices, human rights, and humanitarian policies.

It is a large and complex portfolio. But, I understand having three teenaged daughters that maybe you can accomplish all of that with a large and complex portfolio.

And I am interested to hear your plans and intentions, when it comes to civilian security in Latin America, Syria's growing refugee problem, and human trafficking and women's issues. I am also in-

terested in learning more about your plans in your expected current role as a special coordinator for Tibetan Affairs.

Our second nominee is Richard Stengel to be the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy. Mr. Stengel would be the Secretary's principle advisor on Public Diplomacy issues. He would manage all Public Diplomacy resources and oversee efforts to build lasting ties to cultural diplomacy. He would also help shape foreign public opinion, including oversight of the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications.

He is an internationally acclaimed author and journalist, managing editor of TIME magazine, and brings 30 years of communications experience to this new role, if confirmed.

I look forward to hearing your views on current Public Diplomacy efforts around the world. We would be interested in your views on how we might maximize the role of new media and technologies in our national interests.

I know that Senator Schumer wanted to also be part of welcoming you to the committee. And, when he gets here, we will certainly pause for that opportunity. But, in the interests of time and the fact that there are going to be votes shortly taking place, I would like to move your hearing along.

So, as we did in our previous panel, if you have family and friends, please feel free to introduce them to the committee. We welcome all of them. As I said, service is an extended reality for families. And we appreciate your families' willingness to be part of the sacrifice of that service.

Your full statements will be included in the record. We would ask you to summarize them in about 5 minutes or so, so we can enter into a dialogue with you.

And we will start with Dr. Sewall.

STATEMENT OF DR. SARAH SEWALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Dr. SEWALL. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. You have to put your microphone on, please.

Dr. SEWALL. Thank you, Senator.

And I am almost tempted, in light of the articulate defense of State Department programming put forth by Senator Rubio and yourself, to simply associate myself with your remarks. But I will—

The CHAIRMAN. That would not hurt.

Dr. SEWALL [continuing]. Nonetheless proceed.

[Laughter.]

Dr. SEWALL. But, thank you, Senator Menendez. Thank you all members of the committee. I am deeply honored to be with you today and to be considered for the position of Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights.

It is humbling, the trust placed in me as a nominee by President Obama and Secretary Kerry. And, if confirmed, I pledge to work with you and your colleagues to advance American values and strengthen the security of the American people.

I would like to thank in advance, although not acknowledge in person, my husband, Thomas Conroy, who is a public servant him-

self, and our three eldest daughters, Madeline, Kashin and Emma, in their senior year of high school; as well as our youngest Sophie, who is not quite yet a teenager, but on the cusp, she is 12. So they could not be here today, but they are with me in spirit and their enthusiasm for the possibility of my return to public service is an enormous gift.

Having worked on Capitol Hill, I have tremendous respect for the institution of Congress and the Members of the House and the Senate. Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell taught me the value of listening carefully to alternative perspectives and ideas in the legislative process. He always made time to consider carefully the views from both sides of the aisle. And it is from that spirit of openness and respect that I appear before you today and with which I would serve if confirmed.

If confirmed, I would be eager to work with you and to learn your thoughts about this new Under Secretary position and how its nearly \$4 billion in programs and its numerous people overseas and in Washington can more effectively promote good governance and promote human freedoms. As you know, this Under Secretariat, known within the Department as "J," is a highly operational entity that, for the first time, combines both hard and soft power tools and policies.

The Under Secretary must prioritize and promote synergies among these varied programs; strengthen intragovernmental, international, and civil society partnerships to magnify these efforts; and help the American people understand why it is in their interest to make these investments in human security.

Much of my career has focused on protecting civilians and promoting human rights. And I have done this from very different vantage points. I served in the Pentagon as the inaugural Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Peacekeeping. And then I directed Harvard's Carr Center for Human Rights Policy.

I have always been most interested in how the United States can best realize its policy goals through actions; i.e., the implementation of policy. And that is why, during a decade of teaching at Harvard, I chose to focus my research on operational challenges to realizing human rights. History teaches that even the best policies will falter without effective implementation and that there is always room for improvement.

Particularly today, in light of tightening budgets, the United States must make civilian power more efficient and creative. And, if confirmed, I will work with you to use our resources strategically while continuing to ensure that these programs deliver results for America and for our partners and friends.

In 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote of a single garment of destiny that bound the human race. And his words ring evermore true in today's interconnected, hyperlinked world. When the world is safer, Americans are safer. And when the world is more prosperous, Americans will prosper. When we invest in promoting our values and preventing conflicts today, we reduce the odds that our military will be asked to sacrifice for us tomorrow. And when our Nation is true to its principles, it is all the stronger.

I share Secretary Kerry's view that strengthening civilian security and good governance abroad offers an enormous return on in-

vestment. Not simply in the conflicts that we avoid, but also in the well-being of future generations of Americans. It would be an enormous privilege to bring my experiences and convictions to the role of Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights.

I thank the members of the committee for your commitment to these issues and for your consideration of my nomination.

I look forward to your questions, thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Sewall follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. SARAH SEWALL

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, and the members of this committee. I am deeply honored to be here with you today and to be considered for the position of Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights.

The trust placed in me by President Obama and Secretary Kerry is humbling. If confirmed, I pledge to work with you and your colleagues to strengthen the security of the American people and nations around the world by helping countries build more democratic, secure, and stable societies and to advance human freedom.

I would like to acknowledge my husband, Thomas Conroy, a public servant himself, our three eldest daughters, Madeleine, Cashen, and Emma, who are in their senior year of high school, and our youngest, Sophie. While they could not be here today, they are always with me in spirit. Their enthusiasm about the prospect of my return to government service is an enormous gift for which I am very grateful.

Having worked on Capitol Hill for Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell, I have tremendous respect for the institution of Congress and for the Members of the Senate and the House who fulfill their important responsibilities. One of the greatest lessons I learned from Senator Mitchell is the importance of listening carefully to the views of those with differing ideas and perspectives. Senator Mitchell was an outstanding public servant of deep personal conviction, yet he always made time to consider carefully diverse views from both sides of the aisle. It is in that spirit of openness and respect that I appear before you today.

If confirmed, I would be eager to work with all of you and benefit from your perspectives on this Under Secretary position and how its nearly \$4 billion of programs and numerous personnel overseas and in Washington can more effectively promote good governance and protect human freedoms around the globe.

As you know, this new Under Secretariat (known within the State Department as "J") is part of a broader transformation of U.S. foreign policy. The dissolution of the Soviet bloc, the growth of global terrorism, and the challenges posed by weak or repressive governments have prompted changes in U.S. policy and our methods of engaging with the world. The 2010 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review reorganized the State Department, creating a new configuration of operational bureaus and offices that combines both "soft power" and "hard power" tools to promote civilian security, democracy and human rights.

This combination of policy and programs offers a tremendous opportunity to integrate efforts across a broad spectrum of activities. For the first time, the Bureaus of Counterterrorism and International Narcotics and Law Enforcement reside in the same Under Secretariat, as do the new Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, and the Bureaus of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, and Population, Refugees and Migration, as well as the offices that work to promote international justice, engage global youth, and combat human trafficking. The Under Secretary must not only prioritize and promote synergies among these programs, but also work to strengthen effective partnerships across the U.S. Government, among our global allies, and with civil society more broadly.

While our Nation's engagement with the world continues to evolve, America's goals remain constant: It has consistently sought a stable international system that enables the free flow of commerce and ideas and protects individual freedoms. International stability and human freedom may be "global goods," but they also promote Americans' security and prosperity.

The hardworking professionals at the State Department have embraced this mandate. From responding to conflict in Syria through humanitarian assistance and support to the opposition, to building trust in Burma between long-warring ethnic groups, to strengthening the rule of law in Central America, State Department employees every day tackle tough challenges such as these to build a more just,

safe, and free world. If confirmed, I will devote myself to supporting them and all of the tremendous work that they are doing.

Much of my career has focused on protecting civilians and promoting human rights. I have worked on these issues from very different vantage points—serving in the Pentagon (where I was the first Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Peace Operations), and directing Harvard's Carr Center for Human Rights Policy. Perhaps more important than my involvement in policy is my interest in how the U.S. Government can best realize its policy goals through actions; i.e., the implementation of policy. This is why, while teaching at Harvard, I worked with the U.S. military to help revamp counterinsurgency doctrine (making civilian protection the center of U.S. operations), to reduce incidents of civilian casualties in Afghanistan (capturing best practices and proposing institutional reforms), and to create doctrine for preventing and responding to mass atrocities (now adopted by the U.S. Armed Forces). Even the best policies will falter without effective implementation, and there is always room for improvement.

Particularly in the face of tightening budgets, the United States must work to make civilian power even more efficient and creative in addressing global challenges. The J Under Secretariat can leverage the great work by organizations and individuals within civil society, the State Department, USAID, and partner organizations across the international community. The State Department must ensure that every penny of taxpayer resources is used wisely. If confirmed, I will work with you and my colleagues in the Department to use our resources strategically, while continuing to ensure that these programs deliver results for America and our partners and allies.

In 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote of "a single garment of destiny" that bound the human race. His words ring ever more true in today's interconnected, hyperlinked world. When the world is safer, Americans are safer; and when the world is more prosperous, Americans can be more prosperous. When we invest in promoting our values and preventing conflicts today, we reduce the odds that our military will be asked to sacrifice for us tomorrow. When our Nation is true to its principles, standing with civil society against hatred and repression, we are all the stronger. And as Secretary Kerry has said, strengthening civilian security and good governance abroad offers an enormous return on investment—not simply in the conflicts we avoid but in the well-being of future generations of American citizens.

It would be an enormous privilege to bring the experiences and convictions I have described to the role of Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights.

I thank all members of the committee for your commitment to these issues, and for your consideration of my nomination. I look forward to your questions. Thank you, again.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Professor, you did not use your full 5 minutes. That is remarkable. [Laughter.]

Mr. Stengel, let me, before we call upon you, we are going to have a vote going on right now. We would like to have your full statement and then we will recess before the questions, and we will go vote and return.

So, with that, Mr. Stengel.

Senator CORKER. Mr. Chairman, if I could. I am not going to be able to come back because of a meeting with our U.N. Ambassador, actually.

And I want to thank you both, coming from the private sector, wanting to serve in the public sector. And I will forward some questions for the record down the road. But I think we both had meetings in our office that I thought were very productive.

And I want to thank the chairman for calling this. But, I am not coming back. It is not out of—due to—it is not due to lack of respect, OK?

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Corker.

Mr. Stengel.

**STATEMENT OF RICHARD STENGEL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE
UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY**

Mr. STENGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. If you would put your microphone on.

Mr. STENGEL. Chairman—oh, I am sorry—Chairman Menendez, Ranking Member Corker, members of this committee. It is an honor to be here today. And I am humbled by the trust placed in me by President Obama and Secretary Kerry.

I am mindful, Senator Corker, of your admonition about bringing children. So, I did bring mine today. My wife, Mary Pfaff Stengel, is here; my two boys, Gabriel and Anton; and my niece Amanda, who is a senior at Georgetown is joining us as well. There is one person whose absence I greatly miss, and that is my father who passed away this summer. He was an immigrant's son from Brooklyn, who became an American patriot during World War II serving in the Air Force. And he always wanted me to go in public service and so I am sad that he could not be here today.

Now, if I am confirmed, I will be new to government. But, I have been engaged in a form of Public Diplomacy for much of my life. As the editor of TIME for the past 7 years, it was my job to explain America to the world and the world to Americans. We did that for more than 50 million people on every platform under the sun: Twitter, Facebook, Google Plus, even paper.

And, before that I was CEO of the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia, where my mission was to affirm the centrality of the American Constitution for the American public and for foreign visitors.

And then, a decade before that I had the great privilege of working with Nelson Mandela on his autobiography. And, more importantly, while he was writing his country's constitution. And it was inspiring for me to be there, in Africa, while they were writing a constitution—a modern constitution based on those same principles that had been articulated by our Framers 200 years before.

Every day, everywhere around the world, there is a great global debate taking place. It is about the nature of freedom and fairness, about democracy and justice. It is happening in all the traditional places, street corners, coffee shops, but it is also happening on all of these new social media platforms. As a result the reach, the scale and the speed of that debate is like nothing before in history. I have been involved in that debate my whole life. America, of course, must be in that debate and we must lead it.

Every minute there are attacks and misstatements about America and American foreign policy that cannot be left to stand. Social media is a powerful medium for truth, but it is also a powerful medium for falsehood. Pat Moynihan, who was my Senator long ago, famously said, "You're entitled to your own opinions, but not your own facts." But more and more these days people seem like they feel that they are entitled to their own facts. They are making them up.

If confirmed, I will focus on a few issues that I believe are vital to our national interests. Nearly 60 percent of the world's population is under the age of 30. They are our audience and they are our vital interests. If confirmed, I will advance Public Diplomacy's

focus on youth, including girls and underserved communities, so they see our Nation and our people as friends and allies.

If confirmed, I will work to identify and implement the best practices of social media and mobile technology. We must align our resources at the State Department along these new platforms and targeting the audience that we want. This cannot, of course, replace people-to-people diplomacy. That is indispensable. But, social media is a gigantic force multiplier.

We are, of course, the entrepreneurial Nation. And that expertise is one of our most valuable exports. If confirmed, I will scale up programs that support innovation so that we can connect small businessmen—small businesswomen in Sopala with American business leaders here, so that others like her can succeed in the global economy.

If confirmed, I will also be a champion of educational diplomacy. Education is one of our greatest strategic assets. Our institutions, where more than 700,000 foreign students come, are incubators of democracy. And their learning of the English language is critical, because that is the language of innovation and entrepreneurship. America is also the leader in technologies that are revolutionizing the way people learn. And, if confirmed, I will employ these strategic assets to tailor educational exchanges to the 21st century.

And finally, combating violent extremism is vital to our national security. It is critical to make sure that we provide people, particularly youth in at-risk environments, with alternatives to misguided ideological justifications for violence. One successful example of this, which Mr. Chairman you mentioned, is the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications, which actively refutes terrorist messages on social platforms in real time. This is something that is incredibly innovative that I think needs to be built up. And as the say at CSCC, “We must contest the space.”

Finally, I want to salute the men and women working in Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs around the world, including our exceptional American and local employees who are—they are risking their lives for America. They advance our national interests, often at great risk. It is my honor and privilege to offer my experience and leadership to support their dedicated service to the United States and the American people.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Stengel follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD STENDEL

Chairman Menendez, Ranking Member Corker, all the members of this committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to appear before you. I am honored to be here today and humbled by the trust placed in me by President Obama and Secretary Kerry. I am very glad to have this opportunity to talk to you about the importance of public diplomacy.

My wife, Mary Pfaff Stengel, is here with me today—she is a South African by birth and became an American citizen almost a decade ago when I was CEO of the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia. And I am very proud to have my two sons, Gabriel and Anton, here today as well.

There is one person whose absence today I deeply regret. My father, who passed away earlier this summer, was an immigrant's son from Brooklyn who became an American patriot through his service in the Air Force during World War II. His fondest wish was that I would go into public service. He did not think there was a nobler occupation.

If confirmed, while I will be new to government, I have engaged in a form of public diplomacy for much of my career. As the editor of *TIME* for the past 7 years, it was my job to help explain America to the world—and the world to America. And it was not a romanticized America, but the real America, a nation with outsized virtues and challenges. We did that to an audience of more than 50 million on an array of platforms—Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, Google Plus, Tumblr, even paper. When I was there we grew our digital footprint from under a million to more than 30 million unique users online and 12 million followers on social media.

Before that, as the head of the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia, it was my job to reaffirm the centrality and the importance of the Constitution to all Americans and to visitors from around the world.

And a decade before that, I had the great privilege to work with Nelson Mandela during a fraught period in South African history. A new constitution was being haggled over, and Mr. Mandela was presiding over the negotiations. One morning when we were out walking, he asked me to define federalism. Here was one of the great men of the 20th century creating a constitution that would bring freedom to his people, asking about a principle designed by American revolutionaries over 200 years before on a different continent. That Constitution is the greatest operating system for democracy that the world has ever known. It is also—in a thousand different ways—our greatest export.

I believe that it is our very openness as a country—openness guaranteed by the first amendment—that wins over people around the world. We are a nation founded not on a common religion or a common blood or ethnicity, but on an uncommon set of ideas: that all people are created equal and that we all have certain unalienable rights. But we cannot simply cherish those rights, we must promote them. That's where public diplomacy comes in. Public diplomacy is in our DNA as a nation. In the Declaration of Independence, the men who risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor said they were doing so with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." Thus was born American public diplomacy.

Every day all over the world, there is a great global debate going on. It is about the nature of freedom and fairness, democracy and justice. It is happening in all the traditional ways, in coffee shops and on street corners, but it is also taking place on the new platforms of social media. As a result, the reach, the scale, the speed of that debate are like nothing before in history. I have been in that debate all of my life. America has to be in that debate. We need to guide it, steer it. We need to lead it. And we cannot rest on our laurels.

Every minute, there are attacks and misstatements about America and American foreign policy that cannot be left to stand. Social media is a tool that can be used for good or ill. It is a powerful medium for truth, but it is an equally powerful medium for falsehood. My Senator from long ago, the great Pat Moynihan, used to say, "You're entitled to your own opinions, not your own facts." Well, today, more and more, people feel entitled to their own facts. They choose the facts that conform with their point of view. Even though it is easier than anytime in human history to find information to rebut lies, less of that seems to be happening. But we cannot resign ourselves to this; we need to fight it. That is public diplomacy in the 21st century.

And while the means have changed, the rationale for public diplomacy has not. Old style modern communication was a one-way street—newspapers, radio, television. Because of new technology, this narrative is now a two-way street. It is a dialogue not a monologue. It is no longer governments talking to governments. Everyone with a smart phone has a voice and a vote in this global marketplace. Social media is allowing us to build relationships with people around the world, even in the most remote corners. We can and must continue to reach individuals one by one through person-to-person engagement—nothing equals that—but we can reach exponentially more through the new techniques of social media.

That is why I would argue that much of diplomacy today is public diplomacy. For reasons both good and bad, the private salons of diplomacy are less central now than in the past. So much is already public—and what is not, surely will be. If our policies and ideas are to succeed, we need the support of the public both at home and abroad.

It was Henry Luce, the founder of *TIME*, who called the 20th century the American century. The 21st century should also be an American century, but not necessarily in the same way as the 20th. The rise of new powers, the youth bulge, the ubiquity of technology that makes the world even smaller and flatter, all point to a different but no less important American role in the 21st century. Our values do not change, but how we project those values needs to adapt to a new and different era.

If I am confirmed, I will focus on a number of issues that I think are vital to America's future and our national interests.

- Sixty percent of the world's population is under the age of 30. The number is even higher in the developing world. Strengthening relationships with emerging leaders and ensuring young people have the skills needed to become productive are of vital interest to the United States. If confirmed, I will advance public diplomacy's focus on youth, especially youth in underserved communities and girls. We must build and deepen relationships with new generations so they see our Nation and people as allies and models.
- The media landscape is more crowded and competitive than ever before. No one has to explain that to me. Digital is becoming dominant. Yes, print and radio are still the media of choice in many parts of the world, but we must align our resources toward new platforms that our target audience is using. Social media is a transformational tool that has changed the nature of communication. Working with my colleagues at the State Department, if confirmed, I will identify and implement best uses and best practices of social media and mobile technology. A young girl in sub-Saharan Africa holding a smart phone, for example, can have whole libraries at her fingertips; shouldn't she get a text from us helping to teach her how to start a business? We should also be reaching out to the young man in Sao Paulo who wishes to build a new future through educational opportunity online. We can transform lives by leveraging social media and technological tools.
- We are the entrepreneurial nation. Our entrepreneurial expertise is one of our most valuable exports. If confirmed, I intend to scale up programs that support innovation and connect successful American business leaders with aspiring entrepreneurs in other countries. We should support the efforts of a small businesswoman in Jakarta to attain the language and skills to help her succeed in a global business environment. This not only promotes economic opportunity and highlights the American model of doing business, but also strengthens the rights of disadvantaged groups.
- If confirmed, I will be a champion of educational diplomacy. Education is one of our great strategic assets. The hunger for an American degree is vast. More than 700,000 foreign students study in America, contributing more than \$22 billion annually to our economy. Our educational institutions are the laboratories of democracy for students from around the world. In many ways, English is the language of democracy and English skills are critical to success in the 21st century. If confirmed, I will strengthen our support for English training around the world. America is also the leader in technologies that are revolutionizing the way people learn. I intend to employ these strategic assets—English language instruction, our higher education system and innovative education technology—to tailor educational exchanges to the 21st century.
- One of my goals, if confirmed, will be to expand public diplomacy's worldwide efforts to combat violent extremism. It is vital to our national security that we provide people, particularly young people in at-risk environments, with alternatives to the misguided ideological justifications for using violence. One successful example of this is the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications (CSCC), which actively refutes terrorist messages across cyberspace. Innovative public diplomacy programs designed to counter violent extremism in Pakistan and Afghanistan have been credited with saving American lives. We must confront distortion with reality; we must rebut lies with truth. As the CSCC says, we must contest the space. We must continue to support and advance this vital public diplomacy work.

Finally, I want to salute the men and women working in public diplomacy and public affairs around the world who are advancing our national interests. That includes our exceptional American and local employees working to engage foreign publics overseas, often at great personal risk, as well as our Washington-based staff. They are the inheritors of more than two centuries of American public diplomacy. It is my great honor and privilege to offer my experience and leadership to support and advance the tremendous work of so many dedicated people in service to the United States and the American people.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak with you today.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you both for your testimony.

The committee is going to stand in recess so that members can vote. And we will return immediately after those votes to get into a dialogue with you.

For the moment, the committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. This hearing will come to order.

And our apologies to the two nominees. There was more than one vote, so it took a little extra time.

And just—Senator Schumer caught me on the floor and said he regretted that he could not make it because he was tied up on the floor on the legislation we are appending on and he is about to start a caucus meeting. So his full statement will be included in the record on behalf of Mr. Stengel's nomination.

[The prepared statement of Senator Schumer follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR CHARLES E. SCHUMER IN SUPPORT OF THE
NOMINATION OF RICHARD STENDEL

Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is my great privilege to introduce Mr. Richard Stengel, President Barack Obama's nominee to be the next Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.

I am pleased to say that Rick is a proud New Yorker, born and raised in New York City.

Mr. Stengel's long and distinguished career as a journalist, editor, and author makes him eminently qualified to be Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.

He has covered critical foreign policy issues for three decades for one of the most important magazines in the world. He has interviewed some of recent history's most renowned figures at key moments including Russian President Vladimir Putin, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

As Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, he will be responsible for leading "America's public diplomacy outreach, cultural programming, communication with international audiences, and U.S. Government efforts to confront ideological support for terrorism."

Most importantly, by transitioning from the world of journalism and media to that of diplomacy and public service, we can now say, that Rick is finally "walking the walk" instead of just "talking the talk."

But in all seriousness, Rick has always been a public diplomat. I believe that Rick's extensive global relationships and experience covering global issues at an up close and personal level make him the best person for the job. He will excel in his role as a representative of American culture and commitment to service and excellence abroad.

Rick is first and foremost, a proud New Yorker. He grew up in New York City before attending Princeton University. Upon graduation, he won a prized Rhodes Scholarship and studied English and History at Oxford University.

Stengel began working for Time magazine more than three decades ago as a contributor, including in the 1980s and 90s providing extensive coverage of South Africa during the apartheid-era and developing a close relationship with former South African President Nelson Mandela. He worked his way up the ladder and proved himself to be a stellar journalist and writer.

Rick collaborated with Nelson Mandela on his autobiography, *Long Walk to Freedom*. He even served as a coproducer of the 1996 documentary film "Mandela," which was nominated for an Academy Award.

In 2004, Rick left his position as National Editor at Time and became president and CEO of the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia. The National Constitution Center is the first and only nonprofit museum and education center dedicated to the founding document of American values and law: The U.S. Constitution. I believe this experience will also serve him very well as our Under Secretary.

As CEO, Rick raised the center's profile substantially, increased the center's endowment, and consistently increased the number of visitors. He also started a program to offer constitutional training for journalists, and a high school for students interested in history and government. Under his tenure, the organization became responsible for annually awarding the Liberty Medal for leadership in the pursuit of freedom.

In 2006, Rick returned to Time magazine but as managing editor. In this role, Rick oversaw Time magazine, which has one of the largest circulations in the world, Time.com, and other publications.

I would also like to highlight Rick's role in driving a very important conversation in American life on the case for national service. Rick wrote a very eloquent Time

cover story called "The Case for National Service" in which he argued that Americans needed to redouble their efforts to get involved in community service and volunteerism. His piece sparked a debate between both Presidential candidates in the 2008 election, where then candidates Senators Barack Obama and John McCain answered questions from a live audience on their plans for national service.

I believe Rick's understanding of American values and of such diverse perspectives of American life and the issues affecting our country will prepare him well to communicate with audiences around the world about the role of the United States in foreign countries around the globe.

Rick is a highly gifted communicator that gets the issues, and has had an opportunity that very few have had to meet with global leaders at the highest stage to discuss important matters regarding national security, diplomacy, culture, constitutional values, and the role of the United States.

I wholeheartedly support Mr. Stengel's nomination to be the next Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, and I urge my colleagues to support his nomination as well.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. OK. So, let me start with you, Dr. Sewall. This is a—your portfolio is very large, as I said in my opening, and it is also very important. And there are a series of things that I want to explore with you.

First of all, democracy promotion. I sometimes wonder whether we pick and choose how we promote democracy in the world, depending upon the place that it is. And I am not quite sure that is the right policy, at the end of the day. If we ought to be a beacon of light to the rest of the world, as I believe we are, then having certain universal standards of democracy and human rights I think are critical. And yet, there are times where I get the sense that somehow we have a very different view of promoting democracy in certain parts of the world and we are very vigorous in others.

So, can you give me some general thinking in that regard, since this is one of the critical elements that you will be doing in your position, if confirmed?

Dr. SEWALL. Thank you, Senator.

It is an interesting observation because I think there is a distinction between goals of promoting democracy equally and the tools that we use to do them. And one of the things that is such a challenge and an opportunity for the "J" Enterprise and a challenge, I would relish, if confirmed as Under Secretary, is trying to find more innovative ways to promote democracy when our standard tools appear to be either less effective or harder to apply.

So, in my view, we cannot—the United States must always promote its values and democracy is foremost among them, it is who we are. And I recognize that in the interagency process there will always be vigorous debate about when and how to do that. My role, if confirmed as Under Secretary, will be to promote—to always do it and where it is hardest to do it, to find alternative ways to do it.

And I think that is one of the reasons why it is so important that they have reorganized the Under Secretariat so that a broad range of programming is united within the same span, so that you are not limited simply to words or simply to limited tools. But, your—your range across from security sector reform—all the way from democracies to security sector reform. You are thinking about counterterrorism and the interests that it raises in the context of promoting good governance and accountability and countering corruption.

And so, my hope is that, if confirmed as Under Secretary, I will be able to take a more nimble and creative approach to always promoting democracy, even if the ways in which we do it sometimes need to be adjusted depending on the circumstances. But, I agree with you fully, sir, that the commitment itself needs to be universal. It is, of course, what we say to the world: that we are committed to universal human rights, that we are committed to governance for all, that democracy is what we stand for. And so, I think it is essential. And I think it is the role of the Under Secretary to be promoting that view internally.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I appreciate that. Because, in certain parts, I sometimes think we have double standards. In Burma we actively engage to create the space, the pressure, the international recognition before its efforts to be able to create change. So, peaceful efforts, but nonetheless to create change. In Cuba we have this romanticism and we seem to—the very same types of people, the same types of individuals struggling to create democracy and human rights in their own country in civil society. And yet, they languish in virtual anonymity.

And so, I hope that in your process and confirmation here, that we will see an application of a democracy that is more evenly and vigorously promoted. Because I believe that freedom and civil and human rights in Burma are incredibly important, they are also incredibly important in places like Cuba. And that has not been our reality. And so, I hope that your application of the effort in promotion of democracy will be global in nature, at the end of the day. Otherwise, when we pick and choose, it seems to me that then we diminish our capacity and our standing in the world to be able to promote them.

Let me ask you about—among your many portfolios, is going to be the area of war crimes. The Under Secretary for Civilian Security oversees the Office of Global Criminal Justice, which is formerly the Office of War Crimes Issues. From my perspective, in Syria, Assad clearly has committed and continues to commit war crimes. And while I applaud—and this committee was, I think a big part of making it possible for the President to be in a position to defang Assad's chemical weapons, it does not undermine that he is indiscriminately killing his own people in ways that I think are tantamount to the war crime.

How have you been engaged in your preparation with the State Department on how the State Department is working with its Syrian partners now and in exile as well as in country to document, verify and collect data to develop a case against Assad? If you have, I would like to hear what those observations are. If you have not, then what do you think should be the process and that you would engage in, in that regard?

Dr. SEWALL. Thank you for that question.

Absolutely, there needs to be accountability in Syria for the crimes that have been committed and continue to be committed. In the process preparing for this hearing, I have been impressed by the leadership within DRL in using American funding to create the mechanisms to be collecting all of the documentation and data that we would need to be prosecuting atrocities and crimes, when we are ultimately able to do so.

I think that the American support for justice and accountability is one of the more important ways in which we can help the Syrian people, in the long run, build a very different future than the one they are experiencing now. And I look forward to the time when we are able to do that. I think it is another example of the ways in which creative programming, support from the United States and others to promote a Syrian-led effort to bring to justice those that have committed criminal activity is both an important opportunity and an example for others. And, if I am confirmed, I will closely monitor that process.

Because, as you may know Senator, international justice has been a longstanding concern of mine. I have written about it quite extensively. I think that ending impunity for gross violations of human rights is absolutely critical. And I am firmly committed to taking that on, if confirmed.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I believe it is absolutely critical as well. I know that there are those who are concerned that raising these issues might not lead to a Geneva II Conference. I believe not raising those issues undermines our credibility and our standing in the world and the ability to send a global message that, when you act with impunity and commit war crimes, that you will face a global consequence for it. And so, I am glad to hear your response to that.

I have a whole bunch of other questions. But, in deference to Senator Rubio, who is here, I am going to turn to him. And then I will come back to both you and Mr. Stengel.

Senator RUBIO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for your offer to serve our country.

Dr. Sewal, modern-day slavery is real. Many people think slavery is a relic of the past, and they are shocked to learn it is still going on in the world. One of the powerful tools that we have the Trafficking in Persons Report. Last year we elevated two pretty powerful countries, China and Russia, to Tier 3 for their failure to make efforts to combat human trafficking and modern-day slavery.

The debate, of course, is that they get waivers from the sanctions that are supposed to come associated with that. And there is a debate about that. And we can continue to have the debate about whether those waivers are wise or not. But, I wonder if you could take a moment just to speak about the power of the shaming that comes with that designation and the impact that it has on countries that are designated in that way. Does it still matter to people? Does it still matter to countries? Even if they may not show it publicly, does it still matter to them when they are shamed in this way, as countries that continue to be havens for trafficking and ultimately for modern-day slavery?

Dr. SEWALL. Thank you for the question, Senator.

I agree with you completely about the importance of this issue. It is shocking and it is a global phenomenon and we are not immune from it, here in this great country. My understanding, from the briefings that I have had to date, is that the shaming in fact matters very much. And I think we would not have the keen interest that we do have in the annual list and in the movement of countries among those lists, if it did not matter.

So, I would like to thank you and the Members of Congress who have created this tool because I think it is powerful. And, if I am

confirmed as Under Secretary, I will look forward to leveraging it as best I can to address this global crime.

Senator RUBIO. Another issue that I think we should be concerned about and I know we are in our human rights agenda is the issue of religious freedom. Religious persecution is on the rise in many parts of the world. The International Religious Freedom Office produces every year a similar concept to that of the Trafficking in Persons Report, a designation of countries of particular concern. This administration only issued these designations once in its first term, back in October of 2011.

Would you be supportive of an effort to make that designation an annual occurrence, as we do with other issues, given that—I would imagine that the shaming effect of that would be similar to that of Trafficking in Persons?

Dr. SEWALL. I think that one of the more interesting opportunities I am going to have in coming new to this role is looking at all of the different ways in which we do reporting on different forms of rights abuse and trying to think about how to leverage each as best we can. My understanding is that the reviews are done annually. And my general view, sir, about how we do these reviews is to look at the facts and make the recommendation based on the facts. And so, I cannot speak to decisions that have been made in the past. I can give you my commitment that I will undertake to use all of the tools that we have.

Senator RUBIO. Just the reviews are, but the designations are not. And let me tell you why that is relevant. The other part of it, of course, is that these sanctions that correspond to the designation expire after 2 years. So, would you be supportive of the idea that the sanctions actually remain in place for countries of particular concern for as long as the designation is in place? I mean, what is the wisdom in allowing them to expire if they have not taken any steps to be removed from that list?

Dr. SEWALL. I think it is a good question and I will have to look into it. I certainly share your desires to make the sanctions as effective as possible in support of the goals and the intent. And so, I will take a close look at that, if I am confirmed.

Senator RUBIO. OK. Thank you.

Mr. Stengel, welcome. And congratulations or condolences, whichever is appropriate depending on how you view it. But, thank you for your offer to serve our country as well. You have an interesting task ahead of you, if confirmed.

I believe, as I hope you do and I have no reason to think you do not, that the American example is one of the most powerful contributions that our Nation has made to the world. I know for a fact that people look at what happens in this country as a source of inspiration when they pursue their own freedoms, their own liberties, and their own expectations of what is possible. I mean, so many people in the world have been told their whole lives that people like you cannot rise because you do not come from the right family or the right religion or the right sector of society. They look to America as an example of why that is not true.

One of the challenges that I have found is that, because we have such a vibrant political system, our debates and the chaos that

sometimes ensues around them, people look at that as a sign of weakness. Let me give you an example.

Yesterday I had filed, along with many of my colleagues, a brief before the Supreme Court—and amicus brief on the issue of legislative prayer. So, as I arrived at the courthouse steps, basically every viewpoint in America on that issue was represented outside, people holding signs. You know, there were the atheists were there. There were the—obviously those who believe strongly in prayer. Others who just had constitutional reasons for being there. Viewing that scene alone you would say, “Boy, this is a chaotic country. How do these people share, they are so divided.” But, in fact, in many ways that is the source of our strength because whatever the court rules on that issue, people may disagree, they may disagree very strongly, but at the end of the day people are going to abide by it.

Again, another example of that, which I lived firsthand, was the recount in Florida in 2000, which was obviously a very close election and to this day we still have debates about how that should have turned out. But, at the end of the day, there was no question that, no matter what the court ruled or decided, that is what was going to happen.

How do we go to the world and say: when you see these things happening in our society, when you see these arguments and these debates, and all these things going on it is actually a source of strength, not a source of weakness? That we are able to have a society of such divergent views, but at the end of the day, whatever the outcome may be people may keep fighting to change them, but there is no question that they will abide by them. For example, that President Clinton was not going to roll out the troops and cancel the elections results, in 2000 when Vice President Gore lost. These things are sources of strength for our country.

How do we make that argument to a world that is desperately seeking security and order. But sometimes in a truly democratic process you have to have the space for that—the chaos that comes with debate, so long as that commitment to the rule of law is there. Is that a key component of our Public Diplomacy abroad? To explain to foreign peoples how the American concept works here, in an effort to inspire them to pursue a similar space in their own country?

Mr. STENGEL. Thank you, Senator, for that question.

And I share your passion for the debate and the breadth of that debate in America. Open societies encourage debate. And one of the things that I have been proudest of, in my career as a journalist, is to show the breadth of that debate. And, if confirmed in this job, I would like to be able to show people around the world that it is a strength of America that we have this diversity of opinion, that we can tolerate it. I think one of the things that is appealing to people around the world and why we are a beacon is that that debate is an example of free expression and not only tolerance for the views that we like, but tolerance for the views that we do not like. And that is part of the golden thread that is woven through the Constitution and American life. And I think it is appealing on its own to people around the world. And, if confirmed, I will work on even better ways to promote that.

Senator RUBIO. Can I just take 10 seconds?

I have one more question, which you alluded to in your opening statement. I have been impressed on how many people have a much clearer understanding of what this country is really like and what our freedoms entail, because they went to school here, they studied here, they lived here for a period of time.

I think you alluded to the fact that that is the kinds of things that we should be encouraging more of in the future, the opportunity for people to come here from abroad. Not just to acquire the skills that will allow them to go back to their country of origin—obviously there is some very talented people we would like to see stay here, hence our efforts on immigration reform. But, beyond that, there are folks that are going to return to their home country and potentially become the future leaders of those societies.

What can we do, from a public policy perspective to encourage more of that, to the extent it is cost effective and feasible?

Mr. STENGEL. Thank you, Senator.

Our higher educational system and the educational exchanges, which Education and Cultural Affairs sponsors, is something that is vital and powerful. And its effect is incalculable. I mean, if you look at not just the 700,000 students who are here, but if you look through the history of the Fulbright Scholarships; the number of Nobel laureates; the number of, for example, just in the recent elections in Pakistan, 27 local and national leaders elected in those elections had studied here. I agree with you. I think that makes them more sympathetic to the American point of view. That makes them understand us better.

I was overjoyed to see the story several months ago, when Xi Jinping, the new President of China, came over to see President Obama in California. And he asked to stop at a little town in Iowa where he had been—visited as a leader on one of the leader exchange programs, to have dinner with that family in Iowa that he stayed with many years before, when he was a young man. I think the value of that is extraordinary.

And again, I am a big believer in educational diplomacy. And I will try to increase the number of exchanges because I think that the long-term benefit of that is something that we all want.

Senator RUBIO. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

One of the areas where your portfolio will take you is refugees. And having visited Jordan earlier this year I think the third-largest city in Jordan is now Syrian, the Syrian refugee camp, which creates enormous challenges for the Government of Jordan, the Kingdom, as well as other countries in the region. And, while we have been leading in providing humanitarian assistance, you know, it is unlikely that those refugees are going to return home any time soon.

So, I would like to ask you, what do we do in making sure that our humanitarian aid is linked to longer term development as an effort? Because it seems very shortsighted in one respect. There is an immediate need. But, by the same token, we do not think about the longer term consequence. What would you say to that?

Dr. SEWALL. It is an excellent point, Senator. And it is one of the first questions that I asked when I began talking with people at the State Department. Because I see a real—obviously, we all wish,

given the tragedy in Syria, that it were possible for the refugees to return home as soon as possible.

But, I agree with you. We cannot afford to wait and not address their current plight in ways that have longer term implications. And so, I think there are enormous opportunities to use our refugee assistance outside of the country, where we have a population that is interested in envisioning a future. Use our support there to think more broadly than simply immediate relief. But to think instead of livelihoods, work, to think of developing ways to support internal governance structures, to build a set of skills and habits and expectations that we hope very much can return with them to Syria after the crisis is over.

I was interested to learn about some thinking that has been going on within INL and programming that is now underway to promote a new approach to enhancing the role of community members in working with the Jordanian police and the refugee camps to protect rights and promote security. That has an immediate benefit, obviously. But it has longer term implications too, in terms of training people, in terms of creating expectations about security, and in terms of potentially building infrastructure that would be useful in a national capacity later. And so, that is very exciting to me. And I think that is exactly the direction that we need to be heading. And I would welcome the opportunity to work with you on doing more innovative programming like that to assist these people in desperate need.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a certain expertise and I want to call upon it in terms of the Atrocity Prevention Board. Some have suggested that has been a failure. What would you respond to the critics who suggest that has been ineffective in stemming tragedies in Syria, the violence in Burma, or conflict in the Central African Republic? More than a critique of it, what would you say or would you propose that would increase its effectiveness? Do you have any ideas in that regard?

Dr. SEWALL. I do, Senator. And thank you for the question.

I do think that much of the disappointment that I have sometimes heard from the Atrocities Prevention Board to date stems from perhaps a different set of expectations about its role. And I think about it in two different ways.

First, its role in helping create a mindset within the bureaucratic infrastructure—and by that I mean the people who are our eyes and ears on the ground, the intelligence community—that is attuned to the risk of mass atrocity and the risk of mass atrocity developing into full-blown genocide and violence. And so, there is value, I think, in what I am told are the efforts that are underway within the system to elevate awareness and create a greater sense of responsibility for taking action.

The second piece of that—and this is perhaps more germane to your question—is that I believe the Atrocities Prevention Board's added value is in studying and focusing attention on areas in which there is violence but before it becomes a level of national concern, such as Syria. Obviously Syria is the most important foreign policy priority of crisis management today. And the interagency process, as a whole, is seized with it. The APB, in my judgment, no longer needs to play a role in elevating its attention. The APB, I think,

can add the most value where it looks at the incipient crises and seeks to elevate the awareness and the resources and the programmatic response in areas where we can make a difference, where it is still below the radar of a full-blown crisis that's occupying the attention of the principals.

And so, for my role, if confirmed as Under Secretary, I think that that early warning capacity within the APB offers an enormous potential to focus the resources and the efforts across the entire "J" Enterprise. And it is my hope that we will be able to think more creatively. And we may need to come to the committee and engage in a more consultative process about responding earlier with more fulsome programming in areas where we see opportunities to avert crises in—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I would be very much interested in engaging with you on that because it seems to me that our goal should be to prevent not to elevate. We elevate because—out of the necessity of what is both our national interests and our national security. But, when we get to that point we have already to some degree, I want to say, failed because we cannot always engage and/or prevent every conflict that ultimately rises to a level, as it has in Syria, for example. But I think that very often we are shortsighted about delegating the resources and the effort before it becomes that elevated stature. And I hope that that is one of the things you will pay attention to, when you are confirmed.

Dr. SEWALL. Absolutely. I would be delighted to—

The CHAIRMAN. Two other—

Dr. SEWALL [continuing]. Work with you—

The CHAIRMAN. I mean, I have a whole bunch but I will—your portfolio's so wide. But—so, two others.

One is I see markets around the world expanding rapidly and as such labor forces migrate there to meet those demands. And I would like to hear, in your capacity, how you intend to oversee in the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, particularly to engage foreign governments and corporations to eliminate trafficking in their supply chain.

Dr. SEWALL. Thank you for the question.

I am very excited about the possibility, not simply for the moral reasons that we were discussing earlier, but because one of the hard security elements of the scourge of trafficking is that it is often intertwined with other nefarious practices and actors that we wish to combat.

And so, as I look across the spectrum of bureaus that are active and offices that are active within the Under Secretariat I see great synergies to be developed between our efforts to combat trafficking and our efforts to combat other problems, whether they are generalized criminal behavior, whether they are violent extremist's exploitation of persons. There are a host of ways in which the Trafficking in Persons element, which has highlighted a problem that we, frankly, did not seem to be paying significant attention to is not leading the way, in terms of guiding our efforts to unpack problems that have implications in other areas of the "J" Enterprise.

So, I hope to learn more about what has been successful within the Trafficking in Persons' practices and help ensure that some of those lessons are migrated to other elements of the work that will

be under my span of supervision. And to continue to help us understand that these problems are all interrelated, and so our solutions need to be thinking beyond simply the response to trafficking but also the prevention of trafficking, which is related to other elements of the "J" programming. So, I see it as an enormous challenge, one in which some of what we have learned in trafficking can apply to other areas of "J." And there are also other elements of "J" that can better support our antitrafficking efforts, even if they are not called precisely that.

The CHAIRMAN. And then finally, only because time—we could talk about Tibet, China, religious freedom, and a whole host of other things. But, and I may submit some questions for the record. We had a brief discussion in those regards.

One of the critical things I hope that you will look at is many of the "J" Bureaus—whether it be Population Refugees, Migration, Bureau of Conflict Stabilization, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor—are working in the same—on issues and with resources in countries in which also USAID is working on some of those issues. And, at a time, as we were discussing with Ms. Higginbottom, the challenges of maximizing our resources, of having a greater coordination I hope will be one of the efforts that you will bring to your job.

Dr. SEWALL. Yes, it absolutely will be.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. Stengel, I do not want you to feel left out here. You have a very important role here. Let me ask you a couple of things.

One is structural in nature because I think a lot about whether the good intended consequences for different positions we have in the State Department can be achieved if the structure does not allow them to achieve it. And there are those who have been critics of the structure of U.S. Public Diplomacy who have argued that the Under Secretary's role is not strong enough, from a bureaucratic standpoint within the Department, citing lack of authority to direct most Public Diplomacy resources, personnel, activities abroad.

With most Public Diplomacy officers working in regional bureaus or diplomatic posts abroad, outside of the Under Secretary's organization, what is your understanding of the role of the Under Secretary in directing U.S. Public Diplomacy efforts worldwide? I am sure you had an engagement with the Secretary and the administration in talking about accepting this role. How do you see being able to achieve the very goals that you so admirably stated in your statement and response to some of the questions here?

Mr. STENGEL. Senator, thank you for that question.

And, as you know, the Secretary and the President are strong believers in the idea of Public Diplomacy and global engagement. And I think they each have notions about how to do it even better. Insofar as I have been briefed on the Public Diplomacy aspect of my job in brief, the Public Diplomacy officers who serve around the world, again at great risk often to themselves, have a whole set of tools at their behest that they can use to promote America and America's image abroad and programs. The educational programs, there are visitors' programs, there are more than 700 American spaces around the world that have 16 or 17 million visitors where people engage with American ideas and things like that.

So, I think there are a lot of possibilities. And the reality of what Public Diplomacy officers do I think is great. Certainly, if confirmed, I will look at whether there are other things that might be done to enhance American Public Diplomacy. I would never, by the way, refuse an offer of having more authority. But, thus far it feels like the amount of authority that I have over the Public Diplomacy officers and programs seems adequate.

The CHAIRMAN. OK. Well, I am—the alignment here, between your position and the ability to have those, you know, globally be able to pursue the Public Diplomacy that you envision, that the Secretary and the President put faith in you in this position on does not seem for me to be there. And so, we would love, once you get in the job, to talk about that as a structural element to ensure that we maximize the ability of the Public Diplomacy that you can bring to the Department's efforts to have a multiplier effect in a more powerful way.

In that regard, one of the things you are going to be as the Under Secretary of Public Diplomacy is the Secretary's designate to the Board of—Broadcasting Board of Governors. The entity over—charged with overseeing U.S.- international civilian broadcasting. Do you have any thoughts on that? Have you thought about that element of the role that you are going to be playing? And how do we create a greater integration between the State Department and the BBG?

Mr. STENGEL. Yes, Senator, I have thought about it. And I know you have thought a great deal about it as well. I would indeed be the Secretary's designate on the BBG Board, if confirmed.

The work that they do I think is vital to American foreign policy. There is of course the firewall between the independent journalism that is done by VOA and other organizations. And I would never say that there is too much independent journalism in the world. I think that is important. At the same time, I think there are opportunities for the State Department to work more closely with BBG. There have been examples recently. For example, with a BBG program in Mali that the State Department worked with, where we collaborated. So, I know the structure has changed a lot. And certainly, if confirmed and I am a member of that board, I will look at that closely and try to make it as effective and as efficient as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the goals I seek to see in our Public Diplomacy is the greatest integration in order to have the greatest effect. And that is where I think we lack, which brings me to my final question.

The Bureau of International Information Programs has undergone reorganization in recent years. In order to modernize communication strategies and use of social media and new information technologies, which you referred to in your opening statement in terms of using those new technologies. However, a May 2013 inspector general inspection of the Bureau found that many problems exist including a lack of a clear strategy in performance measurement.

What attention would you place on new technologies and platforms as part of our global diplomacy strategy? And what steps do

you think that that particular bureau would need to take to improve its performance?

Mr. STENGEL. Thank you for that question, Senator.

I welcome the OIG report. Coming into a job for the first time and looking around, to have an Inspector General's Report that kind of looks at the territory and gives you guidance is something I find very valuable. I found that very valuable when I had reports like that in the private sector.

One thing I would be remiss if I did not mention, because I do not want them to feel left out, is that part of my brief is Public Affairs as well as Public Diplomacy. And I think one of the things that I would like to do, if confirmed, is to actually try to bring Public Affairs and Public Diplomacy closer together. Public Affairs is out there on the deck of the ship every day. And they are talking about policy. And they are talking about the President's policy and the Secretary's vision. I think that can help all of the other programs that we do.

From my statement, I think you will realize I am a great believer in the power of social media. I think it is not just a new tool. I think it is actually a new form of communication. And one of the reasons I think it is a very valuable tool to BBG, to Public Diplomacy is that it is interactive. It is not just us preaching and other people listening. We can have a dialogue. We can have a conversation. And I think that is something that is very important. That that illustrates the beauty of the free society that we are. And so, I would try to use all of those tools at my disposal to help and improve Public Diplomacy.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is certainly the new frontier. And it is a frontier in which those who wish us harm, by one dimension, are actively engaged in. And so, I appreciate your earlier comment in your statements about making sure that we are engaged in the space and occupying it as well, proactively as well as responsibly.

Well, I thank you both for your testimony.

The record will remain open until the close of business tomorrow. If there are any questions, and I am sure there will be some that will be proposed to you, I would urge you to answer them as expeditiously as possible in order to try to move your nomination before a business meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. And, with the thanks of the committee, this hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:09 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF DR. SARAH SEWALL TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ

Question. Conflict and Stabilization.—The Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO) was established in 2012 with the mandate to advance U.S. national security “by breaking cycles of violent conflict and mitigating crises in priority countries. . . .” Recently, it has engaged in four principal efforts: providing election support in Kenya; publicizing and training Syrian opposition groups in Turkey; promoting confidence-building measures through landmine removal and education in Burma; and reducing violence in four Central American countries.

♦ Please provide your assessment of these efforts.

Answer. Throughout my career, I have been a strong advocate of civilian power, and particularly the development of civilian planning skills and civilian capabilities to help address global crises. I believe that CSO has begun to play a critical role in U.S. foreign policy, and that its contributions and importance must continue to expand. If confirmed, I look forward to learning more about the successes and limitations of recent efforts, helping promote learning and enhancing capabilities within CSO, and ensuring that we have an increasingly effective civilian capacity to help prevent and mitigate conflict.

CSO's recent efforts have included the following initiatives:

Kenya

I am told that CSO's Nairobi-based team was central to the Embassy's election efforts. The team helped organize and manage the largest diplomatic observer mission in Kenya, featuring 35 teams in 33 of Kenya's 47 counties. I understand that these efforts ensured that the United States had firsthand information and consistent messaging among all international partners during the days following the election when concerns were raised about electoral fraud.

Syria

The U.S. objective in Syria is a political settlement leading to a post-Assad transition that minimizes extremist violence and sets the conditions for an inclusive democracy. I understand that CSO has been at the forefront of promoting the cohesiveness and capability of the moderate Syrian opposition.

I understand that, in consultation with the Syrian Opposition Coalition (SOC), CSO has trained over 1,200 civilian council members from over 350 organizations in civil administration and equipped them with communications to coordinate with each other and the outside world. I have been informed that these skills, equipment, and connections allowed these groups to achieve the following:

- Organize together into provincial councils;
- Establish more than 50 civilian police precincts in 40 different communities in Aleppo province alone; each swore to uphold a code of conduct respecting international humanitarian law;
- Reopen schools and restore electrical power;
- Barter across regions for critical supplies like food and medicine;
- Promote the role of women in civil leadership;
- Publicly contest civil authority with extremist groups;
- Establish nine independent FM radio stations that collectively reach 80 percent of Syria's population; and
- Establish three satellite TV stations that can convey Syrian opposition messages across the Middle East.

I understand that, in the 2 months since CSO's nonlethal support to the Syrian Military Council began to flow, CSO has already provided enough utility trucks to motorize a small battalion, and enough communications equipment to network a brigade.

Burma

I have been told that CSO led a successful pilot in Kayah State to convene civil society actors, Burmese officials, and nonstate armed groups to discuss humanitarian mine action, establishing a model for indirect trust-building activities. Following CSO's program, the Government of Burma and the main nonstate armed group in Kayah State agreed to work together on a mine clearance project. I understand these efforts to increase trust among the Government of Burma and ethnic minority groups through humanitarian mine action are beginning to pay dividends and that CSO has designated 1207 funding to expand pilot efforts and train community leaders on how to effectively collaborate on mine action. If confirmed, I will explore using this approach of trust-building through collective work on a challenge of common interest for other states in Burma, including Rakhine State.

Central America

I am told that CSO is currently focusing its efforts in Central America on the critical issue of reducing violence in Honduras. I understand that CSO is implementing activities that transform the prevailing national hopelessness over escalating violence; supporting civil society advocacy for public security reform; and enhancing community-led, counterviolence programs.

It is also my understanding that CSO is providing its civil society partners with strategic communications advice and financial resources. CSO programming encourages senior government leaders to implement reforms and ensures public security reform is a significant issue not only during the ongoing Presidential campaign but

also for the incoming administration. I understand that CSO's efforts have generated initial, meaningful reforms in the Public Ministry that may help counter violence and impunity in Honduras.

I look forward to learning more about these initiatives and how we can expand and strengthen vital us efforts to prevent and mitigate conflicts abroad.

Question. Interagency Coordination.—Please comment on the degree of interagency coordination within the U.S. Government in its humanitarian assistance activities. USAID has programs addressing U.S. international humanitarian assistance. What relationship does PRM have with USAID's programs? Is there overlap? Do you expect a change in this relationship? To what extent do you believe the Department of Defense (DOD) should play a role in forming and enforcing U.S. emergency relief policy? How does PRM coordinate its work with various international and private agencies working with refugees during humanitarian emergencies? What changes would you like to see in these relationships to make coordination more effective and cost efficient?

Answer. I am told that U.S. Government humanitarian assistance activities are well-coordinated both in Washington and in the field, especially in large-scale emergencies requiring significant U.S. Government resources. For example, in the case of U.S. humanitarian assistance in response to the crisis in Syria, coordination happens through regular Principals, Deputies, and Inter-Agency Policy Committee meetings. Additionally, PRM and USAID's Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) Bureau cochair a Syria humanitarian assistance working group, and PRM and DCHA cochair regular video conferences that link embassies in the region with Washington agencies and DOD's Combatant Commands to share information and coordinate U.S. Government activities. PRM and DCHA senior leadership have also taken joint visits to the field to advance U.S. Government humanitarian objectives.

Regarding the relationship between PRM and USAID, I understand that PRM and DCHA personnel work closely together to ensure that their respective programs are coordinated and complementary and are not duplicative. PRM and DCHA adhere to written "Coordination and Funding Guidelines" that have helped facilitate an effective division of funding responsibilities to meet critical needs throughout the world. I am told that PRM staff confer regularly with USAID counterparts in Washington and in the field. Additionally PRM, DCHA, and the Department of State's International Organization Affairs Bureau coordinate via the Humanitarian Policy Working Group (HPWG). The HPWG meets monthly at senior levels to address high-priority humanitarian policy issues, such as U.S. Government advocacy on U.N. humanitarian reforms, outreach to emerging donors, and guidelines for improved civilian-military coordination in humanitarian response, in a collective and strategic manner.

If confirmed, I look forward to working with PRM and USAID leadership to ensure that the HPWG continues to serve effectively as a coordination mechanism to advance key humanitarian policy issues. If confirmed, I would also make strengthened coordination with USAID a top priority. As you appreciate, humanitarian needs continue to grow, the United States and other donors' resources are limited, and current needs already exceed what any single government organization can meet.

When requested by civilian leaders and nested within a broader humanitarian strategy, I believe that DOD can play an important role supporting State and USAID humanitarian efforts, particularly where the U.S. military can provide a unique capability or where additional capacity is urgently required.

I understand that PRM's coordination with international and private agencies is extensive. In addition to representing the U.S. Government on the governing boards of key humanitarian agencies such as the U.N. Refugee Agency (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), PRM is also an active participant in donor coordination groups in support of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the U.N. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). It actively engages with, and participates in events hosted by, InterAction and Refugee Council USA, two major umbrella organizations for nongovernmental organizations working on humanitarian issues. PRM holds quarterly policy and budget briefings with its international and private agency partners, and attends regular meetings with stakeholders on key emergency issues. In addition, PRM's refugee coordinators posted to U.S. embassies abroad meet regularly with international and nongovernmental partners to coordinate and share information about humanitarian needs and challenges in country.

If confirmed, I will continue to build upon and expand the coordination mechanisms and networks already in place to ensure that U.S. Government humanitarian assistance is timely, effective, cost-efficient, and responsive to the needs of the most vulnerable people.

Question. Syria Refugee Crisis.—The Syrian crisis is well into its third year, and many refugees who have fled neighboring countries will not be able to go home for a long time. The impact of the refugee influx on Lebanon, Jordan, and other countries has been immense, and the possibility of conflict developing between refugees and host communities is increasing. In your testimony before the committee, you noted that we should be doing more to ensure that we are providing assistance to host communities and local authorities and that our humanitarian aid is linked to longer term development objectives.

♦ Please describe your views on this issue and what concrete steps you recommend be taken.

Answer. I understand that U.N., international humanitarian agencies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have worked tirelessly with host governments over the past 2½ years to provide emergency aid to the more than 2.2 million refugees who have fled the conflict in Syria to Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, Iraq, and Egypt. The influx of refugees has placed extraordinary pressure on the region's public services, infrastructure, and social systems, with host communities bearing the brunt of the burden. As the conflict in Syria escalates and expands, it is clear that return to Syria will not be a near-term option for most. In order to bolster the region's stability while the hard work of seeking a peaceful political solution to the crisis continues, U.N. humanitarian and development officials recently unveiled a comprehensive regional strategy to integrate the emergency humanitarian response with broader development support for Syria and neighboring countries. The plan will target support to refugees, host communities, and host governments, aiming to bolster communities to withstand the impact of major population surges by addressing the needs of the most vulnerable, regardless of nationality or status. I understand that U.N. agencies and NGOs are working with host governments to map existing relief efforts and gaps in the humanitarian and development response in order to prioritize the most critical new initiatives. This work is critically important and if confirmed I will do all I can to ensure U.S. support for these priorities.

I understand that this mapping process is well underway in Lebanon and Jordan, where the U.N. is overlaying national poverty data with refugee locations in order to identify the most vulnerable communities. In Jordan, the World Bank has rapidly scaled up its response through the recent launch of a \$53 million municipality support project. At the request of the Government of Lebanon, the World Bank, recently conducted an assessment and released a "Roadmap" identifying priority assistance initiatives to help Lebanon manage the impact of the Syrian crisis. On the margins of the U.N. General Assembly, Secretary Kerry announced an additional \$30 million to support host communities in Lebanon to address development and humanitarian needs.

As the international community develops new responses to the crisis, the U.S. Government should also look to innovative programming that meets the immediate and long-term needs of refugee populations and their hosts. One example is the ongoing Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement (INL) refugee community watch training program for Zaatri Refugee Camp in Jordan. Through this project, the Jordanian Public Security Directorate (PSD) will train approximately 600 Syrian refugees from the Zaatri camp to create units that will provide a visible presence and complement PSD efforts to establish and maintain order throughout the camp of nearly 80,000 refugees. This is a new program for INL but draws on its experience developing curricula for police training.

If confirmed I would work to bring together all relevant actors—host governments, community leaders, U.N. agencies, NGOs, the World Bank, and international donors—to galvanize resources through all available assistance streams to meet the short-, medium-, and long-term needs of refugees and host communities throughout the region.

Question. The Bureau of Counterterrorism is responsible for forging partnerships with nonstate actors, multilateral organizations, and foreign governments to advance U.S. counterterrorism objectives and our national security. If confirmed, what will your priorities be for the Bureau of Counterterrorism? Based on your knowledge of the Bureau's missions and activities, in which areas does it perform well? What policies or activities may need to be reassessed or improved?

Answer. In his May 2013 National Defense University speech, President Obama made it clear that 21st century terrorism presents short- and long-term challenges.

In the short term, the United States must maintain the pressure on al-Qaeda and its affiliates to disrupt their operations and bring terrorists to justice within a framework that respects the rule of law. In the long term, the President emphasized the need to do more to counter the social, economic, and political drivers of violent extremism that fuel terrorist recruitment and also build the capacity of our partners to address the threat within their borders and regions. This is where the Bureau of Counterterrorism, and indeed the broader J enterprise and other actors such as the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications and USAID have a leading role to play.

It is my understanding that the State Department Counterterrorism (CT) Bureau made capacity-building partner capacity and countering violent extremism its strategic priorities during the President's first term.

If confirmed, I would look forward to evaluating the progress toward these goals and working to support CT's efforts to continuously improve its effectiveness and impact. I would also work with the President, Secretary Kerry, and Members of Congress to build on the progress the Bureau has made in these areas.

I understand that the CT Bureau has worked hard to develop new fora and programs to leverage international efforts on behalf of shared counterterrorism goals. If confirmed, I would hope to deepen and strengthen such a "force multiplier" approach to this global challenge. I'm also told that CT has developed innovative countering violent extremism (CVE) programs that target individuals and groups vulnerable to becoming radicalized to violence. If confirmed, I would hope to see these efforts not only expanded, but better aligned with those bureaus and offices in the Department working to address the underlying economic, political, and social conditions that terrorists exploit for recruitment.

More broadly, if confirmed, I would work with the CT Bureau and other parts of the Department to encourage greater synergy among these different efforts, which are at the heart of the President's vision for diminishing terrorist threats over the long term.

Question. If confirmed, how do you envision the Bureau of Counterterrorism informing and supporting the work of the other bureaus and offices you will be leading?

Answer. The establishment of the Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, and the creation of the Bureau of Counterterrorism within that Under Secretariat were conceived as part of a broader transformation of U.S. foreign policy, reflected in the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), which emphasized the need to advance a comprehensive and integrated approach to address today's transnational security and other foreign policy challenges. This approach aims to better integrate all of our foreign policy tools—diplomacy and development, hand in hand with defense to advance U.S. values and interests.

Specialized counterterrorism assistance to help our partners prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and protect American interests abroad is a critical part of this effort. The CT Bureau currently works to provide such assistance and to strengthen the capacity and political will of partners to effectively counter terrorist threats within their own borders through a rule-of-law framework. As such, the State Department's expanded role in counterterrorism is a central element of the broader effort to improve the United States ability to address U.S. 21st century challenges.

As evidenced throughout my career at the nexus of security and human rights, I strongly believe that counterterrorism efforts are most successful when respect for human rights and the rule of law are central elements of the approach.

The J Bureaus and Offices can work closely together across a range of mutually reinforcing lines of effort to strengthen the work of countering both the symptoms and drivers of violent extremism. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the President, Secretary Kerry, and Members of Congress to integrate policies and build on programmatic synergies to advance U.S. CT and foreign policy objectives.

Question. Gender-based violence remains a rampant problem in many of the world's conflicts, including Syria, Burma, and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Please provide an update on implementation of the National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security. How, if at all, has implementation of the administration's National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security made a difference in these countries?

Answer. To realize its commitments under the National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, it is my understanding that the Department developed an Implementation Plan to describe roles and actions for bureaus and embassies to incorporate women, peace, and security (WPS) priorities within policy and programs in conflict and post-conflict areas, and in countries experiencing significant political

transition. To put this plan into action, I understand the Department proactively engages with partner governments, civil society, and relevant multilateral institutions to ensure women's inclusion in all aspects of conflict prevention, peace-building, reconstruction and transitional political processes, civilian security efforts, economic revitalization, and the provision of humanitarian assistance.

In the Syria context, I understand the administration has made a concerted effort to prevent and respond to gender-based violence, and foster the political participation of women in peace-building and conflict mitigation efforts. The Department provided seed money to the Syria Justice and Accountability Center to document human rights violations and support transitional justice processes, including documentation of sexual and gender-based violence crimes. I understand there is also a new Community Watch Program to address security concerns at Zaatari Camp in Jordan. The training will address the prevention of gender-based violence as part of the curriculum.

In Burma, the Department has advocated in interagency, bilateral and multilateral engagements, as well as with civil society partners to advocate for women's engagement in local peace and reconciliation processes. In DRC, women have benefited from such integrated sectoral approaches as the Africa-WPS Initiative, which has supported capacity-building in order for local health, legal, and law enforcement professionals to gather medical evidence for successful prosecution and conviction of GBV perpetrators.

If confirmed, I would continue the work begun across members of the J enterprise—including the Bureaus of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor; Population, Refugees and Migration; and International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs—and in partnership with the Secretary's Office of Global Women's Issues to strengthen efforts in the areas of conflict prevention, protection from conflict-related gender-based violence, participation of women in decisionmaking institutions, and women's role in reconstruction and rebuilding efforts.

Question. State/USAID Coordination.—Many J Bureaus and Offices, including PRM (Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration), CSO (Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, and DRL (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor), are working on the same issues in the same countries as USAID offices are working. Critics say there is inadequate coordination among these many programs.

- ◆ How will you enhance coordination between USAID and your Under Secretariat to increase the efficient use of limited resources and overall effectiveness of programs?

Answer. The Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), which established the Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, provides the foundation that allows the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to become more efficient, accountable, and effective as we work together to (1) prevent and resolve conflicts; (2) help countries protect civilians and vulnerable populations while helping them become prosperous, stable, and democratic states; and (3) build global coalitions to address global problems. I understand that a variety of formal and informal mechanisms already exist to promote coordination between USAID offices and State bureaus. For example, I am told that USAID sits as a member of the panels that evaluate grant applications to DRL.

If confirmed, I would work to enhance this existing coordination. In addition, I would build on the cooperation that has been developed through the work of the Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources in bringing greater coherence, efficiency, and accountability to strategic planning and budgeting in areas in which we work together with USAID.

If confirmed, I would work to further align existing coordination among the bureaus and offices within the Under Secretariat's portfolio and work with USAID counterparts to further strengthen regular and systematic coordination and lessons learned processes.

Question. Since 2001, your predecessors have served concurrently as Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues. This position coordinates U.S. Tibet policy, which calls for human rights improvements, preserving the Dalai Lama's distinct culture, language and religion of Tibet, and dialogue between the Dalai Lama, his representatives and the Chinese Government, without preconditions.

- ◆ If appointed as Tibet Coordinator, how will you engage with both Chinese officials and Tibetan religious, cultural, and political leaders to advance these goals? What will be your priorities with respect to Tibetan communities in India and Nepal? Will you commit to briefing Senate Foreign Relations Committee members or staff every 6 months on your activities in this position?

Answer. If designated as Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues, I would maintain close contact with religious, cultural, and political leaders of the Tibetan people, including through travel to Tibetan refugee settlements in India and Nepal, and I would seek to travel to Tibetan areas of China. I would meet with the Dalai Lama and his representatives without delay. In my private meetings with Chinese officials, during formal dialogues, and in my public statements, I would look for new ways to promote substantive dialogue between the Chinese Government and the Dalai Lama or his representatives, without preconditions.

As the United States continues its rebalance to Asia, we must continue to demonstrate leadership on Tibetan issues, including in multilateral fora. If confirmed, I would press China to grant unfettered access to Tibetan areas to U.N. Special Rapporteurs, as well as to diplomats, journalists, and other observers. I also would continue to call on the Chinese Government to uphold its international human rights commitments, and to permit Tibetans to express their grievances freely, publicly, peacefully, and without fear of retribution.

The United States must remain concerned about China's pressure on Nepal with respect to Tibetan refugees. If confirmed, I would continue to press the Government of Nepal to remain fully committed to the longstanding "Gentlemen's Agreement," which allows newly arrived Tibetan refugees to transit unimpeded to India, and to ensure that the rights of the long-staying Tibetan community are respected. I also would support continuation of the vitally important Tibetan-language services of Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America. If confirmed, I also would coordinate our various Tibet programs that benefit Tibetan communities in India, Nepal, and on the Tibetan plateau, implemented by the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA), Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM), Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL), and by USAID. I would seek new ways for the State Department and other U.S. Government agencies to promote the protection of Tibetans' distinct language, culture, and religion, both through our programming for Tibetan communities in China, India, and Nepal, and in robust interactions and exchanges with officials, civil society, students, scholars, cultural figures, and religious leaders.

Finally, if designated as Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues, I would look forward to briefing and maintaining communication with Senate Foreign Relations Committee members and staff on my activities in this position.

Question. More than 120 Tibetans have lit themselves on fire in protest of Chinese policies. Despite the severe repression, military crackdown, and denial of basic rights, Tibetans have not resorted to violence against the authorities. Many observers ask how long that can last, especially as the Dalai Lama, with his calming influence, gets older.

♦ Given your background in conflict and atrocities, how do you see the trajectory of the Tibetan struggle, and how can we work now to prevent the situation from ever turning violent?

Answer. There is risk that the apparent cycle of repression, protest, and further repression in Tibetan areas of China could continue to escalate, suggesting another reason why resumption of dialogue between China and the Dalai Lama or his representatives, without preconditions, is so critical.

I understand that the State Department repeatedly has expressed the hope that these tragic acts of self-immolation end, and that the leadership of the Central Tibetan administration in Dharamsala, India, has similarly appealed to Tibetans not to resort to self-immolation. President Obama has commended the Dalai Lama's commitment to nonviolence, dialogue and the "Middle Way" approach, and continues to encourage direct dialogue to resolve longstanding differences. At the same time, China has continued to pursue counterproductive policies and failed to address the grievances underlying this crisis.

If confirmed, I would seek new ways both to enhance U.S.-China engagement on these issues and to encourage China to restart, without preconditions, dialogue with the Dalai Lama or his representatives. Dialogue remains the best path to resolution of Tibetan grievances, alleviating tensions in Tibetan areas, improving the stability of China, and strengthening the U.S.-China relationship. I also would call upon the Chinese Government to uphold its international human rights commitments, and to permit Tibetans to express their grievances freely, publicly, peacefully, and without fear of retribution. Finally, if confirmed, I would use the full range of tools available to me to monitor and assess the situation in Tibet to ensure that it receives the interagency attention and programmatic response necessary to help prevent the current violence from further increasing.

Question. Section 620M of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, commonly known as the Leahy amendment, provides guidance for U.S. embassies regarding the collection, use, and public disclosure of information relating to gross violations of human rights by units of host nation foreign security forces. Among other things, the law requires that if the Secretary of State has credible information that such a unit has committed such a violation, U.S. training, equipment, or other assistance to that unit must cease, unless the foreign government is taking effective steps to bring the responsible members of the unit to justice. The goals of this law are twofold: (1) to ensure that U.S. taxpayers are not underwriting assistance to abusive security forces; and (2) to help incentivize reform and the development of systems of accountability by allied security forces.

- If confirmed, please describe steps that you will take to enhance effective implementation of this law within the Department of State and in U.S. embassies.
- If confirmed, please describe the steps you would take to increase awareness of the intent of the law—helping allied governments end impunity for human rights violations.
- If confirmed, will you commit to briefing this committee annually on the steps you have taken to increase the efficacy and implementation of section 620M?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) has worked continuously to improve implementation of the Leahy law, particularly since Congress amended the law in 2011. I am familiar with a recent report by the Government Accountability Office, which highlighted specific areas for improvement in providing guidance to posts on the duty to inform host governments of derogatory human rights information, reviewing posts' Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Leahy vetting, and updating distance learning courses on the INVEST system. I understand that DRL is currently addressing these recommendations and, if confirmed, I would ensure that they continue to do so.

In addition, I would work to expand upon current efforts to educate partner governments about the law and identify ways in which we could guide or assist them in their efforts to ensure accountability in response to allegations of gross violations of human rights. Such efforts may be as modest as helping a government to develop a plan of action, but they could also include greater emphasis on rule of law and improving military justice systems in our programming engagements. I would also work to integrate application of the Leahy law as one of many tools in the U.S. Government's efforts to reform security services worldwide. I am committed to ensuring this committee is briefed periodically on our progress.

Question. The U.S. State Department J/TIP Office (Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons) receives recommendations of Tier rankings in the annual TIP Report by regional bureaus and embassies that often prioritize issues unrelated to the eradication of trafficking in persons. Antitrafficking experts have raised concerns about "grade inflation" in the Tier ranking process.

- ◆ What steps will your Office take to support Tier rankings that reflect true antitrafficking efforts?

Answer. If I am confirmed as Under Secretary, J/TIP will continue to work collaboratively with other bureaus and offices within the Department to ensure the findings of the TIP Report are objective, merit-based, and in alignment with the requirements of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA), as amended. When governments do not produce results in holding those determined to be trafficking offenders accountable and in identifying and providing comprehensive services to victims, these areas for improvement are clearly documented in the report and reflected in the Tier rankings, regardless of the country. Precedent for such results is clearly evident in the Department's downgrading of a number of strategically sensitive countries in the June 2013 TIP Report based on their failure to improve on or make significant antitrafficking efforts.

I understand that many governments use the report's findings as a guide for addressing human trafficking more effectively. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that the report continues to accurately document trafficking trends and government responses.

Question. The Under Secretary for Civilian Security oversees the Office of Global Criminal Justice, which was formerly known as the Office of War Crimes Issues. Syrian President Assad clearly has committed, and continues to commit, war crimes. We now have a process underway to de-fang Assad to prevent future chemical attacks, but our work is far from done. Yet Assad's aerial bombardments of civilian apartment blocks continue. We must make sure that war crimes are not tolerated, cannot continue, and will result in severe punishment. With Russia's veto power at

the U.N. Security Council hampering the ability to pursue a referral to the International Criminal Court, we must establish a foundation today to pursue justice and accountability in post-war Syria tomorrow.

- ◆ How is the State Department working with its Syrian partners now, in exile and inside the nation, to document, verify, and collect data to develop the case against Assad? Please share your views about what additional concrete steps the U.S. Government can take to assist Syrians today to advance eventual justice and accountability.

Answer. I share your outrage about the violence in Syria and your commitment to ensuring that those committing war crimes and crimes against humanity be held accountable. As you know, the U.N. Independent International Commission of Inquiry already has reported on the war crimes and crimes against humanity that have taken place in Syria.

The State Department is supporting Syrian and international efforts to document evidence of atrocities committed by all sides for use in future accountability processes. One such initiative is the Syria Justice and Accountability Center (SJAC). I understand that the SJAC, led by Syrian human rights defender Mohammed Al-Abdullah, focuses on: (1) collection and analysis of documentation in Syria; (2) coordination of Syrian and international documentation efforts; and (3) education and outreach on transitional justice.

If confirmed, I look forward to working with colleagues in the State Department and across the U.S. Government to explore how we might best advance Syrian-led efforts to lay a foundation for transitional justice and accountability processes that the Syrian people, especially victims, deserve.

Question. The Rohingya are possibly the most persecuted people in the world, and yet few people are aware of their plight. A Muslim minority long resident in Burma, they are essentially stateless, and lack basic rights, including the rights to work, travel, and marry. They routinely suffer forced labor, confiscation of property, arbitrary arrest and detention, and physical and sexual violence. In addition, several hundred thousand reside in squalid conditions in Bangladeshi camps.

- ◆ Please describe, if confirmed, if and how you will address the multiple crises facing the Rohingya, and furthermore, if and how the bureaus and offices you will oversee, including CSO (Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations), PRM (Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration), and J/TIP (Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons), DRL (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor), DRL/IRF (International Religious Freedom), are addressing this issue now.

Answer. I am deeply concerned about the stateless Rohingya who continue to face ongoing violence, discrimination, and desperate humanitarian conditions in Burma and elsewhere in the region. As you know, since the June and October 2012 violence in Rakhine State, Burma, approximately 140,000 people, mainly Rohingya, remain internally displaced while some 20,000 to 60,000 Rohingya have fled by boat, seeking refuge in other countries in the region, the largest annual exodus in over 20 years.

I understand that the United States Government is actively engaging the Burmese and other governments in the region to address underlying issues of violence, discrimination, and persecution and to develop durable solutions. The United States Government is committed to ensuring the delivery of humanitarian assistance and intensified engagement with the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh, as well as with other international partners.

I understand that the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) has worked with Embassy Rangoon to condemn ongoing acts of violence and persecution in Burma, pressed the government to provide protection for those at risk, and made addressing the stateless status of the Rohingya in Burma a key priority of the U.S. Government's human rights dialogue with the Burmese Government. Moreover, DRL's Office of International Religious Freedom is actively engaged on religious freedom to map a way forward for Burma that will include respecting the religious rights of the Rohingya.

I also understand that the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO) has detailed a conflict specialist to Embassy Rangoon to monitor developments in Rakhine State and inform U.S. Government policy and programming. In addition, CSO's Washington-based team maintains close relationships with Rakhine State diaspora contacts and continues monitoring and analyzing conflict dynamics and conflict mitigation approaches in Rakhine State.

I understand that the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM), in coordination with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), is lead-

ing U.S. Government efforts to ensure access for the provision of humanitarian assistance and protection to internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Burma and Burmese refugees and asylum-seekers in neighboring countries, including the Rohingya. In FY 2013, the United States provided more than \$51 million in humanitarian assistance to vulnerable Burmese in Burma and in the region, including \$37.6 million from PRM and \$14.05 million from USAID.

I understand that *J/TIP* has repeatedly highlighted in bilateral diplomacy the issue of the vulnerability of the Rohingya population and encouraged Burmese Government officials to redouble their efforts to ensure the protection of Rohingya trafficking victims.

J Bureaus have also worked closely with the Bureau of International Organizations to maintain the U.N. Human Rights Council's mandate for the special rapporteur on Burma; continue the U.N. General Assembly's scrutiny of Burma, including the situation of the Rohingya; and support the establishment of an office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Burma with a full mandate to report on current abuses and build the necessary capacity to address human rights challenges.

If confirmed, I would work with interagency partners, Congress, and the international community to support and strengthen U.S. policy to enhance the security and advance the human rights of the Rohingya population in Burma and elsewhere in the region.

Question. In recent months, news reports have highlighted the loss of more than 360 migrants off the coast of Lampedusa, Italy, the deaths of 92 migrants in the desert in Niger, and the rescue of 700 more off the Italian coast. These tragedies highlight the dangers Africans, many fleeing conflict and poverty at home for the hope of better futures in Europe, encounter when they are exploited by human traffickers.

♦ How is USG addressing the issue now, and what more can be done?

Answer. I understand that the United States Government addresses such issues by providing programmatic assistance and through bilateral and multilateral diplomacy. The Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) provides funding to the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to help build the capacity of countries in the Horn of Africa region to better and more humanely manage migration, including by helping countries in the region coordinate with one another on common concerns and to undertake awareness campaigns to discourage people from undertaking dangerous sea journeys. I understand PRM also supports an IOM program in Niger that provides emergency medical care and assistance to Nigeriens returning home, as well as to other migrant nationalities stranded by the Libyan crisis and the closure of the Libyan borders.

If confirmed, I will work closely with all the relevant J Bureaus and Offices to seek comprehensive approaches to the problem. I will work with countries of origin, transit, and destination—as well as with my interagency counterparts and interested governments—to help address security concerns and ensure access to appropriate protection for vulnerable migrants. Governments can work together to develop safe and orderly migration programs and to enhance economic opportunities in countries of origin. Governments can also improve law enforcement action against both smugglers and traffickers who exploit and abuse migrants and refugees, as well as provide access to appropriate protective services for those who have been ill-treated while making such journeys.

Question. The Democratic Republic of Congo and M23 will soon sign a peace accord, ending 20 months of violence. CSO has operated in DRC in the past, monitoring elections in 2011 and implementing a stabilization initiative in 2010.

♦ Is CSO currently engaged in the DRC? If yes, how will CSO work with the Government of the DRC and regional stakeholders such as Rwanda, Uganda, and the U.N. to help stabilize and bring critical humanitarian assistance to the areas that experienced the most conflict.

Answer. The State Department's Representative for Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) Issues (a CSO officer) is working with U.S. military advisors in northeastern DRC to bring about the end of the LRA. CSO coordinates closely with the Government of the DRC, other LRA-affected governments, Western donor nations, the U.N. Stabilization Mission in the DRC (MONUSCO), the AU, and various NGOs to help end the conflict and ensure that people in the region heal and rebound from this decades-old trauma.

CSO is in the nascent stages of exploring additional work in the DRC, including supporting disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) efforts, providing humanitarian assistance, and strengthening infrastructure (for example, roads).

If confirmed, I will coordinate the efforts of the J Bureaus and Offices and will work with the entire State Department and the interagency community to develop a strategy to help the people and Government of DRC.

RESPONSES OF HON. HEATHER A. HIGGINBOTTOM TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BOB CORKER

Question. Does the Department have concrete plans for preventing increased violence against diplomatic personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan in the wake of those countries' respective U.S. military drawdowns?

Answer. Our missions in Iraq and Afghanistan face serious and ongoing security challenges. As with all our missions around the world, our highest priority is the safety of our personnel in the field. We have detailed security plans in place for both missions and review these plans regularly. We cannot escape the basic fact that Mission Afghanistan, in Kabul and the field, operates in a war zone; and that Iraq continues to pose a serious security challenge. In order to operate in such challenging environments, we have implemented some of the most robust security measures available. We can do much to mitigate risk, but such risk cannot be entirely eliminated.

We greatly appreciate the support provided to the Department by Congress in implementing the Increased Security Proposal (ISP), as well as funding for both ongoing and extraordinary security programs in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) and the Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations (OBO). If confirmed, I will regularly review the effectiveness of our security programs and explore new ideas to keep our missions safe as we approach the transition in Afghanistan. If confirmed, the security of our people will be one of my top priorities. I look forward to working with you on this important issue.

RESPONSES OF DR. SARAH SEWALL TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BOB CORKER

Question. As Undersecretary, you would oversee the newly created Conflict & Stabilization Operations Bureau (CSO), which is currently led by the founding director of USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI).

♦ With both CSO and OTI working in the same places (such as in Syria), can you please describe how the authorities, missions, and methodologies of CSO and OTI differ?

Answer. The QDDR highlighted the need for greater coherence and effectiveness in the way in which State and USAID approach conflict and crisis countries. CSO and OTI have many of the same authorities, favor rapid response, and often work together in priority places across the conflict spectrum. However, CSO was created as a Bureau within the State Department with the unique mission of ensuring that conflict analysis and operations feed directly into policy discussions and drive more coherent, effective U.S. Government policies and strategy at the highest level. The Assistant Secretary of CSO is named the Secretary's Senior Advisor on Conflict, and CSO personnel integrate operational experience and analysis into diplomacy.

CSO focuses U.S. Government attention on priority cases (Kenya, Burma, Syria, Honduras, Nigeria, and Bangladesh); leads interagency analytic processes (roundtables, budget reviews, scenarios, meta-data crunches, joint assessments, etc.); directs funds to the element of the U.S. Government that is best positioned to implement programming; and expands partnerships with other donors on behalf of shared conflict mitigation objectives. For example, in Syria, CSO works with the United Kingdom, Denmark, Canada, and others to pool resources to advance common goals. I am told that CSO is also redesigning a civilian surge, conflict expertise, and expeditionary capacity in the U.S. Government through a new Civilian Response network.

I understand that another major difference between CSO and OTI is that CSO has a greater opportunity to integrate players and funding as it brings together policy and implementation. For instance, CSO convenes experts and interagency representatives to ensure an integrated approach to conflict assessments and strategies and to provide Posts with early options for preventive action.

Question. There is a real tension in our foreign policy between advancing democracy and human rights on the one hand, and advancing our strict national interest on the other hand. Although they are not always different or in conflict, the tension is something with which we as a democracy struggle. Those tensions are really

manifest in your portfolio, where you have democracy, human rights, and stabilization as part of your core responsibility, and at the same time counterterrorism and antinarcotics.

◆ How do you effectively manage that tension?

Answer. Secretary Kerry has made it clear that the prevention and mitigation of conflict and the promotion of democracy and human rights go hand in hand with countering transnational crime and terrorism. Pursuing these goals in tandem is not just the right thing to do—it is the smart thing to do. It is both an expression of our core values, and an imperative for securing our national interests.

Bringing together the diplomatic and programmatic capabilities of these diverse bureaus and offices strengthens our effort to support durable and sustainable security and justice sector capacities that are more likely to protect individuals from violence, oppression, and discrimination. Promoting better governance and accountability of security forces is an essential cornerstone of promoting our interests. It may sometimes be a challenge to help our partners understand this nexus of values and interests, and certainly a challenge to achieve it, but it is this combination that best characterizes the uniqueness and power of American foreign policy.

The advancement of human rights and democratic principles around the world is essential to long-term U.S. strategic and economic interests, including the goals and objectives of all the bureaus in what will be my portfolio, if confirmed. The United States should continue to emphasize rule of law, human rights, effective and accountable governance institutions, and strong and engaged civil society even as it engages in other programs and policies to advance U.S. interests.

Question. The Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights oversees eight bureaus and offices with budgets of some \$4 billion in program funds (as you note in your opening statement).

◆ What is your understanding of the authority you would have to oversee these bureaus and how would you plan to use that authority to ensure accountability in the bureaus and offices that fall under your jurisdiction?

Answer. If confirmed, one of my top priorities will be to enhance coordination among and effectiveness of the eight bureaus and offices that fall under the authority of the Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights as we develop and implement our policies and programs in support of U.S. interests. This is one of the important objectives of the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR) of 2010, pursuant to which the State Department realigned the responsibilities of the Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, and it is a mission that Secretary Kerry fully supports. As a result of the realignment, the Under Secretary oversees eight bureaus and offices and has responsibility for coordination, effective use of resources, and accountability for outcomes. If confirmed, I would use the Under Secretary's authority and role as I work to fulfill the mandate outlined in the QDDR and assigned by Secretary Kerry.

Question. What aspects of your background would you draw upon in overseeing State's International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Bureau (INL) and Bureau for Counterterrorism (CT)? Looking to the future, what do you see as the most important priorities for INL and CT?

Answer. Understanding how national security institutions effectively deliver policy outcomes and do so efficiently and ethically has been a key focus of my work as an academic, foreign policy advisor and public servant. From my experiences serving as the first Deputy Assistant Secretary for Peacekeeping at the Department of Defense, to my position as Director of the 2008 Transition National Security Agencies review, to my role as a contributor to military doctrine for counterinsurgency and responding to mass atrocity, I have drawn valuable lessons for leading change in large, complex national security organizations. I am also fortunate to have had experience working in areas of both "hard" and "soft" power, serving as Director of Harvard's Carr Center for Human Rights Policy and helping pioneer the field of civilian protection in armed conflict. I believe these experiences will help me strengthen the State Department's programs and policies to enhance American values and U.S. national security interests.

As you know, the State Department Bureaus of INL and CT play a critical role in combating illegal drugs, transnational crime and terror while promoting rule of law and countering violent extremism. I understand that INL has transformed into a leading tool to advance and promote respect for the rule of law on a global scale, helping states grow institutions that protect the rights of their citizens while promoting their security. The CT Bureau's work to counter terrorism, including building the capacity of our foreign partners and countering violent extremism to stem terrorist recruitment, complements the work of INL.

I am convinced of the importance of these U.S. efforts to help nations extend the reach of justice under the rule of law and become more effective partners in providing civilian security and international stability. If confirmed, I would work to strengthen these efforts and promote synergy between them and among all of the programs of the J Under Secretariat.

RESPONSES OF RICHARD STENDEL TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BOB CORKER

Question. The Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) recently issued a report (see "Inspection of the Bureau of International Information Programs," ISP-I-13-28, May 2013), that was highly critical of major structural and functional problems with the Bureau of International Information Programs (IIP), which will be under your purview.

♦ Will you commit to implementing the recommendations of that OIG report?

Answer. I welcome the Office of the Inspector General's (OIG) report, which highlights a number of key issues in the Bureau of International Information Programs (IIP). I believe that it can give valuable guidance and be a helpful tool to new management. It is my understanding that IIP is responding to the OIG's recommendations. If confirmed, I will consider the inspection's structural and functional recommendations as part of an overall strategy to make our public diplomacy programs more effective. I believe that it is essential to closely link IIP's work to that of the other public diplomacy bureaus and the rest of the Department. Our American Spaces, speakers programs, social media platforms, and information initiatives should complement and provide context for the work we do with the press. Should I be confirmed, I will draw on the OIG inspection, employ industry best practices I used at TIME, and work with public diplomacy's new leadership team to review the OIG findings to enhance IIP's contributions to our diplomacy efforts.

Question. Part of your purview as Under Secretary will be supervising the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications (CSCC), which, according to the Department's Web site, "coordinate[s], orient[s], and inform[s] government-wide foreign communications activities targeted against terrorism and violent extremism, particularly al-Qaeda and its affiliates and adherents."

♦ Can you explain how robust or extensive CSCC's operations are in comparison to the other components under your supervision? If not robust or extensive, do you intend to expand the CSCC's reach, scope, or efforts?

Answer. The Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications (CSCC) was established in 2011 and is relatively modest in terms of budget and staff compared to some of the other public diplomacy elements I will supervise, if confirmed. Nevertheless, the scope and effectiveness of CSCC's efforts is notably robust. Everyday CSCC counters violent extremist messaging in four critical languages in digital environments and in countries where al-Qaeda and its affiliates are active. Based on my State Department briefings on CSCC activities, I am impressed by CSCC's innovative and unique approach. CSCC is correcting misinformation and contesting the space occupied by violent extremist messaging—and they are doing it in real time. CSCC will continue to magnify its efforts through close cooperation with other parts of the Department and the interagency. Such collaboration is expanding CSCC's scope and effort in cost effective ways. If confirmed, I will review CSCC operations to see how they can be most effective and fulfill its important mission.

Question. The committee is aware that the lack of attendance of the Department's designee to the BBG board has, at times, prevented a quorum and thus prevented the BBG from functioning properly.

♦ In your capacity as a BBG governor, will you attend all board meetings, or ensure a substitute's attendance at times when you are unable to attend?

Answer. Our U.S. Government-supported international media operations are an important element of our foreign policy. Their mission is a critical part of achieving our national security objectives. If confirmed, I will faithfully represent Secretary Kerry on the Broadcasting Board of Governors and be an active participant in the Board's meetings—as well as deliberations between meetings—to ensure that the State Department is at the table. I also commit to doing all I can to ensure a substitute when at times I may be unable to attend.

Question. In your dual capacity as Under Secretary and BBG governor, will you commit to working closely with the committee and other stakeholders to improve

the effectiveness and operations of BBG and the broader U.S. international broadcasting effort?

Answer. More than ever, we need the ability to communicate and engage with nations and communities around the world. The BBG is an essential component for accomplishing this important task. If confirmed, I will work with the committee and other stakeholders to ensure that our international media operations have the leadership, structure, and clear vision to fulfill their mission on behalf of the American people.

RESPONSES OF HON. HEATHER A. HIGGINBOTTOM TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR MARCO RUBIO

Question. On January 7, 2013, the State Department's International Security Advisory Board recommended to "implement a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation process for its security capacity-building programs, measuring effectiveness against defined goals in terms of basic national objectives, not just value for money or inputs provided." In April 2013, the President issued Security Sector Assistance Presidential Policy Directive 23 (PPD 23) pledging to "inform policy with rigorous analysis, assessments, and evaluations."

- ◆ Please provide a detailed explanation of the measures taken thus far by the administration to implement rigorous analysis, assessments, and evaluations of U.S. security sector assistance in accordance to PPD23.
- ◆ Please provide a detailed explanation of the requirements included in S. 1271, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2013, that the administration considers similar to their ongoing efforts to monitor and evaluate security sector assistance in accordance to PPD 23.
- ◆ Please provide a detailed explanation of the requirements included in S. 1271 that the administration considers dissimilar to their ongoing efforts to monitor and evaluate security sector assistance in accordance to PPD 23.

Answer. Over the last several years, the administration has improved monitoring and evaluation, with important work ongoing, and I look forward to building on these efforts. If confirmed, I am committed to improving the way the Department conducts monitoring and evaluation (M&E), as well as linking that information to the budgeting and planning process and enhancing transparency of all foreign assistance.

Monitoring and evaluation for U.S. security sector assistance (SSA) plays an essential role in ensuring the impact, effectiveness, relevance, and efficiency of SSA policies, strategies, programs, and activities. M&E also provide SSA policymakers, planners, program managers and implementers the analytical tools necessary to make effective decisions and resource allocations; set and manage expectations; maximize outcomes; report results; and adapt programs and approaches as necessary. These efforts contemplate the use of best practices, and the application of standards for regularized and integrated monitoring across SSA agencies. Monitoring focuses on whether desired results are occurring during implementation, and confirms whether implementation is on track; whereas evaluation (the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes) documents the achievement of outcomes and results at the end of an intervention and, in some cases, the value of continuing the investment.

PPD 23 sets robust common standards and expectations for assessing security sector assistance requirements, in addition to investing in M&E of security sector assistance programs. It provides that such standards will be aided by guidelines for measurable security sector assistance objectives, appropriate data collection of the impacts and results of security sector assistance programs, and improved efforts to inform decisionmaking processes with data on what works and what does not work through impact evaluations, when permissible. Such standards and data collection will take into account the varying security and information environments where U.S. programs operate.

I am supportive of the goals of S. 1271 and understand that conversations between your staff and the administration are ongoing. I am confident that we can find a way to advance our shared goals about strengthening monitoring, evaluation, and transparency. If confirmed, I look forward to helping evaluate any corresponding legislation as it may move through the legislative process in light of the very robust security sector assistance measures envisioned and being undertaken by the administration.

I understand that the administration's M&E processes being planned pursuant to PPD 23 are robust and address the provisions for M&E set out generally in S. 1271

for security sector assistance. For example, the administration will introduce common standards and expectations for assessing security sector assistance, in addition to investing in M&E of security sector assistance programs. Such standards will be aided by guidelines for measurable security sector assistance objectives, appropriate data collection on the impacts and results of security sector assistance programs, and improved efforts to inform decisionmaking processes with data on what works and what does not work through impact evaluations, when permissible. Such standards and data collection will take into account the varying security and information environments where U.S. programs operate.

It is my understanding that interagency guidance has been prepared to ensure that the M&E measures contemplated by the President's policy for SSA are realized. And, if confirmed, I will ensure the Department continues to provide its leadership toward oversight of SSA.

RESPONSES OF HON. HEATHER A. HIGGINBOTTOM TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR EDWARD J. MARKEY

Question. What criteria do you believe the United States should use to determine whether to give aid to Egypt? Under what circumstances, if any, do you see the current aid suspension being lifted?

Answer. As the President and Secretary have said, we are deeply committed to the U.S.-Egypt relationship, and we want to help Egypt's transition succeed.

The administration is reviewing the October 9 decision, informed by credible progress on the interim government's political roadmap toward a sustainable, inclusive, and peaceful transition to democracy. As events develop in Egypt, we will be watching not only progress along the government's roadmap, but other aspects of the transition. We do not believe that having specific, public benchmarks for our review would contribute to our ability to influence the course of the transition.

In our recent conversations with the Egyptian Government, they have reiterated their commitment to completing their political roadmap. Maintaining flexibility to respond to, and influence, changing events on the ground is of critical importance in allowing us to advance our national interests. That is particularly true in our assistance relationship.

Question. Do you agree that Egypt's adherence to its peace treaty obligations with Israel is a fundamental criterion for U.S. support?

Answer. The United States has an unshakeable commitment to Israel's security. Adherence to Peace Treaty obligations is a fundamental to U.S. support for Egypt, and Egypt is meeting its obligations under the treaty.

U.S. assistance to Egypt will continue to advance peace and security between Egypt and Israel. The United States will work with Egypt's interim government to provide assistance that helps Egypt secure its borders and the Sinai; prevents the flow of weapons into Gaza that threaten Israel's vital security objectives; and counters extremism, terrorism, and proliferation.

Question. How should the United States balance our support for democratic values and respect for elected governments, with the reality that the Egyptian military has been a close ally of the U.S. and is playing a useful role in fighting radical Islamists in the Sinai and in Gaza? More broadly, how do we balance democracy vs. stability?

Answer. Egypt is a vital partner, and our longstanding relationship is predicated on our shared interests in a stable, democratic, and prosperous Egypt, securing regional peace and security, and countering extremism and terrorism. As President Obama said at the U.N. General Assembly, the United States will maintain a constructive relationship with the interim Egyptian Government that promotes core interests. Our relationship with the Egyptian Armed Forces has contributed to the implementation of the Peace Treaty with Israel and in other aspects of our cooperation.

The United States will at times work with governments that do not meet, at least in our view, the highest international expectations, but who work with us on our core interests. Nevertheless, we will not stop asserting principles that are consistent with our democratic ideals and our values. We are seeking to encourage a more democratic transition in Egypt. In fact, as Secretary Kerry emphasized during his November 3 visit to Cairo, progress along a more democratic transition can contribute to greater stability and calm, and thereby to economic growth and badly needed new foreign and domestic investment.