

**HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY
ASSISTANCE: INCREASING THE
EFFECTIVENESS OF U.S. FOREIGN AID
HEARING OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

2172 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.
9:30 A.M. EDT, THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 2010

**CHAired BY:
REP. HOWARD L. BERMAN (D-CA)**

**WITNESSES:
JENNIFER L. WINDSOR,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FREEDOM HOUSE;**

**THOMAS CAROTHERS, VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDIES, CARNEGIE
ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE;**

**ELISA MASSIMINO, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST;**

**LORNE W. CRANER, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL REPUBLICAN
INSTITUTE (IRI)**

Transcript by Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. BERMAN: The hearing will come to order. And in a moment, I'll recognize myself and the ranking member for up to seven minutes each to make opening statements. I'll then recognize the chair and ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight for up to three minutes for any opening remarks they would like to make. All other members will then have the opportunity to make one-minute opening statements if they wish to do so. And without objection, members may also place written statements in the record.

But before we begin the statements, I would, I really, enthusiastically want to extend a very warm welcome to Ted Deutch, who was appointed to the committee as a permanent member last month. That's why I have all those seats below him on the other side. Ted was elected to represent Florida's 19th district, a seat held by our former colleague, Bob Wexler, in a special election on April 13th.

As a member of the Florida State Senate, he wrote in past legislation that made Florida the first state in the nation to require the public pension funds divest from the companies that do business with Iran. And hopefully, in legislation we will pass soon, we will ensure that those kinds of state laws will stand up to potential judicial challenges.

Without objection, Mr. Deutch will be assigned to the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, the Subcommittee on Europe, and the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight. We are really very pleased to welcome you to the committee. We hope you enjoy this much as we do some of the time, and we look forward to working with you. Good to have you.

Now on to the hearing. This is the latest in the series of hearings on foreign assistance reform, one of the committee's highest priorities. In past hearings and in other fora, we have examined the proper role of the military in carrying out humanitarian and security assistance, the efficacy and structure of our development programs, and of course resource levels appropriate to meet our national security diplomatic and moral commitments around the globe. Today, we will focus on our government's efforts to promote human rights and democracy abroad, a foreign policy imperative that enjoys strong bipartisan support, and what we can do to make those programs more effective and efficient.

A core American principle is that all people should enjoy freedom of speech, expression and religion and freedom from tyranny, oppression, torture and discrimination. U.S. foreign policy should reflect and promote those core values. Not only because it implicates fundamental human freedoms, but also because it serves U.S. national interests.

Violent extremism that threatens U.S. national security flourishes where democratic governance is weak, justice is uncertain and legal avenues for change are in short supply. Efforts to reduce poverty and promote broad-based economic growth are more effective and sustainable in a political environment in which fundamental freedoms and the rule of law are respected, government institutions are broadly representative, corruption is held to a minimum.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

Regrettably, our human rights and democracy assistance programs continue to face obstacles that impede their effectiveness. With the fragmentation of resources and capabilities, gaps in the delivery of certain types of assistance and lack of flexibility, be it through presidential initiatives or congressional funding directives, taxpayers simply aren't getting an adequate return on their investment.

While those deficiencies are not unique to human rights and democracy, these programs are particularly sensitive and deserve special attention. We have seen how ham-handed attempts to insert the United States in the political processes of other countries runs the risk of failing to achieve meaningful reform, and either endangering those who have dared to speak out against the policies of their own governments.

To address these problems, we recently released a discussion paper on human rights and democracy assistance -- democracy assistance, which is available on our committee website that proposes a number of common sense solutions to these problems.

These proposed reforms such as requiring action plans to broaden civic participation and prevent human rights abuses, enhancing the democracy and governance functions of USAID, modernizing and codifying existing human rights statutes, and improving training for democracy and human rights officers will allow us to more effectively assist human rights defenders promote participatory forms of government and strengthen the rule of law.

Some may argue that these proposed reforms go too far while others may say they don't go far enough. Even on those points where there is agreement in principle, there are likely to be many challenges in operationalizing these ideas. We have tried to find the right balance among a variety of competing objectives such as increasing flexibility while maintaining consistency or assisting reformers without compromising their independence.

The purpose of the paper was to generate a robust discussion on these important issues and we welcome any comments from the witnesses, and at the appropriate time, other stakeholders, and members of the public. We will be scheduling meetings and roundtables in the near future for that purpose.

It's worth noting that our democracy assistance does not aim to impose a particular form of government on anyone. These funds help local partners build representative and accountable institutions in their own countries. They take the lead while we provide the training and resources that will enable them to be more successful.

Our programs include activities often carried out by nongovernmental organizations such as training judges and journalists, monitoring elections and encouraging the development of political parties and civil society organizations. On the human rights front, we have a two-fold task; providing support for defenders of internationally recognized human rights and ensuring that our aid stays out of the hands of violators.

Finally, I'd like to note that additional funding is not only -- is not the only key to advancing human rights and democracy abroad. Yes, increased resources such as those proposed by President Obama will certainly enhance our ability to protect human rights and promote

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

democratic governance. But equally important are our efforts to reform the current system of providing such funding.

In order to be responsible stewards of taxpayers' dollars, we owe it to the American people to make the system we have, function in a more effective, transparent and responsive manner.

We're fortunate today to have a distinguished panel of witnesses with us and we are interested in hearing your views on how we can more effectively assist those who champion the ideals upon which our nation was founded. And now, I'd like to turn to the ranking member, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen of Florida for her opening remarks.

REP. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN (R-FL): Thank you so much Mr. Chairman as always. And it's wonderful to see a packed house and congrats to have all these young people present today. I also welcome our fellow Floridian, Congressman Deutch, to our committee. He will be a valuable member.

Foreign assistance programs, as we utilize them today, are a relatively new concept. Most of our assistance programs today did not exist before the Second World War, 60 years ago. Some of our programs such as those for the promotion of democracy and the protection of human rights are in fact even more recent additions to our assistance efforts.

The relatively new and evolving nature of our democracy promotion programs argue strongly for ensuring that we have objective means of assessing their performance over the long term. Today with an annual budget for democracy promotion that is estimated to reach almost \$3 billion annually, we must also review the challenges that have arisen in the course of their implementation over the past three or four decades, and how best to address those in order to increase their efficiency and ensure that they advance U.S. interests and our priorities.

Some of the issues we must look at in order to improve our democracy assistance includes the need for better coordination of programs that are administered by a range of U.S. government agencies and nongovernmental organizations. Also the need for objective, quantifiable means of measuring the effectiveness of democracy assistance programs. Also, differing point of views on how to best implement such programs whether by targeting political entities, individuals and events by embedding them in other developments programs or by a combination of approaches. And finally, what is the proper role of democracy assistance in relation to our diplomacy in support of human rights and the expansion of democratic governance.

With regard to that last and very important point, I'm concerned that the United States is shying away from strong diplomacy in this vital area by failing to condemn and hold accountable, or even worse, by actually engaging directly with repressive regimes. While the recently released national security strategy includes two pages on the promotion of democracy and human rights, what matters is what is done, not just what is written.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

If a foreign aid for any objective including development is to be effective, we must have open and responsive governments and institutions so that we can track the use of our funds and ensure that they are not diverted into private bank accounts. Second, a lack of diplomatic focus on human rights and democracy will only embolden those dictators and corrupt rulers to consolidate their power. We need to ramp up our diplomacy in support of democracy while also targeting our assistance for this key challenge.

For example, while aggregate funding numbers may have increased, I have concerns about whether certain time-tested organizations such as the National Endowment for Democracy are maintaining their proper place in our budget priorities. The administration's request for NED for -- NED for fiscal year 2011 is nearly a 9 percent cut from fiscal year 2009 levels, and an 11 percent cut for an estimated -- for the estimated FY 2010 levels.

Assistance for Iranian civil society and the democratic opposition in Iran has to be considered a priority. As the Iranian people have intensified -- as the Iranian regime has intensified its crackdown on the Iranian people, the United States has actually reduced our support for democracy and human rights in Iran. While the budget for fiscal year 2009 requested \$65 million for the State Department's Iran democracy fund, the fund has now been scrapped. Its replacement, the Near East Regional Democracy Fund, has an unclear mission and has received significantly less funding.

These programming shifts and funding cuts have had a real and negative consequence. Funding must be moved from organizations whose commitment to the principles of democracy is questionable, such as the farce that's called the Organization of American States. And we should ship those funds to organizations that are consistent in their efforts on behalf of democracy. The United States puts 60 percent of the entire budget for the OAS while that organization pursues an agenda of appeasement toward repressive governments in our hemisphere.

The OAS position on Cuba, in spite of hundreds of political prisoners languishing in jail, having committed no crime but speaking on behalf of democracy, in spite of there being only one political party allowed to operate in Cuba -- the communist party, in spite of no labor unions allowed to operate, no human rights respected, what did the OAS do? It recently passed resolution lifting the 1962 suspension of Cuba from the OAS.

Following an attack on a prominent synagogue in Venezuela which highlighted the growing anti-Semitic campaign facilitated and tolerated by the Chavez regime, the then U.S. Ambassador to the OAS rightfully called for a condemnation. What did the OAS do? Nothing. And the secretary general expressed confidence in the Chavez system and its investigation of its -- of the incident. What a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Again, our diplomacy on behalf of those who are oppressed, and our commitment to democratic governance and the consolidation of democratic institutions must be strong, and it must be vigorous.

I thank our panel of witnesses this morning and I look forward to hearing their testimony on this important issue. Thank you as always, Mr. Chairman.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. BERMAN: All right. I thank the ranking member for her statement. And I'm pleased to yield three minutes to the chairman of the International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight subcommittee, Mr. Carnahan of Missouri.

REP. RUSS CARNAHAN (D-MO): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to start by adding my welcome to Ted Deutch, not only for being on the full committee, but the Middle East Subcommittee and Subcommittee on International Organizations. We really look forward to working with you and you'll be a great voice in what we do here.

Chairman Berman, Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, thank you for holding this hearing regarding human rights and democracy assistance.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight, I'm pleased we're examining this critical component of foreign assistance. And I want to look back to 1948. Our famous Missourian, Harry Truman, during his administration helped draft the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," which states, quote, "Whereas the people of the united nations have reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, and equal rights of men and women, have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom."

Much has changed since 1948 when Universal Declaration of Human Rights was signed. We've also witnessed great changes since 1961 when our Foreign Assistance Act was adopted by the Congress. Whether it's YouTube in Venezuela, Twitter in Iran or Google in China, we've seen traditional democracy and human rights assistance struggle to keep pace with the times. Foreign assistance needs to be modernized to meet current challenges. We need to ensure transparency, accountability of our funds. At the same time, there needs to be a much greater efficiency and flexibility.

We need to make better use of the broad range of all of the tools in our smart power arsenal and look at some basic commonsense measures. We should raise the profile of the Office of Democracy and Governance within USAID. We should streamline the reporting requirements, reduce the reporting burden on our missions abroad and focus on better leveraging those reports to promote fundamental democratic changes within countries.

Finally, we need to have a serious examination of the deficiencies in contract oversight. Way too much taxpayer money is being lost to waste, fraud and abuse particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan. The reputation of the U.S. as a beacon of freedom and human rights has also suffered in recent years. And in the current administration, we've seen efforts to protect basic freedoms at home and restore our image overseas. This approach has yielded significant benefits to our economic and our security interests.

I thank our leadership for having this hearing again today. I look forward to hearing from our distinguished panel on this critical and timely issue. I yield back.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired. My colleague from California, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Human Rights and Oversight, Mr. Rohrabacher. Three minutes.

REP. DANA ROHRABACHER (R-CA): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Today, in another part of town, they're marking a -- there is a commemoration of the third anniversary of the Victims of Communism Memorial. And I felt that it was more important for me to be here, continuing that fight rather than just memorializing that fight.

I just -- I remember Tom Lantos has played such an important part in making sure that the Victims of Communism Memorial was actually built. I was his partner in that endeavor. And it was a struggle simply to get it in some place in Washington and it's -- it's over in a corner now. Some people who have authority just didn't like the idea of commemorating all those millions of people that were Victims of Communism; they called it being belligerent and war-like to make that memorial.

Let me just note that standing up for freedom is not belligerence. It is an honorable and it is a part of our national heritage. Today -- and usually when we do not stand up for freedom or we do not meet that traditional element of America's heritage, we lose.

Today marks the first anniversary of the uprising in Iran after the phony elections that the mullahs had -- that kept them in power. We all remember that one year ago today, the body of Neda, a young journalist, laid there in the streets for the world to see. What we didn't see of course were the other bodies that were in the streets, that were destroyed and murdered by the mullah regime and the others that have been murdered by that regime over the years.

What is happening in Iran is a failure of the United States long ago to make human rights a priority and for us to assist in any way that we could, those people who would fight for democracy and human rights in Iran. This takes -- leads me to the main point, which is policy. American policy is much more important than funding. It is America standing up for its principles, not just how much money we're dishing out that makes a difference.

Ronald Reagan's very aggressive assertion that the Soviet Union was an evil empire was far more important than even the increases in military spending during his administration. His -- in fact, I was very proud to be part of Reagan's administration, one of his principal speech writers. And I know that his speech at the British Parliament in which he established the National Endowment for Democracy was a huge turning point, I believe, in the struggle for freedom throughout the world. These are things that I think that we must -- (inaudible) -- said it already.

Well, thank you Mr. Chairman. We have a challenge in China, as well as radical Islam, and we must stand up for human rights. That's how we succeed.

REP. BERMAN: Time --

REP. ROHRABACHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired. Does any member of the committee seek to -- opening statement? The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Green is recognized for one minute.

REP. GENE GREEN (D-TX): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding the hearing today. And I'd like to welcome our witnesses. Promoting human rights and democracy around the world is an important and worthwhile strategic goal of American foreign policy; the United States must remain a global leader in this area. And I've long believed that the best way for us to show this leadership is through soft assistance to other countries. This is accomplished through foreign assistance programs which involve a team of different organizations, each playing different roles.

We're here today as part of that team and the role we play is to find ways to reform and strengthen the structure of these programs so they can be more flexible, accountable, and efficient. Promoting human rights and democracy is a bipartisan foreign policy objective to finding ways to make our foreign aid programs more effective, should be likewise, a bipartisan effort. It's important to remember that providing soft assistance to countries helps us promote American values and interests around the world, and avoid the need for possible complicated and expensive interventions.

Mr. Chairman, having been to both Afghanistan, and watch what our foreign assistance is trying to do with our military in alternative crops, and watching it also in Latin America, I think there's -- we realize it's so much cheaper to provide foreign assistance than it is to activate the 101st Airborne or 82nd Airborne. So with that, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired. Is there anyone else -- Mr. Smith, from New Jersey is recognized for one minute.

REP. CHRIS H. SMITH R-NJ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I want to welcome our very distinguished panel of human rights activists and leaders. Thank you for calling this hearing along with Ranking Member Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

I just -- you know, with the TIP report findings coming out on Monday -- due to come out on Monday, I am very concerned that countries where there has been an egregious erosion of human rights, relative to a whole number of areas, but especially in the area of human trafficking, that countries like China, Vietnam, and India, we'll be looking very carefully to see if they are on the list of tier 3 countries. My hope is no matter what the remedy or penalties that might be prescribed after that, we need to speak truth to power to each of those countries about what is truly going on in the area of human trafficking.

And also, Mr. Chairman, I remain very concerned that now, a year and a quarter into this administration, to the best of my knowledge, we still do not have an ambassador at large to run the International Religious Freedom Office, that is a revelation of priorities. It is, I think, a serious mistake by this administration, and I hope that they soon name that person.

REP. BERMAN: Time of the gentleman has expired. Anyone else seek recognition? The Gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Scott, is recognized for one minute.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. DAVID SCOTT (D-GA): Yeah, thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I just want to say real briefly that as a member of the committee and one like many on this committee who travel, we want to get a very good compliment to our foreign aid or foreign service workers, many of them in places where their lives are on the line.

But I must add that we have an efficiency problem of how we effectively use our resources, and we've got to address that. And I'm very hopeful that this hearing will certainly accomplish that purpose. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. BERMAN: Further request for time, the gentleman from -- Mr. Royce, the gentleman from California is recognized for one minute.

REP. ED ROYCE (R-CA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last month, the State Department hosted a Chinese delegation in Washington for two days of what we call human rights dialogue. And according to State's point man on human rights there, we didn't tell China anything, this was a discussion among two important countries.

I think for me, the comments by the assistant secretary of state, Michael Posner. He said he brought up the new Arizona immigration law early and often. And also noted, quote, "a troubling trend in our society, and an indication that we have to deal with issues of discrimination."

I regret very much that he is not here today. And I think he should be before this committee to clarify why he chose to focus on these issues as opposed to China's abysmal record that includes religious repression, extrajudicial killings, prison camps, no freedom of expression, not to mention the forced repatriation of North Korean refugees back across the border to face certain death.

There are credible reports China has been harvesting the organs of religious minorities.

The human rights situation in communist China is beyond grim, but to hear State describe it, we've got the same issues. This downplaying of China's despicable human rights record is deplorable.

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Connolly, is recognized for one minute.

REP. GERALD E. CONNOLLY (D-VA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to welcome our panelists here. And I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having this hearing. I particularly want to tie it to our pending rewrite of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The whole question of democratization -- building democratic institutions and human rights have many elements that are similar to conditions that prevailed 50 years ago, but a lot has changed.

And so, in the post-Cold War world, is it not time to revisit some of these issues and make sure that the institutions we support are well-structured to promote the values and the institutions we want to see succeed. And so, I'm looking forward to this hearing, Mr.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

Chairman, and I continue to enjoy and look forward to working with you in this ongoing effort to make sure we take cognizance of those changing circumstances in that all-important rewrite. Thank you, and I yield back.

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. McMahon.

REP. MICHAEL E. MCMAHON (D-NY): Thank you Mr. Chairman, and thank you for convening this very important hearing, and thank the witnesses for coming. Mr. Chairman, Alexis de Tocqueville had once said that "The greatness of America lies not in being more enlightened than any other nation, but rather in her ability to repair her faults." I believe that this committee's efforts to increase the effectiveness of foreign aid are embodied in this quote.

The NGOs that work to promote democracy, protect women's rights and health, and increase opportunities for the poor, to direct them away from terrorism need fast and effective aid to achieve these worthwhile objectives. However, one thing that U.S. agencies seem to struggle with is the issue of relative importance, and of relative performance.

No country has a spotless human rights record, and the challenges in developing countries are even greater. Trying to distinguish between countries that are relatively better on human rights, and whose governments are taking the right steps becomes difficult when incidents arise.

If the expectation of a perfect record is not realistic, how can decision-makers decide what is good enough. And we must also focus on women's rights as we go forward and make that a very important issue.

Thank you Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time.

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired. And the chair is unaware of anyone else seeking recognition for an opening statement. So we will now -- I have the pleasure of introducing our panel, and the hearing from them. And it's 10:00, that's -- we started the hearing at 9:30, we get the witnesses by 10:00. That's good.

Thomas Carothers is vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He oversees the endowment's Middle East program, Carnegie Europe, and the Democracy and Rule of Law Program which he founded. Mr. Carothers has worked on democracies -- democracy assistance projects for many public and private organizations, and carried out extensive field research on democracy- building programs around the world. He also has significant experience in the field of development, human rights, comparative politics, international institutions, and foreign aid.

Lorne Craner is president of the International Republican Institute, previously served as assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights, and labor. A member of the Council on Foreign Relations, Mr. Craner has testified on numerous occasions before House and

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

Senate committees, and I've had the pleasure of having a chance to meet with him in the past on democracy promotion issues.

Jennifer Windsor is the executive director at Freedom House. Previously he -- she served as deputy assistant administrator and director of the Center for Democracy and Governance at the U.S. Agency for International Development. Ms. Windsor began her service at USAID working on democracy and governance issues in Africa, and also served as special assistant deputy chief of staff to then-USAID administrator, Brian Atwood.

Elisa Massimino is president and chief executive officer of Human Rights First, where she has worked for almost two decades. Previously, she was a litigator in private practice at a Washington law firm, where she was pro bono counsel in many human rights cases. Ms. Massimino writes frequently for mainstream publications and specialized journals, and has testified before Congress, dozens of times.

We're pleased to have all of you here. Mr. Carothers, why don't you start?

MR. CAROTHERS: Thank you very much --

REP. BERMAN: And of course everyone's opening statements in their entirety will be included in the record, and feel free where appropriate to summarize.

MR. CAROTHERS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. It's my pleasure to be here today. Supporting democracy abroad is a vital part of U.S. foreign policy. Democracy assistance programs are a crucial tool in that goal. A well-crafted rewrite of the Foreign Assistance Act can help make democracy assistance more effective.

I appear before the committee today as someone who studies democracy assistance. I try to understand what works and what doesn't, how we can make it better. I'm often known as a critic, because I think we often fall short of our ideals and our aspirations. But I'm a critic who believes in the overall endeavor. And my critical comments, both today and in general, are aimed at that larger goal.

The committee has before it, many questions and issues with regard to democracy and human rights assistance, one of which is clearly on the committee's mind, is whether or not there are too many sources of democracy aid in the U.S. government. There sometimes appears to be almost a chaotic salad bar of institutions involved, and one can wonder, is there unnecessary duplication and the lack of coordination in this area.

I understand the instinct to worry about this, but I don't think that's the central problem. Democracy assistance is complicated. There's a lot of different parts to it; many different places, many different themes. It's useful having different organizations that develop different strengths and weaknesses.

Also, democracy aid has a complex relationship to U.S. foreign policy. Sometimes it's good to have democracy aid coming from the State Department, where it's directly integrated into policy. Sometimes it's good to have it come in from a nongovernmental organization like the

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

National Endowment where it's at arms length. Having a variety of institutions gives you more flexibility, a greater range of tools in democracy assistance.

Moreover, I don't really see coordination as a problem. And I do a lot of research on the ground asking people what could make this assistance better. People working on the ground in the different parts of the U.S. government, the different agencies and organizations talk to each other, they know what they're doing, there isn't a lot of problem with coordination or tripping over each other.

So where do the problems then lie? I think the problems lie more in how the assistance is being given out. And the key to improve it is not to reduce the number of sources but to make each source work as effectively as possible. And I'd like to focus in my time here on USAID, which is the big fish in this pool. USAID is by far the largest source of democracy assistance, well over a billion dollars a year.

In fact, USAID has devoted more resources, more energy, and more time to democracy assistance than any organization in the world in the last 25 years. USAID has done many valuable things in this domain, but time is short, so I'll cut to the quick. USAID's democracy assistance has serious problems, reflecting serious problems that have been facing the agency for many years.

First and foremost, it's extremely bureaucratic. Our assistance, unfortunately, is often inflexible.

It's cookie-cutter, it's slow, it's cumbersome. Democracy aid needs the opposite; you need innovation and flexibility, the chance to seize opportunities. But USAID is weighted down by a bureaucratized system that makes it often ineffective on the ground. It means a serious bureaucratic cleaning of the house, a de-bureaucratization.

I ask the committee and the House not to think of putting more and more procedures, regulations, requirements on an agency that's already in a sense groaning underneath those that weigh upon it. It doesn't need obviously to be let loose from legislation, but it needs freedom, it needs the air to breathe, it needs the possibility of de- bureaucratizing itself and operating more in the spirit of democracy itself.

Secondly, USAID does not give enough roles to the people in the countries with which it's trying to work. Too often when it does a project, it hires some Americans to come and design it, another set of Americans to come in and implement it, a third set of Americans to come and evaluate it. This isn't the way you choose local institutions. There needs to be a change in spirit and practice here.

I don't mean that we should necessarily just give money directly to the local people, but we need to give money in a way -- sometimes the U.S. organization, sometimes directly to locals, that allows them to have real partnerships with Americans, to have long-term relationships, not short-term projects in which Americans come and just tell them what to do.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

Third, USAID has been doing democracy work for 25 years; but still doesn't give a strong enough place within the agency. If you go to USAID and ask who is the most senior person responsible for democracy issues. Not the administrator, not the deputy administrator, not an assistant administrator, it's the deputy assistant administrator, of whom there must be dozens at the agency. Yet we claim that this is the central priority of the agency. There needs to be an elevation in a number of ways, which I could go into in the questions and answers, to elevate the place of democracy within the USAID.

What will it take to do these things; de-bureaucratize, to strengthen local actors, to give a greater place. Above all, leadership from the agency derived from the top, this is an agency that responds to central imperatives from the leadership and a willingness to focus on these often less glamorous bureaucratic procedural procurement issues that really are the thing that makes the agency ineffective or effective depending on how they carry it out.

It will also require the support of Congress. And as I said, it will require Congress to have a helping and a sort of a thoughtful, and itself a nimble hand in helping USAID achieve its potential, rather than just simply try to impose upon it more and more procedures, regulations, rules that are already to some extent suffocating the agency.

I ask that the remainder of my written testimony be entered into the record, and I thank you for the opportunity to appear today.

REP. BERMAN: Well, thank you very much. And as I indicated, all of the statement will be in the record in its entirety.

Mr. Craner?

MR. CRANER: Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman Ros-Lehtinen, and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I commend you for calling this hearing on ways to better help the oppressed abroad. When I joined the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor some years ago, a friend of mine named Ken Kimble (ph), who was just coming out of the administration gave me a piece of advise that I didn't believe at the time.

He told me that in advancing human rights and democracy in the administration, my best friends would be here in the halls of Congress, and learned that he was right. Congress is a branch of our government that most closely represents the American people who are good and decent and they want a foreign policy that reflects those traits.

For those reasons, three decades ago, Congress created my own bureau, DRL. Over administration objection, the Congress mandated human rights reports. In the last 10 years, Congress, each time over administration objection, created State Department offices to combat anti-Semitism and combat trafficking and to further religious freedom.

Congress also passed the ADVANCE Democracy Act recently after much back and forth with the Bush administration. These actions all greatly enhanced our efforts to promote

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

human rights and democracy. Today, we face tougher obstacles abroad and more action is needed.

As I told Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice after I had left the administration, but when I headed the State Department's advisory committee on democracy promotion, our government bureaucracy is not organized to deliver on presidential promises on democracy and human rights.

AID's democracy capabilities are weak, career officials need to be better trained and incentivized. There is an excess of bureaucracy at the State Department on this issue, and better coverage is needed across the field. The paper being circulated by the majority addresses many of these issues.

My written statement has a comprehensive rundown of my views including some additional thoughts on the paper's provisions. But I believe that those upgrading AID's democracy office requiring mission plans, consolidating reporting requirements, and requiring diplomat training, and assignment to functional bureaus have special merit.

I would commend my friend Tom Carothers' paper to you. It describes additional problems and solutions for AID. I hope, as do Tom and I think Jennifer, that AID can be revitalized. If not, in a tough budget climate, an amount of democracy funding should be deducted from AID with part going to the more efficient DRL and NED and the remainder frankly going to reduce the budget.

Other changes I suggest are addressing the creeping bureaucratization of DRL, and the much worse value less bureaucratization of the "F process." Mr. Chairman, I believe there is another reason to act.

As I described it in my written testimony, the Obama administration is facing many of the same questions on human rights that were faced early in the Reagan administration, almost 30 years ago. Both succeeded unpopular presidents whose foreign policy problems were seemed to have been based on a misplaced concern with human rights.

And early, in both administrations, the concern about human rights was downgraded. In Reagan's case, congressional reaction, including by the then Republican Senate helped bring the administration around within 17 months of his inaugural. In fact, 28 years ago, this week, President Reagan delivered the Westminster speech which was referred to earlier.

He had re-crafted Carter's policy, but he also added a strategy and the means the NED and vital diplomacy to accomplish it. From the editorial pages of the Post and New York Times, the dictators, Democrats, and dissidents abroad, the current administration's human rights and democracy policies had been found wanting.

President has delivered a good number of speeches on this issue, and the recent national security strategy is a good addition. But 17 months into his administration, he has not put in place his strategy and the means to build on the 30-year bipartisan policy that preceded him.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

In the past, whether it was a Republican or Democrat Congress or Republican or Democrat president, Congress when it has found the administration wanting, has taken action and brought forth legislation that helped put us back on track. Today, we'll be reviewing some of those proposals. Whether they are considered as part of a larger bill or on their own, I hope the Congress will soon act. Thank you.

REP. BERMAN: Windsor?

MS. WINDSOR: Chairman Berman, distinguished member of the committee, thank you for convening this important hearing. Thank you. I want to start by complimenting your staff on the excellent discussion paper on human rights and democracy.

Freedom House supports many of the changes proposed in that paper. We believe that the U.S. should advance democracy and human rights as an end in itself, as well as a way to advance other U.S. interests.

In particular, we welcome the fact that the draft presidential study directive appropriately prioritizes and recognizes the role of democratic governance in U.S. development policy. If there is anything that we have learned from good development policy, is that it has to take into account the political structures and democratic governance as a vehicle in which to achieve better development.

We are in a time, unfortunately, of a global freedom recession, as our various studies have shown. Of particular concern is the assault on and erosion of fundamental freedoms of association and expression, the very freedoms upon which democratic systems that respect human rights are based.

International human rights defenders have asked for more U.S. support and more U.S. leadership in these areas. As you can see from the action plan that came out of the Washington Human Rights Summit we convened with Elisa and Human Rights First, earlier this year.

I want to now turn to current U.S. capacity to handle these challenges. The committee discussion paper notes and several of my co-panelists have noted the problem of multiple actors. But we actually agreed that while there might be a need for better coordination, that consolidating democracy and human rights programs into any one entity either within or outside of the U.S. government would be very counterproductive. Federalism, in this case, has supported innovation.

While Tom Carothers has already mentioned the problems of USAID, I want to add my two cents, since I worked there for almost 10 years before I came to Freedom House. I believe that USAID needs a strong central unit to complement and guide the work done by USAID field missions.

The current office of democracy and governance needs more human, more financial resources and more policy influence. I wholeheartedly agree with the paper's recommendation that the democracy and human rights office, staff and programs be

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

removed from Humanitarian Conflict Bureau and elevated within the agency to a bureau that is on par with the other development sectors.

More broadly though, in talking about all parts of the U.S. government, we need more discussion on what the proper role for any official from the U.S. government should actually be in managing democracy and human rights programs. While of course, we expect our government officials to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently, excessive government control and involvement can be counterproductive.

It can stifle innovation and programming and prevent programming that is flexible in responses to the needs on the ground. The very lessons that we have learned from Tom Carothers and other studies is that we need to be more flexible and more able to change in this area.

And I'm worried that we're seeing too much micromanagement from U.S. government officials that are pushed by a number of pressures, including from the Hill, in this area.

I now want to turn to the issue of results. Many of the members here mentioned the need to make sure that there is efficiency and effectiveness of our programs. I want to -- we have problems, a number of problems with the current system that has been put in place with F process. The agency and now the state department have been struggling with the issues of results for many, many years.

We -- I want to just make a couple of points about the area of democracy and human rights, which I think provides unique challenges in this area. First, attributing progress in a country to specific U.S. government funded programs may undermine the very legitimacy of groups and individuals that are the intended beneficiaries of that -- of those resources.

If you say that assistance to Ukraine brought about the Ukrainian own revolution in Ukraine, that delegitimizes the very people that were -- brought about that change. U.S. programs absolutely help, but that doesn't mean that they've been -- they themselves are the cause for the change.

Second, context matters a great deal in what results in democracy and human rights can be achieved. In a relatively open country like Nigeria, a program to support human rights groups can result perhaps in a change of law or change in practice that better protects human rights. But in a situation like Ethiopia, the mere survival of independent human rights groups represents an important achievement, given the Ethiopian government's attempts to try to stifle all civil society activity in this area.

Third, in this time of a downward trend in freedom around the world, the system must impact measurement, and expectations must be adapted to realities. It maybe enough that the situation does not get worse. Fourth, in places like Burma, North Korea, Uzbekistan, Iran, the U.S. should be providing a lifeline of support to human rights defenders regardless of whether there are measurable results.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

I would like to finish by being a bit provocative. The term "country ownership" has come up in the broader context of foreign aid reform. We fear that this term maybe misinterpreted to mean that governments should be able to veto the kind of assistance that the U.S. or others provide in a country. The Obama administration has made a series of very bad decisions in this regard.

They have recently zeroed out funding for democracy and governance and human rights in Bolivia, at the request of the government there. They have limited USAID funding in China, Russia, Uzbekistan and Egypt only to registered organizations, when we know that such registration processes are being used to control or eliminate quote, "undesirable activities of human rights groups."

Meanwhile the State Department is moving ahead with plans to set up a \$300 million Mubarak-Obama endowment for Egypt. This is country ownership in its worst form. Let me state for the record that we oppose the U.S. government signing any agreement that gives authoritarian governments veto power over U.S. support for democracy and human rights.

Similarly, we oppose any attempts that attempt to involve governments in determining what is responsible NGO behavior or regulation of the independent media in the Internet. In these cases, the governments always are the problem.

I want to end by recognizing the efforts of this committee to move forward the process of U.S. foreign assistance reform. I thank you for the opportunity to appear today.

REP. BERMAN: Ms. Massimino, and I apologize for mispronounce your name. It's not a name I'm familiar with. (Laughter.)

Go ahead.

MS. MASSIMINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too appreciate the opportunity to be here today, to share our recommendations on this important issue. The existing statutory framework for foreign assistance is sorely in need of an overhaul after nearly half a century. And we are very grateful for your leadership, Mr. Chairman, and that of this entire committee in tackling this challenge head on.

I want to echo my colleagues' thanks to the committee staff who have consulted widely with stakeholders as part of this process. My comments today will focus on the committee's Human Rights and Democracy Discussion Paper that you referenced. Human Rights First, along with a number of other groups, have put forward two sets of recommendations to committee over the last several months, and I've attached those as part of my testimony and ask that they be made part of the record.

Our views on this issue are also shaped by the recommendations which came out of the summit that Jennifer mentioned that we co-hosted with Freedom House, here in Washington in February, which brought together activists from over two dozen countries to discuss the challenges they are facing, and to formulate recommendations to governments for how to strengthen support for those on the frontlines, including this government and

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

actions by this government. So I ask that those recommendations be part of the record as well.

REP. BERMAN: Without objection, that will be included.

MS. MASSIMINO: Thank you. Let me begin by saying that we very much welcome the overall approach in the committee's discussion paper.

That includes a number of the recommendations that we put forward. That said, legislative reform has to be a lot more ambitious in order to meet the objectives that the committee has set out.

I'd like to highlight three principles that we believe are to guide those efforts. The first relates to much of what we've heard today -- and including from members of the committee is, do no harm.

It's essential that the U.S. assistance, especially security assistance, does not undermine respect for human rights or democratic governance, or lend legitimacy to governments that violate fundamental rights. Where possible, assistance should provide incentives to encourage recipients to improve their human rights performance.

Second, foreign assistance that's specifically designed to achieve human rights outcomes must be based on a clear strategy and operate through multiple channels in order to be effective.

And third, a new statutory framework for foreign assistance ought to strengthen the infrastructure to advance human rights throughout the government, not just at the State Department and AID. A whole of government approach to advancing human rights and democracy should result in reinforcing messages and consistent political support for human rights from all parts of the government.

Let me elaborate briefly on each of these principles. In the area of doing no harm, the committee's discussion draft rightly prioritizes an effective minimum standard of human rights compliance before permitting a country to receive U.S. aid, and highlights the need to evaluate existing assistance to determine its impact on human rights.

We recommend that the legislation build incentives that will help move recipients of assistance away from practices that violate human rights. This could be done by establishing an annual process for determining which recipients of U.S. security assistance have significant human rights problems, and such a finding could result in withholding a certain percentage of security assistance, both state and DOD-funded, until specified improvements are achieved.

Congress ought to authorize affirmative assistance to help those governments meet improvement benchmarks and avoid having their aid permanently reduced. In the absence of effective conditionality on foreign security assistance fuels the damaging impression that

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

the United States government condones or even supports human rights violations committed by recipient security forces and governments.

Such impressions are harmful to broader U.S. national security interests, and represent a significant cost that should be taken into consideration when objections are raised suggesting that applying human rights conditions will complicate or worsen vital strategic relationships. Another aspect of this principle of "do no harm" is that we have to ensure that the way in which U.S. foreign assistance is delivered doesn't undermine the basic political freedoms that the assistance is designed to promote.

For example, as Jennifer pointed out, we should not be acceding to the demands of other governments to vet or restrict U.S. foreign assistance to independent human rights organizations. Those kinds of arrangements create the impression that governments hold the veto power over the way the U.S. funds are dispersed and restrict access to much needed support for very vulnerable local human rights defenders.

We very much welcome the discussion paper's focus on strengthening the Leahy Law and incorporating it directly into the statutory framework for foreign aid. Restrictions on aid to security units who have committed severe violations of human rights with impunity are vital in upholding the "do no harm" principle.

We strongly endorse the expansion of the Leahy Law to units of recipient governments, beyond the security forces, which should include the police. And we also welcome expansion to aid provided by the Defense Department. The Defense Department has become, as you know, a huge donor of foreign aid.

One estimate has the DOD at 8.9 billion (dollars) in military aid worldwide in Fiscal Year 2009, outstripping all the programs administered by the State Department. It's essential that we bring transparency and oversight to that process as well as bring DOD aid squarely under human rights policy.

To do that right, there has to be a good process for gathering evidence of human rights violations and including adequate funding to do that oversight. So we recommend that this be supported by a fee on security assistance to help shore up the infrastructure design to do that.

We also welcome the discussion draft's emphasis on human rights and democracy action plans, that's something that we have called for, for many years. These are essential building blocks, and affirmative assistance ought to be funded as a part of an overall strategy embodied in those plans.

USAID human rights assistance, in particular, should be tied directly to a multi-agency strategy to promote human rights in a specific country, rather than being derivative of an overall AID country strategy. Those action plans should include strategies to import and -- to support independent human rights groups and they ought to be involved in the development of those strategies.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

In our view, it would be a mistake to view assistance designed to advance respect for human rights as a subset of democracy assistance, as the discussion draft seems to suggest. Human rights and democracy are inextricably connected. Only when human rights are respected can democracy be secured.

Yet, it's also possible, and sometimes it's critically important to advance human rights objectives through affirmative assistance in non-democratic countries or in countries where the strategy to promote democracy is unclear. In those countries, support can be provided to human rights defenders to enhance their efforts to document violations, advocate before international bodies, and raise public awareness.

That's critically important if we're going to build the civil society to advance human rights and democracy. The Discussion Draft proposes strengthening the democracy and human rights functions at AID. And while AID can certainly do more to advance human rights objectives, we would caution against an over-reliance on that approach.

I think this is consistent with what you've heard from all of the witnesses. Decision-making there is heavily concentrated in field missions, and for many of the development objectives, the mission works closely with host government, in some cases as it should. But that just underscores for us the need for a multiplicity of actors in this area and against consolidation.

As part of the mix, the State Department's lead bureau with human rights and democracy promotion, DRL has to have sufficient capacity to do this. That really underscores the necessity for building up all of the levers of our power.

One important recommendation out of the Human Rights Summit that we heard from our human rights colleagues was that the United States needs to facilitate, support and strengthen engagement by independent civil society organizations in regional and sub-regional multilateral bodies. And we would welcome an emphasis on that and specific attention to supporting those efforts.

Finally, in our view, none of this works unless there is a whole-of-government approach. This goes a bit to what Ms. Ros-Lehtinen mentioned about consistency in our diplomacy. A lot of the infrastructure of U.S. government to advance human rights globally is embedded and traced to the Foreign Assistance Act, the country reports. And any rewriting of that should strengthen the ability of the entire government not only to deliver more effective assistance, but also to ensure that the rhetorical commitment of the -- as to universal human rights is backed up with committed action as a foreign policy priority.

For those plans, those country plans to work, they need to exist more than just on paper. They have to become part of the fabric of the U.S. approach to every country across all government agencies. That requires leadership from the top and its going to require consistent oversight from you all here. And there has to be somebody in charge of implementing those plans.

That could be the U.S. ambassador, the chief of mission, but there needs to be somebody designated. And of course, there has to be sufficient resources. That's got to be backed up by

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

sufficient resources and attention here in Washington. And we think that the regional bureau in the State Department, each of them should have a deputy assistant secretary devoted to human rights.

In conclusion, I just want to point out that in the National Security Strategy that President Obama released just recently was structured around looking at the world as it is and the world as we want it to be. And we see foreign aid as a critical vehicle from getting us to point -- from point A to point B. And this is the moment when our U.S. interests and values are so aligned, to align our foreign aid structure to those values. And we look forward to working with the committee to seize that opportunity.

Thank you.

REP. BERMAN: Well, thank you and thank all of you very much.

Now, we will go to the comments and questions of the panel of -- under the five-minute rule. That means if the question takes 4 minutes and 55 seconds, the panelists have 5 seconds to answer.

I will recognize myself for five minutes, and there are many questions to ask and I won't be able to raise all the issues I would like to pursue with you, but let me start with this. And I do this notwithstanding what could be interpreted as Ms. Windsor's admonition regarding -- but I take her point not so much as crediting America for something happening. You do have to measure effectiveness of programs and that requires some discussion of what's happened as a result of programs.

In a recent briefing to committee staff, a senior government official claimed we don't really know how to do governance and democracy programs. And that devoting additional funds to this area and presumably, continuing to fund what is -- at the current levels would be a waste because they have failed to achieve tangible results.

Do you agree with that assessment? Can you provide meaningful examples of where our democracy and governance programs have achieved meaningful results?

MS. WINDSOR: Well, I'll start to say, I absolutely agree with you that we should be knowing whether programs are actually good programs or making a difference, whether they get attributed to U.S. or not. I'm sorry to hear about the senior government official; there's at least 20 or 30 briefing books that are in AID and the State Department on different results measurement, and there's actually an onsite book that's prepared on this and I'm sure I could recommend some reading.

But -- so let's talk about what kind of results one can see. And I will use Freedom House programs because those, I think it sort of concretizes it. So we -- when DRL -- when Lorne was the head of the assistant secretary for DRL, we received funding for an independent -- to try to set up an independent printing press in Kyrgyzstan. Because there was no alternative capacity to that of the state and states and the region to print alternative

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

newspapers; it was a way that the government used to try to control the free flow of information.

The U.S. invested in this. Everyone said technically there is no way that it could be helpful. And now there is actually a printing press that works. There's opposition newspapers that are -- that have been printed on it. There is a lot of other things that have been printed on it. The state printing press has upgraded its capabilities. Has this changed democratic development in Kyrgyzstan?

No, as we can see, during that time Kyrgyzstan has gone through a number of political changes. It's not responsible for that, but I would say this result is an example of a good investment.

We were talking about the issue of women's rights. In Jordan, a program that we had with working with Jordanian human rights and women's rights organizations to look at honor crimes. We had brought a lot more awareness to the issue.

And one of the parts of raising awareness was to look at how courts actually treated these issues. So we monitored with our local partners, hundreds of cases. And out of that, the recommendation was that there needed to be a specialized court chamber to hear cases in a more equitable manner. And that was put in place.

Now, again, I think that that was a good recommendation. Is there still a problem in terms of treatment of women in Jordan? Yes. Have we -- do we think that this is an effective use of money to be able to advance the process? Yes.

REP. BERMAN: Let me just (hold ?) because there's only a minute remaining, are there - anybody else want to weigh in on this?

MR. CRANER: I would. I was kind of shocked to hear you say that. It makes me wonder where this diplomat has been for the last 25 years. I think if you talked to folks in the Philippines, or Chile, or Serbia, or Indonesia, or Georgia or Moldova and many other places, I know that they say our aid has been effective.

I'll tell you a story which is I was in Bratislava, Slovakia, talking to Mikulas Dzurinda who defeated Meciar in the 1998 election. And I said this place looks a lot different. I'd driven in from the airport; there was lot more economic activity. There was clearly a lot of investments. There was an even an Ikea up by the airport.

And he -- I said now you are in the EU and NATO, I said this is all due to you, you know, to your presidency from '98 to 2002. And he said, no, it's not, it's all due to you. It's all due to the assistance that you gave us. He said without your assistance, we could not have done this.

Jennifer is right, this is -- measuring this is -- it's an art, not a science. This is not like how many kids did you immunize, or did the (DMD ?) approach, or how many miles of road did

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

you build, and it is measurable. And I'd be happy to brief your staff on some of the work we at IRI have been doing. But the foreigners are our best evidence that it works.

REP. BERMAN: Thank you very much. My time has expired.

I yield to the ranking member, five minutes.

REP. ROS-LEHTINEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Three country-specific questions. On Iran, should the Iran democracy fund be restored, and if so, what should its specific objectives and performance benchmarks be? On Cuba, the Cuban regime's imprisonment of U.S. citizen Alan Gross has effectively put U.S. democracy assistance to Cuba on hold for months, playing directly into the dictatorship's hands. Do you believe that the administration should continue to allow the Cuban regime to dictate our assistance to freedom seekers on the island?

And finally, on Haiti. Keeping in mind the relatively perhaps the fate of Haiti's government, what role do you think democracy assistance should play in the U.S.' immediate and long-term assistance and funding to Haiti?

Thank you.

Lorne, let's start with you.

MR. CRANER: Let me talk a little about Cuba first. I have also found this very, very frustrating. I understand, you know, reluctance to -- on the surface or reluctance to continue the programs, but I think with a few minutes of thought we ought to be able to get past us.

There are many, many programs that have been done over the years in a similar fashion. I don't hear any complaining about this kind of program going on in Zimbabwe. I don't hear any complaining about this kind of programming going on in Burma or North Korea and many other places; it seems to be focused on Cuba.

REP. ROS-LEHTINEN: Thank you. If I could have the others discuss Iran and Haiti then.

MS. WINDSOR: Well, let me comment on Iran. I think it's less important where the Iran program is placed.

If in fact, it provides less rhetorical interference by putting it under a regional program, I think that is -- that's not a problem. The problem is what's it's actually focusing on and what the approach is.

And some of the decisions have been made that we don't agree with programs that have been cut off and other programs that have been funded. And it's very hard to figure out what strategy is. We think that priority for assistance should be given to political prisoners,

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

refugees and Internet in securing digital communications. It seems like if we have a number of very critical areas, we identify the priorities and let's drive towards those.

REP. ROS-LEHTINEN: Thank you. And on Haiti, if I could have the other two speak.

MS. MASSIMINO: I wanted to add a word on Iran, if I could. Obviously, assistance to a country like Iran, it's incredibly complicated. And from our perspective, it's very important to take into account the use of the activists inside the society. We have to be really careful, I think as Jennifer pointed out, to focus on what objectives we're trying to achieve there. And we have to be very careful not to conflate regime change with human rights promotion. That's essential.

I'd very much agree with what Jennifer said about where we should be focusing our assistance on -- the political prisoners, human rights activists who are so much under siege.

REP. ROS-LEHTINEN: Thank you.

Lorne.

MR. CRANER: I think you know IRI no longer operates in Haiti. I think that the lessening of our democracy assistance there was a big mistake. There is a lot of talk about country ownership coming out of the administration. I don't know how our country can own some of the programs that we want them to own, absent a functioning government. That seems to be a big problem in Haiti.

So to now cut off the assistance to try and help build a functioning government, it seems to me we're going to be giving a lot of aid there for a long time since we are the only effective actor.

MR. CRANER: Thank you.

Mr. Carothers.

MR. CAROTHERS: I'd add a word on Iran that I think the impulse of the United States government to try to do everything that it can to support democracy in Iran is commendable, but we also have to be realistic in understanding what's possible. The kind of efforts that Lorne described in Slovakia that did produce such positive results and really a wonderful legacy are impossible or difficult if not impossible to carry out in Iran because of the lack of political space there.

So we have to be careful in thinking about what kind of opportunities there are there to carry out the sort of training, or other kinds of technical assistance that we do in other places. And so I think with Iran, it isn't the amount of the money that's important; it's the care and the sensitivity and the thought with which we do such programs.

On Haiti, we have to use this effort of reconstruction. If you just pile on to a country lots and lots of reconstruction money and don't try to integrate the new inception in Haiti, when

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

are we ever going to get past the failed state problem in Haiti and build that into the reconstruction effort -- then we are simply repeating the mistakes of the past. I worked on Haiti in the late 1980s, and we haven't moved much beyond that. So reconstruction does need to be combined with democracy assistance in Haiti.

REP. ROS-LEHTINEN: Thank you very much to all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. BERMAN: Thank you.

And the gentleman from New Jersey, Chairman of the Africa and Global Health Subcommittee, Mr. Payne is recognized for five minutes.

REP. DONALD M. PAYNE (D-NJ): Thank you very much. Let me say that I'm very pleased that we are having this very important hearing. And I apologize that I did not get an opportunity to hear the testimony.

However, I am quite familiar with the work done especially, NED, which I think has been a very important agency so to speak. Not quite an agency, but by NED being the type of a organization that it is, it's able to transcend whatever administration it's in, and the work of NED continues to be a balanced, and they move forward with the IRI and NBI and National Chamber of Commerce and AFL-CIO; having all those areas in.

But let me just ask, and I know, Lorne, we've seen -- I mean, Mr. Craner, we've seen sometimes that the work that we attempt to do in countries promoting democracy, and some countries seem to, in some instances -- we do not and I won't go into them specifically, but I think you know the ones -- (laughs) -- that we are talking about.

How do we keep a balance though -- God bless you -- how do we keep a balance of us doing democracy-building without -- and I know it's a -- it's kind of a delicate balance, without becoming intrusive or really injecting our own, sometimes even subconsciously, our individual biases or preferences as we want to say it. Because of course, as you know, in several instances on different continents, we've heard the criticism. Of course, many times, they criticize because they don't -- countries don't want to admit that they have a problem, but how do you do that balance?

MR. CRANER: I think you do it with a couple of things that I always tell my staff. One is that we assist, we don't lead. That it is our job to walk a couple of steps behind the folks we're helping; or when they turn to us for advice, give them the advice they are asking for. We need to understand it's their country, not ours, but it will turn out -- their democracy will turn out looking very, very different from ours just as our democracy looks very, very different from that of the British and was born from them.

Maybe, most of all we need to understand it's their fight, not ours; that they have chosen to make this stand. And that we're not there to cheer them on, we are there to give the most objective advice we can about how to help them accomplish that. And finally, I always say

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

we need to have a very un-American virtue called patience that we need to understand that we can't go into a country for two or three years and spent \$100 million and then say, geez, they don't look like us.

But in a lot of these countries, especially the ones that are left, it's going to take 10, 15, 20 years to really be able to make a difference. And if we're willing to make that commitment, then some better things will come out the other end.

MS. MASSIMINO: Could I add something quickly to that.

REP. PAYNE: Go ahead.

MS. MASSIMINO: I think one of the key factors in achieving that correct balance is listening to the human rights and democracy activists on the ground.

Chairman Berman, you asked, you know, when has there been real concrete, measurable progress. I would say that most of the places where that's happened are examples of where we did a good job of listening to the activists on the ground.

You know, USAID which helped to establish this innovative new accountability mechanism in Guatemala, the SysEg (ph) that now is really providing an opportunity for activists who have been collecting evidence for, you know, decades of war crimes in that country now have a place to have those cases heard.

That was done with USAID and it was done by listening to the priorities of the activists on the ground, and there are numerous examples of that kind of concrete progress.

REP. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you very much.

Before my time expires, I just want to throw out two questions and I really can't get an answer, but we do push democracy.

Of course, we pushed elections in Gaza and we end up with something we didn't want. That's for sure. In Algeria, we had elections; they won, but then -- they'd government, the army went in and said we can't have that.

So, sometimes this democracy has a two-edge sword. But the final thing I want to just say today, on August the 4th, Kenya is expected to vote on their draft referendum which is going to -- they're either going to approve or reject is very important because they're not -- we saw the tragedy that happened after the last election, when many people died.

However, let me just say that outsiders are really intruding in this antiabortion provision that has no exception for the life of the mother, and there is also some 9,900 -- 999-year leases that outside people don't want ended. So the danger is we're going to have outside influence killing a bill that the country needs if they don't get a referendum going.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

I predict the same thing is going to happen at the end of the next election that happened with the thousands that were killed at the end of the last --

REP. BERMAN: The time -- the time of the gentleman has expired. And for those of us who are willing to sit this on, we'll have a chance to come back again.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Rohrabacher, recognized for five minutes.

REP. ROHRABACHER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of comments. And that is regime change is the goal of human rights activists and activity in dictatorships that murder their people and suppress those liberties that we consider to be important and valuable. This idea we just -- that we're supposed to be just engaging these ghoulish, monstrous regimes like in North Korea, we've got to engage them rather than seek to change that regime is at best counterproductive to try and to achieve the goals for your people, and for your world.

What has happened in North Korea through this type of logic has been the cementing of their power rather than the replacing of a regime that threatens the peace and stability of an entire region in the world.

I'd like to ask a question to panel. I happen to believe that one of the greatest obstacles to achieving the human rights goals that we have in mind and that we agree on as Americans. One of the greatest obstacles is that we have corporate America on the wrong side, and that we have people in -- Americans going over and trying to cut deals with these dictatorships, whether it be in China, or Ethiopia or elsewhere; in a way that basically, we are told by that type of engagement, we're going to change the Chinese or change this dictatorship or that dictatorship could in fact -- what happens is that our corporate leaders become mouth pieces for the dictatorship here rather than promoters of democracy there.

What role does the corporate America play in this whole struggle? Just to comment.

MS. MASSIMINO: Well, I can -- sorry, do you want to go?

I mean, I think it's huge. I think you are absolutely right that in some countries corporations have a bigger footprint and a bigger influence than the U.S. government does. And I think that it's vital that we, I mean, if you just think about Internet freedom and freedom of expression which was the biggest issue that came up -- the freedom of expression and association in the virtual space, at the summit that we held in February.

And you know, while we raised all these concerns and the activists who were here raised them with the U.S. government, the people who really needed to be in the room were the heads of Google and Microsoft and Yahoo and these other companies. And I was heartened to see that the State Department has kind of laid down a marker that Secretary Clinton has, you know, called these companies in to talk about how their actions can be undermining and potentially could be supporting our foreign policy.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. ROHRBACHER: But people who believe that democracy and freedom should be a major priority for American policy need to be appalled when they hear that people like Assistant Secretary Poisner has conducted meetings with the communist Chinese, which happened to be the world's worst human rights abuser. And the framework of the discussion is based at America has some sort of moral equivalency to these type of vicious dictatorships.

Well, I'm afraid when corporate America deals with these dictatorships; whether its china or elsewhere, it is always based on they're legitimate. Meaning, our corporate leaders are providing legitimacy to any type of agreements and deals they make with these -- with the cliques that hold power in these vicious regimes.

So we must -- I think we have to focus on making sure that we don't succumb to this engagement strategy with dictatorships and instead we have the strategy of replacing those dictatorships on the official level. And that we don't let corporate America undermine our efforts by giving legitimacy, by making deals for those very same regimes.

I've got 30 seconds now. Go ahead, Mr. Carothers.

MR. CAROTHERS: Well, Michael Poisner, I am sure, will have the chance to respond. But let me say that I know a little about those talks. Michael Poisner has worked for human rights for over 20 years; he doesn't believe in a moral equivalence between Chinese human rights practices and American ones.

(Cross talk.)

MR. CAROTHERS: Excuse me, I think his approach to that dialogue was one that this is going to be a long-term process for the Chinese, and in the first conversation you have with the difficult partner, you don't start screaming at them. I think it was more of a tactical approach rather than a strategic one, and I think he understands the real challenge of the issue.

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Deutch is recognized for five minutes. Pass?

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Connolly is recognized for five minutes.

REP. CONNOLLY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And let me ask, one of the concerns I've had over the years in looking at our efforts at trying to foster the democratic values and democratic institutions. And particularly I'm focused on NDI and the Republican Institute as well. We -- my observation is we have a top-down kind of approach that somebody who spent 14 years in local government, my sense is democracy is built from the bottom-up, not the top-down.

And I think that's a fundamental problem in the pyramid of our efforts. And I am just wondering especially you, Mr. Craner, but others as well might comment on that.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

MR. CRANER: Well, I know this isn't the season, but I hope you can come out and travel with us sometimes so we can allay your fears both in helping civil society groups and in building political parties, we work from the ground up. You can't have -- the political parties we usually run into are top-down.

They are also usually very, very small because of that. And the point we make with them is that if you're only operating in the capital or urban centers and if you don't have a platform that appeals to people across the country, and if you don't have branches across the country, and if you don't have members across the country, you are not going anywhere.

So our approach is to help them build from the ground up because they do, usually not surprisingly, in the countries they work, have a very centralized mentality. But whether it's us or NDI (come on out with us ?), I think we can allay your fears.

REP. CONNOLLY: Sure. Especially, if we are looking at fostering elections at the village or local level, you actually might see incipient democracy that you will not see at higher levels of government.

MR. CRANER: And that's why we -- both we and NDI have taken on this issue of governance. On this, it happens we are both working very much at the local level so that the good examples percolate up and they percolate across the country.

REP. CONNOLLY: Do either you or NDI have a local government component --

MR. CRANER: Absolutely.

REP. CONNOLLY: -- actually dedicated to local government?

MR. CRANER: Absolutely. And we're currently operating in many countries. Colombia is our oldest program. Jordan, we just started a program like that. In Moldova, we have a similar program, in Georgia, got a similar program I'm going to see next week in Berbera (ph) Kenya.

REP. CONNOLLY: Do you believe that AID, which is really the source of funding adequately funds local government initiatives we're trying to undertake?

MR. CRANER: I think perhaps more than adequately. And I think there's a missing element in their programs. Their programs are very much focused on service delivery, you know are they -- are the lights working in the streets, are those garbage being collected, all of which is important to people in the cities or villages they think, but they don't really know.

They assume that those are the things that are important. It's kind of like in Afghanistan when we started, we would pull up to a village, and say, hey, I bet you need health clinic. And what they really needed was a well dug. And the missing component is that political issue. It's putting the people in the village together with the providers so they can say, "We don't need a health clinic, we need a school, or we need a well dug; that's what would really make a difference to us in this town."

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. CONNOLLY: Yeah.

Ms. Windsor, you were shaking your head in affirmation.

MS. WINDSOR: Yes, I think that in fact, the local level -- how you define the local level is important, especially is your objective more democracy and human rights. I think there's plenty of programs that are ensuring better citizen involvement in different processes, et cetera; building up, training local government officials, increasing budget transparency. I think that sometimes the local government programs though are looked at apolitically.

And in the end, whether it's local government or judicial systems, parliaments or other aspects, this is a political system that we're interfacing with. And sometimes I think that AID can be a little cut and dry in terms of looking at what local government means and takes the politics out of local government.

MR. CRANER: Yeah. Well, it's inherently political, because there is a contract. That is that if I'm collecting your taxes, however well or badly, there -- the contract is -- and I will provide services to you, however well or badly. And it's a fairly fundamental principle, but it is a real essential building block of democratization anywhere.

REP. BERMAN: Mr. Carothers, in the 19 seconds we have left, you want to comment?

MR. CAROTHERS: I think what Lorne and Jennifer have described is really an evolution over the last 20 years. IRI in India, they might have started out in the '80s with a very national focus. They had less money, less experience, but there's been a real evolution over time. In places like Russia, even though it's a big country, IRI went very local for a while. So I don't think that's any longer a problem.

REP. BERMAN: Time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Smith?

REP. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH (R-NJ): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First let me just say to Secretary Craner, I appreciate your pointing out that human rights laws have been established repeatedly over the objections of the administration that's Democrat or Republican, and you cited the Religious Freedom Act.

I held all the hearings here. The administration -- Clinton was against it. He ended up signing it. Trafficking Victims Protection Act, they were against it. He ended up signing it. And then the Bush administration was against the Special Envoy new office on anti-Semitism; passed it, he signed it. And that was the Bush administration.

So from my point of view, there's a bad habit that has to be broken. And we're seeing it again with the International Megan's Law which we have voted out of here. I'm very concerned that this administration is going to try to kill it.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

I'm worried about the International Child Abduction and Prevention Act, which is not getting any traction at the department, and even though there are 2,800 American children who've been kidnapped, 1,800 or so American parents left behind. And then the Global Online Freedom Act, which was opposed by the Bush administration, and I believe will be opposed by the Obama administration. And that too is very clear, non-ambiguous, and at least two of your organizations have been outstanding in helping us write it and now support it. And I'm afraid that's going to die as well.

Let me just raise another issue, or two quick issues. With regards to China, which I believe in scope pervasiveness is the most egregious violator of human rights on earth. I was very disappointed when Ms. Clinton said we will not allow human rights to interfere with climate change and with selling our debt.

We know that now a number of labor activists, more than before, are being arrested and incarcerated, beaten even for asking for fundamental ILO protection. It's no coincidence in my view that the Cairo speech by the president was made during the anniversary of Tiananmen Square. It was very, very clear.

But -- and one issue that absolutely is probably the worst issue of human rights in the world and it's the one-child-per-couple policy. We're now giving money to at least two organizations, Marie Stopes International and the U.N. Population Fund even though huge numbers of women are being violated as never before.

I would ask unanimous consent that the op-ed by Chai Ling, the leader of the human rights Tiananmen Square student movement call China's one-child policy as brutal and hypocritical as ever. And she points out there's missing at least a 100 million girls, the missing girls, because of the forced abortion policy, and also that some 30-40 million more boys than girls under the age of 20.

And she puts that in perspective. That's equal to the entire young male population of the United States of the same age. Those girls are gone, killed by gendercide.

And recently we had a hearing, and a woman named Wujian testified, and this gives an indication just how horrific this policy is and why so many women are committing suicide in China; 500 women per day commit suicide according to WHO.

Wujian said, then I was put into a room with several moms. The room was full of moms who had just gone through forced abortion. Some moms were crying, some were mourning, some moms were screaming, and one mom was rolling on the floor in unbearable pain. Then I kept saying to her -- to the abortionists, how could you become a killer by killing people everyday? Then she talks about how when they put the big long needle into the head of her baby, the baby died.

At the moment, it was the end of the world for me; she went on, and I felt even time had stopped. Since it did not come out as expected, they decided to cut the baby into pieces in my womb with scissors and then suck it out with a special machine. I did not have any time

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

to think as this most horrifying surgery began by force. I could hear the sound of the scissors, cutting the body of my baby in the womb.

Eventually, she went on to say, the journey in hell, the surgery was finished, and one nurse showed me part of the bloody foot with her tweezers. Through my tears, the picture of the bloody foot was engraved into my eyes and into my heart and so clearly I could see the five small bloody toes.

This is the One Child Per Couple policy.

I say to President Obama, silence in the face of this barbaric Chinese government behavior is not an option. Why have we not spoken out on this issue? And I mean in a way that's meaningful, not some passing reference. This is the worst violation, in my opinion, of women ever.

Finally, my friend and colleague, Mr. Payne talked about Kenya. Kenya is a pro-life country. Virtually every poll shows massive majority believe in the sanctity and the dignity of unborn life. And yet the U.S. government has contributed at least \$11 million in the constitutional rewrite. We have asked -- Ms. Ros-Lehtinen and I and another member of Congress -- that the IG investigate this wrongful use, violation of the sole gender amendment in promoting this pro- abortion constitution. (Off mike.)

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Scott, is recognized for five minutes.

REP. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me ask you, each of you that the United States provides certain types of assistance to countries with repressive governments like China, Vietnam, Cuba, so forth -- use of the assistance is for nongovernmental organizations that promote democracy and human rights or for activities in such areas as environment protection and disease control, which are important to the health and safety of American citizens.

But do you believe that such assistance programs should be terminated in countries with poor records on human rights and democracy?

MR. CRANER: There's a fundamental dilemma here, and I kind of faced this in Uzbekistan when I was in government. There was -- the Uzbek government is about as nasty a group of people as you could find and there are many -- that kind of description I could tell you about how they treat people.

We by dint of 9/11 were caused to be engaged to working with the Uzbek government. There was a time when we thought we were making progress from a very, very low base in terms of how they treated people. I mean it was pretty nasty in terms of how they were killing people and prisoners back -- (off mike.) And then Andijan happened, which was the big massacre out on eastern Uzbekistan. And all U.S. relationships with Uzbekistan essentially ended.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

Does that help the people in Uzbekistan that we ended a relationship over something awful that happened? I would contend that -- and I know that Congress has addressed itself to this on occasion that in countries where we have a complete embargo, the human rights and democracy would be allowed to continue, and I think especially in Serbia in the late 1990s where Congress faced that dilemma and made that decision.

So I would make the case that under in -- very, very limited, very, very narrow types of programming should be allowed to continue in those countries. I don't find it morally satisfying that not having a relationship and not be able to help.

REP. SCOTT: Okay. Ms. Windsor?

MS. WINDSOR: However, I just want to reiterate my point that signing MOUs with the government of China to allow them to dictate what kind of assistance we provide, as has recently been the case with USAID's program in China, is not the way to go.

I would also say that it's not the democracy and human rights assistance that we should be worried about in many of these countries. That is a very, very -- they're -- it's a pittance in terms of overall relationship and message that these governments are getting from the U.S. government in terms of what's really important.

And that's true in Uzbekistan where we are now currently re- looking at restoring military relationships, China, Vietnam. Whether we assist democracy and human rights groups under extremely narrow circumstances is not the problem there.

REP. SCOTT: Let me ask you about -- let me ask you about Africa. I mean, we got a serious, serious human rights violation problem particularly in the heart of Africa, in places like Rwanda and especially in the Congo in a place called Goma where I was and went.

And I want to ask you if you could comment on what should be done. The number one difficult ailment and treatment in the hospitals of Goma are not tuberculosis, it's not colds, it's not strokes, it's not heart disease, it's not high blood pressure.

It is violation of sexual cruelty to women. That's the number one treatment. Not rape, it's sexual violence. How deeply are you aware of this and what would be your advice as to how we can use our resources of get in there and help, or what are we doing?

MS. WINDSOR: Well, it's -- as you know from, if you've been there, a rampant and huge problem. And I think from our perspective, we're not working on this directly right now, but have spoken to groups on the ground who are struggling to deal with this overwhelming problem.

And like many of the problems that we're talking about today, there are complex causes and needs to be tackled from a number of different avenues.

REP. SCOTT: What would you say as the cause?

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

MS. WINDSOR: Well, I think --

REP. SCOTT: Just expand on the complexity of the cause?

MS. WINDSOR: I can't put myself out there for -- as an expert on this. But I would say that the, you know, the legacy of the wartime abuses is a serious problem there and created a culture in which this kind of thing is committed. And so there is that aspect of the problem that has to be dealt with in addition to dealing with the victims after the fact, prevention.

REP. SCOTT: Thank you.

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Flake.

REP. JEFF FLAKE (R-AZ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank the witnesses.

Ms. Windsor, Freedom House has documented very well the human rights abuses in Cuba that have gone on. Yet Freedom House still advocates the lifting of the travel ban to allow Americans to travel. Do you want to just talk about that for a minute?

MS. WINDSOR: Yes, we did it with our first act actually when the Obama administration was -- went into office. Which is we thought that we have -- we think that the lifting on the ban of travel to Cuba makes sense. It will enable the free flow of information to Cuban citizens that will increase ideas of liberty, and it will be harder for the Cuban government to contain that information which they're able to do.

And I also noted that the U.S. ban on Americans to travel to Cuba will reaffirm the rights of Americans to travel wherever they want. They have -- I mean, we're allowed to travel to any of these other countries that have greater sanctions.

However, we don't think any policy changes, any additional policy changes -- we need to be in consultation with the democracy and human rights groups within Cuba and make sure that what we do is supported by them.

REP. FLAKE: Well, thank you.

MS. WINDSOR: And things that will -- they will increase freedom and liberty in the island.

REP. FLAKE: Well, thank you very much for that position, a thoughtful position. And I'm holding here a letter to the House of Representatives from members of Cuban civil society, signed by 74 individuals, people representing civil rights society there, clerics, intellectuals, artists, political prisoners, across the board.

And they make the argument that "We share the opinion that the isolation of the people of Cuba benefits the most inflexible interest of its government." And so it would seem across the board -- and I know you'll find a dissident here or there, who will say, no, we should continue with the status quo. But the status quo of 50 years has gotten us very little.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

And Mr. Craner, you had mentioned that we shouldn't put a hold on democracy programs just because we have a problem with Mr. Bruce (ph) being held and mention that we have democracy programs continued in Burma or Zimbabwe or whatever else. But we also Americans to travel to those countries; we don't have that prohibition. Do you feel that that prohibition is still warranted here in this case?

MR. CRANER: I have to tell you I looked at this from a little bit of experience, not with Cuba, but another country called Vietnam. I used to work for Senator McCain as you may know.

REP. FLAKE: Uh-huh.

MR. CRANER: And I was very -- I thought it was a smart thing in the 1980s and even into the -- first Bush administration, Bush 41, to lift a lot of the sanctions against Vietnam to allow businesses and to establish diplomatic relations, et cetera, because I thought it would help on human rights and democracy.

And I'm afraid that I was wrong. I don't think there's any -- been any improvement in human rights and democracy in Vietnam. The idea that if you let businesses, and that folks from IBM or Exxon are going to proselytize for democracy, I think they're going to be a little too busy making money.

REP. FLAKE: Individuals to travel; you certainly wouldn't advocate re-imposing the travel ban or imposing a travel ban on Vietnam?

MR. CRANER: I think -- I don't know that there ever was a travel ban on Vietnam.

REP. FLAKE: Oh, that's right -- (cross talk.)

MR. CRANER: But certainly in the case of Cuba, I don't see any -- I mean this has been an administration very dedicated to engagement. And I think that they are coming to the -- in some countries at least -- they are coming to the end of their tether on what engagement has been -- has produced. So absent some willingness on the part of the Cubans to move, I don't know why we would.

REP. FLAKE: I've always held the position -- I think most in Congress do -- that this is in our self-interest. We have tried to outguess, second-guess the Cuban administration as to what they want. I've never been convinced that they really want the travel ban lifted. But I think we should we should disregard what we think that they want, and do what we know is in our interest.

And it's simply not in our interest to deny Americans the ability to make that choice themselves as to whether or not they'll travel.

And I commend those in the AID and elsewhere in government who have tried to implement programs that will help those Cubans who need it badly that I think we ought to

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

allow Americans that have simply greater contact and things will happen that we simply don't know.

But it's not -- I mean Cuba can impose their travel ban. If we lift ours, they'll probably impose some kind of ban. But that should be their problem, it's not ours. And so I thank FreedomWorks and others who have been -- I would encourage all of you to encourage travel and trade. I --

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired and the gentlelady from California, Ambassador Watson.

REP. DIANE E. WATSON (D-CA): Thank you so very much. And I want to thank all the witnesses.

Having been an ambassador myself, I have to agree with my colleague over on the other side, Mr. Flake because I do think that the more contact Americans have with the Cuban people on the ground, I think, under new leadership there, however it still be -- could be convinced by the brother to hold on to policies. But having discussions with Fidel Castro, I feel we can make some headway, if we relieve the travel ban and let people go into Cuba by their own need too, whatever -- tour, to talk with the Cubans themselves.

I had an opportunity to be on the campus of a medical school there. I'm going to say this real quickly, so I might get to my other point. But I just went up to students that were getting off the bus going to the campus.

And I recognized them as being Americans and African-Americans. And I did ask them, what does this experience mean to you. They said a quality medical education virtually free and I'm looking forward to voting -- to devoting two years of my professional life delivering health-care services in underdeveloped countries. And you know, if you talk to the people who were there, they're not looking at the politics.

But they're looking at what they can benefit from this program, some of the best health care. And I've been attacked because I said that some of the best health care I've seen has been in Cuba.

Now, let me get to something I think I heard Mr. Carothers or Mr. Craner say, either one. And it was about Haiti. I understand from President Clinton, the envoy to Haiti, that he had worked out a development plan with President Preval prior to the earthquake, short-term, midterm and long-term. And this was our assistance to Haiti to start developing their country. Either one of you, if you can respond, I'd appreciate it. With that -- I thought I heard somebody refer to development in Haiti.

MR. CAROTHERS: I did refer it. My point, Congresswoman, was that now that we're in a phase of giving extensive assistance to Haiti again -- as you know, it kind of waxes and wanes in American policy, we should take advantage of that moment to address fundamental issues of building the Haitian state and building a democratic state. Because Haiti's calamities

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

were simply occur and reoccur, if we don't get to the essential problem or the fact that they have never built a genuine relationship between their state and their society.

And so we want to be as helpful as possible as quickly as possible that simply pouring the construction money onto a state that basically doesn't work, isn't going to get to the fundamental roots of the problem.

REP. WATSON: And I'd like this verified and maybe Mr. Chairman, we could send a letter to the official envoy, President Clinton, because he then told us that he had the president's signoff on the development plan, which included many plans in the following -- developing a strong middle class.

And I understand since 1751 that resources were held at the top, but they never went down. So the Haitian people have learned to just be survivors at the lowest level. And I understand in the MOU that was signed that some of this was included. So maybe we, as a committee, could get some answers as to what was contained in the development plan.

MR. CAROTHERS: On the issue of --

REP. WATSON: How best to --

MR. CAROTHERS: -- part of our resources on governance and --

REP. WATSON: Yeah, how best to aid the Cuban people in terms of --

MR. CAROTHERS: Haitian.

REP. WATSON: Excuse me, Haitian.

How best to aid the Haitian people in terms of developing their country on a more democratic basis, in terms of developing their infrastructure, in terms of jobs and in terms of -- I see my time is up.

SEN. BERMAN: Yeah.

REP. WATSON: But you get the gist.

MR. CAROTHERS: I do and we'll follow up with you to pursue that.

REP. WATSON: Thank you.

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentlelady has expired. The gentlelady from California, Ms. Woolsey is recognized for five minutes.

REP. LYNN WOOLSEY (D-CA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretaries Clinton and Gates have both talked about promoting the idea of smart security. I actually have legislation

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

that is -- that promotes the smarter approach to reaching peace in accordance around the world, with nations that we might be having arguments with.

And because it's so absolutely no longer acceptable that our foreign policy would be based on preemptive strikes and military might, and that we would think that if another country's approach to democracy or human rights, in a real effort, don't look like ours, so then it's our job to bully them into submission. That has to stop. It's not working, we know that.

And so my question to you -- I guess I'm just telling you that; since we need to prevent discord, we need to build cooperation, we absolutely must worldwide -- are there states where in your opinion, it isn't possible to start the dialog and make inroads? I don't know where to start.

Mr. Craner?

MR. CRANER: You mean start the dialog and make inroads on this issue or in general?

REP. WOOLSEY: Well, on this issue. I mean on working with the United States.

MR. CRANER: Yeah, I think there are some countries that simply aren't interested, where the leaders simply aren't interested. I think if we went and tried -- and I think we do try and talk to the North Koreans on this issue. We're not going to get much of a response.

I think the people are more interested, but it's very difficult for us to be able to get out and talk to the people. And it's also in that kind of country such a repressive environment that it's very, very -- as soon as somebody lifts their head and says something, that's coming out of their head, not ours, they go to prison.

REP. WOOLSEY: So North Korea, there's others. What about -- what are you thinking about Iran?

MR. CRANER: I think Iran, there's clearly -- and I think we saw it in the demonstrations last year. There's a tiredness with the regime. I think, you know, if you go back to when -- to 1979, people clearly thought they had an American-imposed authoritarian government. To an extent they were right.

I think they have gotten tired these 37 years later of what they brought themselves and how for many of them, it did not live up to their expectations in 1979.

And I think that's why, you know, Iran -- amongst the citizenry, not the government -- but among the citizenry, maybe the most pro- American and pro-democratic country in the Middle East because they are tired of living under their rulers.

REP. WOOLSEY: And do any of you have any opinions on the Hamas leadership of the Palestinians? You know, will they be willing to work?

MR. CRANER: In terms of these issues?

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. WOOLSEY: Yeah.

MR. CRANER: Again I don't -- that is an organization that is willing to take advantage of the forms of democracy and the methods, but not to subscribe to the substance of democracy. They're happy to use elections to get into power. They're not particularly interested in democratic practices thereafter.

REP. WOOLSEY: So I have a little bit of time. Anybody have an opinion in -- on how we can convince nay-sayers that there is a way to engage that is smarter than militaries and bombs and guns?

MS. MASSIMINO: Well, I -- absolutely. I mean I think that's in large part what we're talking about here today is how to leverage a, money and diplomacy and including non-security assistance to -- and the need for a multiplicity of actors to be involved here.

I mean in a lot of the countries that we've just been talking about, it's vitally important that the U.S. be engaged. Now engagement has to be, you know, could be engagement with, you know, our real allies in that country which are not the government.

They are, you know, people who are advancing the ideals of human rights and democracy that we share. And we have to understand what it is that they need, how to be sophisticated about that kind of engagement so that we're not undermining them. But we don't throw up our hands and say well, we can't measure, you know, achieving any results. So we should just butt out, or it's too complicated. And that's why this is such a tough job. But it's vital.

And I think, you know, the president laid it out in the National Security Strategy how these things have to be so closely aligned. So we've got to -- you know, we have to find different ways of doing it, and it's not just -- (cross talk) --

REP. BERMAN: Time --

MS. MASSIMINO: -- or a bilateral switch.

REP. BERMAN: Time of the gentlelady has expired. The gentlelady from California, Ms. Lee is recognized for five minutes.

REP. BARBARA LEE (D-CA): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Welcome. Let me ask you a couple of questions that I've been dying to ask.

And I wanted to find out first of all, in promoting democracy abroad, do we recognize -- oh, excuse me, is it on now? In promoting democracy abroad, do we recognize that democracy may emerge differently from country to country and may not necessarily be an American form of democracy? And if so, how do we have a standard for democracy assistance, if in fact, we allow for those differences. If we don't, then why not?

Secondly, during the last administration, I'd continually warned Secretary of State Rice about pushing for elections as it relates to the West -- you know, the Palestinian people in terms of

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

what was taking place in the Middle East. And you know, I often said be careful what you ask for. What happened was, of course, we know the history; they push, push, push, and Hamas was elected.

At what point should we make decisions about pushing, pushing, pushing for elections, recognizing that those elections may or may not be in the United States' best interests based on administration and policy, and when do we not push, push, push, where it could be, you know, detrimental to what the United States feels is in their best interests.

Because of course, obviously, people voted for Hamas, and you know, for a variety of reasons. And of course, we know what has happened and that has not been in, of course, Israel's or the United States' best interests. But we push, push, push and we should be careful what you ask for. So how do we balance that off, and when do we know when not to push, push, push?

REP. BERMAN: Mr. Carothers?

MR. CAROTHERS: Thank you for the question. There are certain underlying principles in democracy that are common to all democracies, but many of its specific forms are different.

And so when we go out in the world's to promote democracy, we have to be consistent and true to these underlying principles, but willing to accept that it's going to take different forms in different places.

Recently for example, Ukraine had elections. And the United States has been working to promote democracy in Ukraine for a long time. We clearly saw that probably one candidate would have been better for U.S. security interests than another because they might have been less pro-Russia and then maybe pro-American. But the United States promoted democracy in Ukraine, and a leader emerged who might not have been our first choice, but we stuck to our principle and we promoted a system, not a particular candidate. That gives us credit in the world.

I was with a group of visiting Russian delegates who were talking about the hypocrisies in the American democracy promotion. And I said, "Would Russia be willing to support a process and not an outcome in Ukraine?" And the fact that we were willing to support a process and not a particular outcome makes us so good in the world.

But with respect to pushing, pushing, pushing on elections, you know, in 98 percent of cases countries' election schedules are set in their constitution and it really isn't up to us.

Palestine had had elections before; Yasser Arafat was elected before. In almost cases in the world, it really isn't up to us to decide whether or not a country has an election; it's up to us to decide whether or not we can help to make that a better election. And so, I think the dilemma about -- or the idea that we are out there causing all these elections in this world is a little bit of a red herring. And the fact that we focus so much on the case of Hamas is because it's so exceptional.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

There have been surprisingly few cases in the last 25 years at elections that have really produced damaging results to American security. You know, in 99 out of 100 cases, it's better if that country lets the system breathe, has elections, continues with its constitutional schedule. So what we're really trying to push forward is better elections. We're really not in the driver's seat about whether elections. And so the push, push, pushing on elections really is, or at least should be, let's push on better elections.

REP. LEE: Do we accept the outcome then on all elections?

MR. CAROTHERS: Yes.

MR. CRANER: Yeah, I think Tom explained it very, very well. Elections are occurring. They may not be very good elections. Soviet Union used to have elections. The question is what's the character of the elections going to be. You can make the argument --

REP. BERMAN: A little louder.

MR. CRANER: You can make the argument in Palestinian case that there were supposed to have been elections sooner. Had those elections been held sooner, I think Hamas might not have won. You also -- I think it's fair to consider in the outcome of elections. Simply your having had a fair election doesn't necessary mean we're going to agree all the time on everything with the government that was elected. And so that needs to be brought into consideration simply because they were elected it doesn't mean we have to like them.

MS. LEE: President Aristide was elected to be the duly elected president of Haiti and our government helped depose him.

REP. BERMAN: The time of the gentlelady on that interesting last question, has -- the time has expired. And the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Ellison, is recognized for five minutes.

REP. KEITH ELLISON (D-MN): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would you like to respond to the Aristide question?

MR. CRANER: There is a quote by Colin Powell that I think is worth looking up and talking to him about, and he basically says that President Aristide, because of his misrule, brought that (slip ?) on himself. Sorry, I defer it for somebody who was in office at the time who has an understanding of what we did or didn't view. I think Colin Powell would be worth talking to. If I can go back to your question --

REP. ELLISON: No, I don't have that question for you, sir. Could you respond on the way that our country responded to the issue in Honduras and a duly elected president deposed -- would you like to respond on that one in terms of how it conforms to our policy of supporting elections and helps holding up of the integrity of the election?

MR. CRANER: I think this goes back to what I talked about before with Hamas that there are governments that are elected on occasion which don't respect democratic processes after

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

they come into office. And I don't think that we or the OAS or anybody else has a good-enough policy that deals with this issue of what do you do when somebody who is not democratic is elected in a democratic process.

And I think that the administration came to see that that was an issue in Honduras this time last year. Basically when the issue started, they were very staunch and very firm in favor of the deposed president. And I note that Secretary Clinton yesterday or the day before was at the OAS saying that they are to readmit Honduras considering the election that they just held on this --.

REP. ELLISON: Do you all have any thoughts on how the dynamics and timing of a process of elections over time, if a government as you described was -- a government is elected which doesn't subscribe to democratic principles that we would want them to. Have we really actually tried to let them rule and then seeing over the course of a few elections whether or not the responsibility of governance pulls them into more amenable conduct? Ms. Windsor, do you want to take a stab at that one?

MS. WINDSOR: Well, I think we've led -- certainly recently, we've let a number of countries sort of try that approach, so. In Venezuela, it hasn't actually worked so well, and at least for the Venezuelan human rights activists or society groups that are really been squeezed. So you know, we don't have -- we shouldn't be in the position of trying to remove governments, but we can speak out for any government whether they are elected or not, misuse of their own populations. And I think we need to do that.

REP. ELLISON: Yeah, then -- I think they are separate issues, though. I mean the practice is that -- let me ask you the question as well, does the responsibility of governance moderate the more pernicious aspects of what a particular government may have done if they were not allowed to bear the burden of governance? Anybody?

MR. CRANER: It may or it may not. It depends whether while they are in office they are saying, "Oh, let's not have another election. Or, gee, I think I'll extend my term, or let's get rid of the judiciary; if they are hemmed -- or let's go after civil society. If they are hemmed in by these elements of democracy that you see in democracies from Asia to the Middle East to Latin America, then they might say, I think I'm going to have to moderate my behavior because if I don't I'm not going to be in office anymore. But if they don't have to worry about that, they don't have to moderate their behavior.

REP. ELLISON: And of course, they don't do it in a vacuum as Ms. Windsor pointed out, you know, people domestically and in the international community can raise issues around civil and human rights and it should. Ms. Massimino?

MS. MASSIMINO: Just very briefly. You know I think it's important to remember that while democracy can emerge in different contexts and it may look different in different countries and all of that, there are universal standards of human rights that all governments, almost all government have agreed to. And these commitments, respect for those commitments helps to set the stage for real democracy and for elections that actually

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

represent the rule of the people. And then they are the standards on which any government, whether it came into power through elections or not, should be judged.

So I think just getting back to the focus of the hearing that it's really important that we not lose sight of that aspect of our goals for foreign aid; that we need to focus on that too in addition to the democracy part.

REP. ELLISON: I think I'm out of time.

REP. BERMAN: I think the time of the gentleman has expired. But if the gentleman wants, I am prepared to have a second round, at least for myself and I think therefore anybody who wants to --

REP. ELLISON: Yeah, I actually do --

REP. BERMAN: But then I'm going to go back to it -- (laughs.) The test is how much do you want the second round. I will yield myself five minutes.

Two of you, I gather, one in state and one AID, were in the government for significant parts of your careers. I'm curious if it's been long enough since you've been gone that you feel comfortable of talking about the tension between what you were supposed to be pushing and doing, and your own sense of what you were supposed to be pushing and doing came from those bureaus that were focused more on -- and people and higher-ups who were focused more on the nature of the bilateral relationship, a very specific or range of issues in that bilateral relationship where what you might be pushing to do would create tensions that they didn't want to have to see come up.

And sort of, tests of how some of that should get resolved and others on the panel who want to join in as well. I mean you -- take the case, Egypt is a fascinating example. But other issues raised here, Iran, nuclear weapons, the consequences of the election a year ago and all that's happened, the preexisting limitations on human rights. I'm less interested in this case in the specifics than sort of a construct for maintaining our commitments in this area, and pushing what we want to push in this area and the struggles people in your roles faced.

MS. WINDSOR: Well, anybody that knows me knows that I am always comfortable complaining -- even when I was within the U.S. government, I was interested in complaining about behaviors that I thought were not very helpful. And certainly being an NGO gives you a lot more freedom and opportunity to criticize those inside.

So I do want to say within USAID and State Department, there are people that are working on democracy and human right issues, and oftentimes they are the ones that are pitted against those that are very, very focused on the bilateral relationships.

And I completely respect them. I just think that the balance is way off in terms of the resources, the human resources, so that that democracy and human rights can actually get on the table at important discussions and has the chance of being heard. And I think that's as true today as it was -- in fact, I think it's probably more true today that the democracy and

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

human rights groups are not -- voices within the government are not at the table as much as they should be.

I will say something sort of provocative part. State Department and AID is all focused on the country units, whether the ambassador, or the USAID mission director, field missions, et cetera, you get this kind of everything should be pushed down to that level. Well, the nature of being an ambassador or mission director is that you are wanting to improve the relationship with that country. And there is not enough --

REP. BERMAN: Country as defined by government?

MS. WINDSOR: Exactly. And I think there is not enough, this is what the ADVANCE Democracy Act was about. And efforts to try to train give incentives to AID and State Department officers that it's in their interests that they see it as part of a larger bilateral relationship, that's in their interest to actually care about democracy and human rights.

And the most recent example is Kyrgyzstan. I mean the embassy managed to put itself against democracy and human rights. So you know, I think that there has to be very strong central pressure from inside of both AID and State on embassies and missions that they have to include this in their definition of what makes a good bilateral relationship.

And that is incomplete. So we have certain mission directors or certain ambassadors that are great on these issues, and then we have others that are not. So if you have an across-the-board approach, for instance, in AID that the mission always knows best, you're going to get programs that actually undermine democracy and human rights. And I think that that should not happen.

REP. BERMAN: Anybody else want to -- oh, my -- I've just used all my time. I yield five minutes to the ranking member.

REP. ROS-LEHTINEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Some may have a revisionist history, a revisionist view of recent history about what went on in Honduras. Apparently some may ascribe to the Benjamin Franklin quote that said, never let a gang of brutal facts get in the way of a beautiful theory. What is the beautiful theory that would happen in Honduras was a coup d'etat -- love to say that.

Now, the brutal facts are that Manuel Zelaya, the president of Honduras, put on the ballot -- printed that the ballots that were about to be voted on by the public a question asking the public what their thoughts are on extending the presidential term. The problem is that according to the Honduran constitution, putting that ballot questions is in and of itself, a violation of the constitution. So the Supreme Court of Honduras ruled against Manuel Zelaya committing this illegal act.

Then the human rights Ombudsman of Honduras ruled against Manuel Zelaya. Then the Congress of Honduras, both parties; opposition and Zelaya's party, ruled, also voted on, yes, you have violated the constitution. The civil society organizations agreed that the actions taken by Zelaya were in violation of the constitution.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

The United States is involved in doing all the wrong things there. But the Honduran people, the Honduran institutions were all in agreement. The Supreme Court decided it, the Congress decided it, the civil organizations all signed documents saying that this is wrong. And so he was arrested pursuant to a legal warrant. That he was -- should not have been taken out of the country, I agree.

And all the parties have said that was wrong to do. He should have been judged, he should have been tried, and he would have been found guilty because that law was clear, you violated the constitution.

So Zelaya was trying to extend his term illegally in -- by pushing an unlawful referendum to change the Honduran constitution, which clearly limits to one term the time of office of the president. Those are the facts. And so after all of these decisions, Zelaya was removed from power according to the constitution, according to the Congress, according to the rule of law.

Now, we've got a very active U.S. ambassador there, in Honduras, who is going to try to do everything within his power to continue the failed policy of this administration to say that what happened there was an illegal act. Never mind what the Supreme Court said, never mind what the Honduran Congress said, never mind that the Honduran people celebrated a free, fair transparent non-corrupt election that was held by all parties as an example of a terrific election process in Honduras.

All applauded, Lobo was sworn in president. And the United States administration, the Obama Administration, the secretary of state, and our activist U.S. ambassador in Honduras continued to try to pressure all other parties because he is obsessed with this to try to call it a coup d'etat and continue on with this last problem.

The Honduran people have moved on; the Supreme Court has ruled on, the Honduran Congress has moved on. Some have not moved on and they want to call this a coup d'etat. So they want to continue, continue, continue -- even though we have a democratic, new government all applauded by all the international groups saying this was a clear and fair election. Let's not change the facts just to get to this beautiful theory.

It was not a coup d'etat and the Honduran people have moved on. They would like the recognition by the international community. Slowly, we're restoring the visas that we should have never taken away from them in the first place. We are still punishing those who were with the new interim government, Micheletti; those people are still being punished.

We withdrew U.S. aid that went against our own interest including U.S. anti-narcotic efforts. We held that country as a prisoner, as prisoners. They could not escape; they had no visas. And so some of us aren't being (pulled ?) if by contrast, our ambassador in Nicaragua rightfully highlights Ortega's efforts to trump on the judiciary and constitution.

Let's look to what Hugo Chavez is doing; let's look at what Daniel Ortega is doing. Get over Honduras. The Honduran people are very happy with their duly elected, democratic government. This was not a coup d'etat. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. BERMAN: Time of the gentlelady has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota.

REP. ELLISON: Just a few more questions about your democracy work. And I actually agree with the work you do and applaud you for doing it. The only problem is, I think, as a country we have got to really deal with some real results to be consistent with it when we do it. And I do -- I think people around the world, when we say we are for democracy, they take it seriously, and they often will try to take full advantage of what we say we're about. And we need to be ready to deal with that regardless of what the consequences of that are.

At the same time, never giving up, as Ms. Windsor pointed out, our obligations, responsibility to call people to account when they veer from agreed-upon constitutional norms. But I don't think we should ever stop doing democracy promotion.

Let me just ask this question in that regard. You know, how do we -- I mean, how do we balance these two things of promoting democracy, and then when it doesn't go the way we want, making sure that we don't undermine the democracy that we helped to promote?

MR. CAROTHERS: Well, I think the key is to have a set of democratic support policies and programs that really represent a wide range of institutions in the country and processes. You know, democracy promotion just like what comes up again and again, really isn't mostly about elections. Elections are -- can be a capstone or cornerstone of the democratic process, but it's really about a much, much wider range of things; whether it's media assistance, local government, working with parliaments, working with human rights organizations and so forth.

So the idea that, you know, we're caught in the headlights like a deer, if somebody gets elected who we are not entirely happy about. We have a whole range of things that we might be doing in the countries supporting, as Lorne said, institutions to counterbalance the power and so forth. So I think if we have a properly broad conception, we'll be in better shape.

And I'd like to take advantage of this to say one thing also to the chairman. You know, if we try to understand what results can we have, I'm still in a sense -- "stuck in my throat" is that quote from a senior State Department official about tangible results. Because you know, I think maybe the person meant transformative results.

But let's just pause for a moment and think about the fact that, you know, the United States is spending \$2.5 billion a year on democracy assistance. Wow, that's a lot of money. What can \$2.5 billion buy here in the United States? Well, widening the Wilson Bridge costs \$2.5 billion. So you know, we sit down and we spent a certain amount of money in a hundred countries around the world, is it realistic to hope to transform a hundred countries' political direction with the amount of money that it cost to widen one bridge between Virginia and the District of Columbia?

So I think we need to have a sense of proportion about what we're doing and we expect from it. And that this money is variable, and the people like Loren and Jennifer, and then

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

employees of their organizations, they get every morning, and I don't think they do that day in, day out, week in, week out, month in, month out, year in, year out, for rather modest salaries I must say, if they weren't producing that something tangible. Are we thinking this money in transforming the world? No, we're not. Would it be realistic to expect that money for one bridge to go out and change a hundred countries' political destiny? I don't think so.

REP. ELLISON: Well, let me follow up with you on that one. What do we hope to achieve over time? Over time, do we expect -- I mean you know, sometimes you can't look at one country during one election cycle and say, well, we've done our thing. But if we look at it in a region and we looked it over time, and what do we hope to see in central Asia if we keep this up.

MR. CAROTHERS: Well, you hope to see in a society, you know, nucleuses of people who are, you know, who believe in something, who are working for positive change and feel, first, a sense of moral support. Second, they feel the ability to learn things that are coming from abroad that others will have the experience. Third, they might have some actual resources from us to do what they want to do. So what you're trying to do is inject and help inject some elements into the society that were, you know, working for positive change.

And you cannot travel to most countries in the world without meeting dozens, hundreds or thousands of people who've been affected by these programs and who believe that they are better actors whether they are in government or out of government with these basic principles. And it takes a long time. It takes a lot of different --

REP. ELLISON: I only got 40 seconds, sorry about that. Could you talk about what you guys do in a specialized way to help women and minorities be a part of the election process?

MR. CRANER: We have come to have a great focus on that. We think -- we used to think it was important to put men in the -- women in the room with men to train them. We now understand that training separately is much better because, frankly they're reluctant sometimes to speak up.

What we have done is, a, try and persuade party leaders, usually the guys, to bring women into the political parties as candidates. Often, you know, making a self-interest argument -- you're missing half of those here if you don't do this -- to ensure that when they bring them in, they're not just symbols, and then to work with the women who may get elected to ensure they are the best candidates and best office holders possible.

REP. BERMAN: Time of the gentlemen has expired. The gentleman from California -- but the gentleman, oh you haven't done the -- well, he hasn't done the first round, you haven't done the second round.

REP. : (Off mike.)

REP. BERMAN: Split the baby in half, no. The gentleman from California.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. BRAD SHERMAN (D-CA): Thank you. Much has been made of the Mineral Management Service having the conflict of interest because it both collects the revenue and imposes the rules. There is also a institutional conflict of interest at stake. At the one hand, it's their job to conduct diplomacy with every country with whom we have relations including those ruled by tyrants. On the other hand, it's their job to promote democracy, something rarely appreciated by tyrants.

And often I see that first objective getting in the way of the second. The best example of this was when Congress, over the objections of the administration, required that money be spent for democracy programs in Libya. The ambassador to Libya and much of the State Department thought that that was at least annoying, and they didn't want to just figure out a way to spend the money in an innocuous and ineffective manner, which would be their usual response.

They decided to go one step further in their efforts to get along with Qadhafi. Their plan was to give the money to Qadhafi. And only with pressure from Congress did they decide that that's not what Congress had in mind when we thought that democracy should be promoted in Libya. At this point, I can't propose any structural change because I think democracy programs benefit from the power they have from having a voice inside the State Department, but often it works the other way around.

The first question I have, and I don't know who to address it to, is with regard to our efforts in Iran. There is a huge pro-democracy movement in Iran. As far as I can tell, that has nothing to do with anything we've done through our democracy programs. And one thing I've been calling on the government to do is to take the many radio shows that -- and even TV shows created in Los Angeles and pay the pittance that it would cost to make sure that these shows were available on satellite in Iran. The institutional response has been pretty ugly.

First, that means that money that could be spent on bureaucratic jobs is spent somewhere else. But more importantly, it means that we would have a thousand flowers that bloom or we wouldn't control the message. Can someone comment on whether getting these private-sector-produced shows into Iran would be a good use of our Iran democracy funds?

Ms. Windsor?

MS. WINDSOR: I could more generally say that the need for free flow of information, that's what the Iranians want. And they want to hear -- they want -- they were a very engaged society with the outside world. And so they don't appreciate the current regime's attempt to isolate them. And in terms of whether we -- Iran -- I want to just talk about the, if I could the -- some Iranians have actually been very clear they don't want our help.

But there's many Iranians that say that they do. And they -- what the help that they want, primarily is not only to help the people that are in political prison and that have had to leave the country, if there's such a crackdown. But they want the ability to connect with each other and with the outside world. And there was a number of efforts that the U.S. provided that helped that happen.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. SHERMAN: I appreciate that. I want to squeeze in one more question for Lorne Craner who is with the best organization in Washington that has the word "Republican" in its name.

Mr. Craner, in your testimony you stated that the role of Foreign Assistance Bureau within the State Department needs to be examined. Could you explain how the Bureau came about and how it's changed and expand on that for us.

MR. CRANER: Yes. I actually had a conversation about this with Secretary Rice, and I mentioned to her that I had tried for three years to get from AID a list of its democracy projects around the world by country, and that they've never been able to produce that. And she said, that's really interesting because she said, I tried for the first three months I was here to get the same, and I couldn't get it.

And we both finally were given three legal size sheets, single-spaced, with a grid that showed where it -- but in the meantime and it actually happened that AID had had to go to the NGOs. It was giving money to them saying, what are you doing with our money because the secretary wants to know what we're doing with the money.

So there was good reason for African start which was, not only did State not know what AID was doing with its money, AID didn't know what AID was doing with its money. So there was a good reason for its start. Unfortunately, like many good ideas in the bureaucracy, it's kind of gone haywire. And you now have F deciding essentially how every foreign aid penny from this very, very small, centralized group -- how every foreign aid penny is going to be spent where. And that's -- and how it's going to be accounted for, and how it's going to be monitored and evaluated. And that simply has added a layer of bureaucracy with no value at the State Department.

REP. BERMAN: Time of the gentleman has quite expired. Gentleman from New Jersey.

REP. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (Inaudible) -- and I were just speaking, and we both agree the travel ban ought to be lifted by Fidel Castro. Because if you are a human rights activist or democracy activist, you don't get out, and if we lift it unilaterally without any kind of linkage, there will be a very perverse outcome.

And you know, our Ambassador Watson talked a moment ago about the medical students, that how the -- happy doctors that she met. But Dr. Oscar Biscet remains in -- often in solitary confinement, an Afro-Cuban medical doctor, Elbeigyn (ph), an outstanding human right activist who got 25 years for advancing the cause of liberty and human rights. So, lift the travel ban -- and I often remember they would have done that back in the early part of this decade, if and only if the political prisoners are released. And I think we ought to have that linkage and we ought to be very clear about it. You might want to comment on that.

On Belarus I'm meeting with Lebedko, Alexander Lebedko, a good friend and human activist. I'm very concerned that the Belarus Democracy Act may be weakened by the administration. I know there's some talk of that, your view on that.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

On Vietnam, thank you Secretary Craner for saying, you know, the engagement didn't work. As soon as the bilateral agreement was signed, there was an immediate demonstrable deterioration of human rights. And those who signed Block 8406 found themselves being hunted down, religious freedom gains were immediately reversed.

And I join the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom in saying, we impose CPC, your views on that. On TIP, we'll find out, Ms. Windsor, on Monday whether or not the (clientitis ?) that you spoke of, again manifests itself inside the building and from our U.S. missions abroad.

India ought to be on Tier 3, Vietnam absolutely for its labor trafficking. And China, one of the worst trafficking meccas in the world ought to be on Tier 3. And I'm very fearful politics will again rear its ugly head; your views.

And then, finally, last week I was part of a launch by Child-Link of a new initiative called All Growth Allowed. It's an effort to re- enfranchise the girl child in China who has been targeted for extermination as a result of the one-child-per-couple policy.

Why, I would ask all of you, has the international community been so grossly indifferent and enabling even by groups like UNFPA? Where is CEDAW, where is the Human Rights Council which dashes Israel with predictability, unfortunately? Where is the genocide panel of experts at the U.N. and others, while women and children, especially the girl child is being, like I said, exterminated in China. Where are they?

REP. BERMAN: You have 2 minutes and 16 seconds.

MR. CRANER: On Cuba, one might be able to cite reasons, I might not necessarily agree then to lift the travel ban; human rights and democracy is not one of them. That's the bottom-line. It may help businesses, it may help the hotels in Cuba whatever, but human rights and democracy is not a good reason.

On Belarus, the Democracy Act, it is being weakened. The (Charge d' ?) has taken in Minsk - - one of five diplomats we still have left there has taken it upon himself to say that the character of assistance for the opposition should be changed and reduced.

On Vietnam, if they are not making improvements then absolutely CPC should be changed. On China, the Chinese are going to have the biggest problem of all with us because it's creating huge social tensions in the country. You and I both know there's a lot of trafficking into China of women from abroad because there aren't any women, there aren't enough women for all the guys to marry, and they've already got huge social tensions and economic tensions caused by our recession. This is going to be one big problem for them.

MS. MASSIMINO: Well, I could just reinforce on China as you know, I mean we -- it took to get recognition here, it took an act of Congress to get the United States to recognize that victims of forced abortion are victims of persecution. Our laws on refugee status were not being interpreted even to recognize that that constitutes persecution, that's absurd. I think

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

obviously, China is a human rights disaster on so many levels. It's a complicated place, in order -- it's easy to condemn, it's very difficult to make progress.

And I think one of the things, if I could just highlight for us that structurally, I was really concerned when, you know, today in the Post it was announced, but we've known this that the midterm review of the report of the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review is not going to be made public. Many of us have been working on that for a while. And what we do know is there are 12 task forces working on this, and none of them seems to have anything to do with human rights.

And I -- we hear that it's integrated throughout in all of that, but I think Congress really needs to ask some questions about this. And I think there ought to be hearing on it as quickly as possible.

REP. BERMAN: Time of the gentleman has expired. Gentlelady from Texas.

REP. LEE: Mr. Chairman, thank you for your courtesies and I apologize for the witnesses for being delayed. I'd be remiss not to say to you that the one of the overriding crises is that of the BP oil spill, which might need some conflicting concepts of freedom, democracy and otherwise. And I come from the Gulf region. So thank you for your indulgence with my questions.

I do want to say that this is a very important hearing. And I think I'm going to take a different bend. I was not here, so I don't know what the others have done so as well. There's a concept called allies. And it raises it heads in a very large way. China is an ally or one that we've built over the years. Afghanistan is an ally. We're working to make the continent of Africa "allies" plural.

And of course, Iran has a different posture. But we have Iranian Americans. And here's my concern. When we talk about human rights and democracy assistance, it is what we overlook. For example, the good news is we had a hearing on the rights of women yesterday and we understand the United Nations is in the midst of putting together a task force to develop a component or a department that is for women's rights, that would have the leadership level of the secretary general.

But when we have allies, we tend to not be restrictive, not be demanding, and not use the human rights clout. And part of it is that some of these countries are independent and some of them, we need them. So for example, in Afghanistan. That government makes a lot of conversation about human rights and women's rights, but continuously allows -- because they are in a war, I guess, position -- the abuses to continue.

What do we do there? Because we are giving them dollars for governance. But we hear stories that women parliamentarians can't travel back to their districts for fear of loss of life. In Iran for example, there is a resistance movement that we seem to characterize as terrorists or bad. And I don't understand why we can't find ways of working or collaborating or finding out more facts, so that if there is a legitimate resistance movement, not by violence, but by supporting opportunities for democracy and human rights.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

And so my confusion is on how we use this assistance is, that we're blocked by way of our friendship, and then when there are groups that are willing to take a risk, they get labeled, they're stigmatized. Maybe there is a basis for it, but I think we've got to find a way to really own up to how much we are committed -- without violence, without a war -- I don't want us to be in that posture, but to really be forceful, consistent on this question of promoting human rights and democracy.

Can I just -- I'd like you to go down the line with -- looks like I have 1.56 seconds. Thank you.

MS. WINDSOR: Well, let me just say that, well, it's -- you can't get complete consistency absolutely, every government, no matter whether they're our ally or adversary, should be subject to the same standards -- the universal standard that Elisa mentioned earlier. I will add to one of the allies, the list of allies where we ignore democracy and human rights concerns, that being Ethiopia. No one actually talks about Ethiopia.

But it's really been -- essentially democracy and human rights has been ignored for the last -- since this government came in power and since the 9/11, it's been -- they just had the worst possible elections and there was really no U.S. statement at all, or no U.S. effort to try to criticize them because of course they play a very important role.

Similarly in Egypt, I think that we keep on saying that we are going to put democracy and human rights. We need the Egyptians to do certain things from us. But it makes us look --

REP. LEE: Well, we've got to push. Can I just yield to Mr. Craner, what you -- where's our push?

MR. CRANER: Where's our push; I think the leadership from the department is very, very important. This body does not confirm officials, the Senate does. But I can't tell you how important it is as somebody who used to work in legislative affairs of the State Department, and who worked again for Secretary Powell doing human rights, how important it is that you bring people up here.

I once said to Marc Grossman, who is the undersecretary of State -- I'd been at State a couple months, my second time -- and I said, you know, I'm finding that folks under 40, 45 get human rights because we kind of grew up with it.

And I'm finding -- but I'm finding that people who are little older, don't get it. But I said then oddly, people who are the assistant secretaries and the undersecretaries get it. And he looked at me like I was a fool and he said, Loren, they have to get confirmed and they have to go up and testify at Congress. Don't underestimate your role and value when witnesses come up here on bothering them on these issues.

REP. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, you've just gaveled me down. But I must say that we've got to make some use out of power on human rights if we are going to carry our message of democracy and freedom forward. Thank you, I yield back.

Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery

REP. BERMAN: Thank you. I think, given the time, I'll forgo the third round. I did want to pursue this notion of the conditioning in security assistance. But some other time, some other place. (Laughs.)

Thank you very much, it's been a very valuable contribution you've made to our education on the subject, and we're grateful that you took the time to come here.

With that, the committee hearing is adjourned. (Sounds gavel.)

END.