IS AMERICA'S OVERSEAS BROADCASTING UNDERMINING OUR NATIONAL INTEREST AND THE FIGHT AGAINST TYRANNICAL REGIMES?

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 6, 2011

Serial No. 112–13

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

65–628PDF WASHINGTON : 2011

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
RON PAUL, Texas
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas
TED POE, Texas
GUS M. BILIRAKIS, Florida
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
BILL JOHNSON, Ohio
DAVID RIVERA, Florida
MIKE KELLY, Pennsylvania
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
ANN MARIE BUERKLE, New York
RENEE ELLMERS, North Carolina
VACANT

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
BRAD SHERMAN, California
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
DENNIS CARDOZA, California
BEN CHANDLER, Kentucky
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
ALLYSON SCHWARTZ, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY, Connecticut
FREDERICA WILSON, Florida
KAREN BASS, California
WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island

YLEEM D.S. POBLETE, *Staff Director*
RICHARD J. KESSLER, *Democratic Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

DANA ROHRABACHER, California, *Chairman*

MIKE KELLY, Pennsylvania
RON PAUL, Texas
TED POE, Texas
DAVID RIVERA, Florida

RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
KAREN BASS, California

CONTENTS

Page

WITNESSES

The Honorable S. Enders Wimbush, Board Member, Broadcasting Board of Governors 6
Ms. Jennifer Park Stout, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, U.S. Department of State 19
Mr. Philo L. Dibble, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Department of State 25
Mr. Amir Fakhravar, general secretary, Confederation of Iranian Students 31
Shiyu Zhou, Ph.D., vice president, New Tang Dynasty Television 38
John Lenczowski, Ph.D., president, Institute of World Politics 43
Mr. Robert Reilly, former director, Voice of America 55

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

The Honorable S. Enders Wimbush: Prepared statement 8
Ms. Jennifer Park Stout: Prepared statement 22
Mr. Philo L. Dibble: Prepared statement 27
Mr. Amir Fakhravar: Prepared statement 34
Shiyu Zhou, Ph.D.: Prepared statement 40
John Lenczowski, Ph.D.: Prepared statement 46

APPENDIX

Hearing notice 78
Hearing minutes 80
Mr. Robert Reilly: Prepared statement and material submitted for the record . 81

IS AMERICA'S OVERSEAS BROADCASTING UNDERMINING OUR NATIONAL INTEREST AND THE FIGHT AGAINST TYRANNICAL REGIMES?

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2011

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:50 p.m., in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dana Rohrabacher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Good morning. Except it is not morning. Good afternoon, everyone. And I want to thank the ranking member, who isn't here, and he will be here, and I will thank him when he gets here, and the other members of the subcommittee who have joined us here. And I also want to thank the witnesses for coming today.

I have called this hearing to investigate one of the greatest failures in recent American foreign policy, and that is to define and follow a strategic communications strategy. As I was going through my background, when I said I worked at the White House, obviously most of you know I was one of President Reagan's speech writers. And a communications strategy—I was actually on the scene to witness Reagan change the world.

Today I would like to talk about this, a strategic and lack of, perhaps, a strategic communication strategy, and I would like to talk about this in the context of two of America's most dangerous enemies, Iran and Communist China. First and foremost, American strategic—Russ, come right on. Sorry I started without you, but we did wait for you. Honest we did.

First and foremost, American strategic communications and public diplomacy should seek to promote the national interests of the United States through informing and influencing foreign audiences. This is often referred to as the war of ideas. The role and responsibilities of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, that is the BBG, is not only journalism. I was a journalist before. While I was doing all those crazy things, I was earning a living being a journalist. That is not the only job for the Broadcasting Board of Governors. The BBG is critical to our national security effort, and not just to a journalism and a journalistic effort.

While much is said about how new technology—Internet, social networks, Twitter—is bringing the world together and empowering

the general public, not much is being said about the messages being carried along these new information conduits. It is often assumed that these messages are being dominated by people who believe in freedom and would liberate the country from tyranny, yet the dictatorial regimes of Communist China and Iran are currently controlling and manipulating the flow of information in their countries and about their countries.

During the Cold War I worked in the White House when President Reagan ordered a massive infusion of funds to help Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Reagan knew the utility of public diplomacy, and he used it artfully. Lech Walesa, leader of the Solidarity freedom movement, and later the President of Poland, remarked on the value of U.S. Radio broadcasting by saying of its importance, "it cannot be described. Would there be Earth without a sun?"

Could the BBG's programming today have that same level of significance and importance to the modern Lech Walesas of Iran and China? Is our programming helping or undermining freedom movements in those dictatorships?

During the Cold War we defined the Soviet Union as the enemy, and under Reagan's leadership we set out to defeat it. If the Communist Chinese Party is to be defeated without us suffering war, not just us but them suffering war, as Reagan ended the Cold War without a confrontation, a conflict directly between the Soviet Union and the United States, we must have the same level of commitment to broadcasting our message and the freedom message, and we need to energize public diplomacy.

Recently it was announced that the Voice of America will lay off over half of its Mandarin language broadcasters, a reduction of 45 Chinese journalists. The BBG proposes to eliminate Voice of America's daily 12-hour Chinese radio and television broadcasting next year. This is worrisome. I look forward to hearing our administration witnesses address this point specifically. Is there more behind this reduction than merely saving money? The $8 million saved will do far more to weaken our efforts in trying to confront a belligerent and dictatorial China than it will to balance our Federal budget, that is for sure.

In Fiscal Year 2012, the BBG has requested over $767 million. That is an increase from the $758 million that they were appropriated in Fiscal Year 2010. I might add, being given money this year of all years is no small request. We need to make sure that it is worth it because we are in the business of cutting down the level of deficit spending. So if we spend more, we have got to get more. And the gutting of the VOA's China service does not seem to fit into this criteria. At the same time, China is spending lavishly. The Chinese regime has dished out over $7 billion over the last 2 years on its propaganda, this as we are slashing our communications effort.

I seriously question the wisdom of the BBG's recent decision to switch from short-wave radio broadcasting to an Internet-based service. This new approach will be much more vulnerable to the type of Internet controls and monitoring that the Chinese Communist Party has been perfecting for the last few years.

As the U.S. has retreated from short-wave radio, the Communist China Radio International has expanded, tripling its English broadcasting since 2000 and going from using 150 frequencies to over 280 frequencies. Obviously short-wave is working for someone if they are expanding that way. As we are about to lay off over half of VOA's Mandarin language workforce, the official propaganda arm of the Chinese Communist Party is aggressively expanding and opening an office in downtown Manhattan.

Unfortunately, the problems with U.S. public diplomacy extend well beyond China. Promoting democracy in Iran has been an official U.S. policy since the Iran Freedom Support Act was passed in 2006, though American broadcasts to Iran, of course, started much earlier than that date.

Radio Farda and the VOA's Persian News Network have in the past used Iranian Government sources for their reporting. Giving air time to the Iranian Government is a misguided effort perhaps to have some kind of journalistic balance. Well, the American taxpayers are not and should not be funding an effort to give a balance to the mullahs' repressive views. This is less of a problem for Radio Farda, since they spend the majority of their time and resources playing music, not talking about issues or informing the Iranian people.

It is disturbing to learn of the BBG's slowness in reporting information about the violence that the Iranian mullahs unleashed against the Green movement when it was protesting the stealing of Iran's elections back in 2009. And so at the same time we are trying to give balance to views, we are slow at reporting the type of negative things that they are doing. Certainly this is not the kind of record that best serves America's national interest.

Recognizing these problems, I am a strong supporter of U.S. diplomacy, and I believe we need more of it and not less of it. But it needs to be reformed, and it needs to be energized and properly directed. America needs an up-to-date national communications strategy that reflects our values, ideals and our national interests. U.S. broadcasting must commit itself to this.

Perhaps background checks or more training of BBG employees is in order here. We will discuss that. But I am sure—and I am sure our distinguished witnesses, will have some ideas how to improve U.S. strategic communications, and I am looking forward to hearing them.

To explain the issues today, we have a number of witnesses who I will introduce after my ranking member Mr. Carnahan proceeds with his opening statement.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to start off by congratulating you again on being chairman of the subcommittee. I enjoyed working with you on the subcommittee in the past and look forward to working with you as ranking member in this upcoming session. Also, I know, as you said, that you are a strong supporter of U.S. diplomacy to be sure that we are doing it in the most effective way, and I join you in that commitment. And thank you for holding this hearing.

Taking a critical look on how we are conducting public diplomacy and strategic communications abroad is a great start for the subcommittee. Public diplomacy programs are a critical and indispen-

sable component of U.S. foreign policy. From exchange programs to international broadcasting to strategic communications, public diplomacy is not only an effective component of U.S. foreign policy, it can and it should also be cost-effective.

I commend Under Secretary of State Judith McHale for her new Strategic Framework for Public Diplomacy that she released this year. While there are enormous challenges facing how we conduct public diplomacy, I would highlight that her pointing out the need to reach populations that are underserved by U.S. engagement, such as women and young people, is especially critical. I held a subcommittee hearing last year on women's empowerment in the political process. That hearing showed the impact that empowering women can have on increasing stability in many countries.

Regarding the youth population, we need to look no further than recent events in the Middle East and North Africa to see not only the need to reach this huge group of people, but also the great promise it can have, and particularly their use and engagement of new social media. I will be especially interested to hear about these points from our witnesses today.

All five of the strategic imperatives laid out in this initiative have great merit, but I want to make a few comments about the second that seeks to "expand and strengthen people-to-people relationships." The value of human interaction has some of the highest impact of our foreign policy. One of those is our student exchange programs. Both Americans abroad to show others firsthand who we are as a country, as well as those coming from other countries here to learn American values are invaluable. I was very pleased when Secretary Clinton indicated her commitment to these programs when she testified before the full committee last month, and I will continue to encourage the administration to support these types of programs going forward.

As I have stated before in this subcommittee, my district is home to one of the largest Bosnian American populations in the country. I often hear from them about the value of U.S. broadcasting to Bosnia. Many of them watch Voice of America on line or via satellite. This type of programming has enormous value, both here and abroad. It continues to reinforce American values to diasporas like the Bosnians in my district who stay active in their home countries. We need to continue engagement in all possible ways. I look forward to hearing about how we can continue these efforts in the most effective way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you.

Our witnesses today, I would ask if you could, if you do, if you can, limit your remarks to 5 minutes, and then we will put the rest into the record, and we will then proceed to have a question-and-answer session.

With us today we have—and we are a little mixed up because I got everybody up here so we could have one session of questions. To explain these issues today we have Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Jennifer Stout. Pardon me, I could not read your thing from here, and you were supposed to be there, but that is okay. We will work this out. Jennifer Stout, responsible for public diplomacy and public affairs in the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

Ms. Stout worked here on Capitol Hill for over 11 years before going to the State Department, and was then, before that, a staffer to Senators Biden and Leahy. She holds an M.A. from George Washington University.

And next we have Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs, Philo Dibble, who is a retired senior Foreign Service officer—where are you? There. Okay—who has been overseas on many overseas assignments, especially the Middle East. He has a master's degree from Johns Hopkins University.

From the Broadcasting Board of Governors we have with us Enders Wimbush and Michael Meehan. Of course, Mr. Wimbush is a senior vice president at Hudson Institute. And from 1987 to 1993, he served and did a great job as director of Radio Liberty in Munich, Germany. And Mr. Meehan is president of the Blue Line Strategic Communications, and over the past two decades has served in senior roles for Senators Kerry and Boxer in addition to others.

Then we have with us John Lenczowski, or I should say Dr. Lenczowski, one of my very good friends from my years in the Reagan White House. John was the Director of European and Soviet Affairs at the National Security Council, a man targeted by the Soviets, but stood firm. And we were always proud of the good work that he was doing there, and a man who I think can at the end of his career feel very satisfied that he helped end the Cold War. And today he is the founder and president of the Institute for World Politics and International Affairs Graduate School here in Washington, DC.

Another friend of mine from the Reagan years, Robert Reilly, who was a special assistant to President Ronald Reagan and then went on to become director of the Voice of America. During the Iraq war he was a senior advisor to the Iraqi Ministry of Information and a senior advisor for information strategy to the Secretary of Defense.

And we also have with us Amir—please pronounce it.

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. Fakhravar.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. Fakhravar.

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. That is okay.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. There you go. Can you pronounce Rohrabacher?

And we are very happy to have him with us today. He was a writer and journalist inside Iran, who was jailed by the regime for opposing their despotic and violent ways. After spending 5 years in prison, he came to the United States in 2006 and founded the Confederation of Iranian Students to work to create a free Iran.

Then we have with us Mr. Shiyu Zhou. There you are. Okay. And he is executive vice president of the New Tang Dynasty Television, the only U.S.-based, independent Chinese-language TV network broadcasting into China. Mr. Zhou is a Ph.D. and formerly a computer scientist at the Mathematical Science Research Center at Bell Labs.

I would like to ask the witnesses to summarize for 5 minutes each. The order will be Mr. Enders Wimbush first, then Ms. Stout, then Mr. Dibble, and then the gentleman who I can't pronounce his name.

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. Fakhravar.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. There he is. You are next.

And then Mr. Zhou. And then Mr. Lenczowski and Mr. Reilly.

Did I forget anybody? No. Okay.

So may we start with Mr. Enders Wimbush.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE S. ENDERS WIMBUSH, BOARD MEMBER, BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Mr. WIMBUSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. It is a pleasure to be here to discuss something that has been part of my professional thinking for my entire professional life. I would like to, Mr. Chairman, submit my full testimony for the record and proceed with even abbreviated remarks.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Without objection.

Mr. WIMBUSH. Thank you.

The focus today is going to be on Iran and China. I am ready to address both issues from the standpoint of the Broadcast Board of Governors, but I want to start with a little good-news story that has to do with neither, but affects both, and that has to do with the recent events in the Middle East.

Just 2 weeks ago in Tahrir Square, a nascent democratic movement that started in Tunisia blossomed on the streets of Cairo. Citizens took to the square to air their political demands and economic demands and their demand for justice and change.

The Arab-speaking world saw and heard the events unfold through reporters from Alhurra Television on the air and on the scene 19 hours a day, providing live coverage of these historical events. In a flash survey of Cairo and Alexandria during the critical events, 25 percent of respondents, 25 percent of respondents, said they used the station to follow the news. These results are comparable to international broadcasting's best success stories during the Cold War.

At the height of the demonstrations, pro-Mubarak demonstrators targeted international journalists. They passed out fliers on the street naming Alhurra and saying, we are going to kick you out of Egypt. Thugs physically ejected Alhurra's journalists from their Cairo studio, but the journalists immediately found another place, and for a significant period of time in Tahrir Square, Alhurra Television was the only network in the world with a live feed coming out of Tahrir Square. Alhurra is just one of the—one part of the global broadcast enterprise that constitutes U.S. international broadcasting.

It was quoted—Alhurra's coverage was quoted around the world. The leading Pan-Arab newspaper, Al Hayat, wrote that, and I quote, "Alhurra was distinguished for its live and continuous coverage of the protest through its network of correspondents in the different European cities."

The same news coverage continued in Libya, in Syria, in Bahrain and in Yemen. In Libya, a Radio Sawa correspondent, part of the Middle East broadcasting network, accompanied the rebels as they advanced toward Tripoli. Time.com commented on Alhurra's positive coverage exposing Yemenis to "the support of the outside world."

On March 27th, in a cooperative transmission effort with the Department of Defense, direct broadcasts of Radio Sawa were sent into Libya on an FM frequency from Commando Solo, an airborne transmission platform provided by the United States Air Force. Commando Solo will provide approximately 6 hours per day of radio transmission from the aircraft. Prior to this breakthrough, Radio Sawa was only available in Libya via the Internet streaming or satellite broadcast.

I cite this, Mr. Chairman, to begin my remarks as a reminder to all of us that we have some extremely brave people involved in international broadcasting, and they do some extremely important things in the national interest.

In broadcasting to Iran today from the Voice of America's Persian News Network and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's Radio Farda, the BBG has taken this as one of its highest priorities. And I will be happy to discuss both our concern of the way things—the way we found things, and what we have done to pick things up and to get it back on an even keel.

The Government of Iran, as we know, does what it can to jam both the PNN and the Farda broadcasts and to interfere with their Internet sites. PNN broadcasts are jammed on satellite. Radio Farda's medium-wave signal has been jammed since shortly after its inception. Things haven't always been perfect in these places, but these are pretty good measures of effectiveness. More recently Radio Farda was the target of a denial-of-service attack to swamp its incoming phone lines and disrupt calls from its audience.

In China, as in the case with Iran, BBG broadcasts faced substantial transmission hurdles. The BBG is unable to place its programming on any media, any media, in China, despite, as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, the Chinese ability to place their content on media around the world. We are not able to place it on any media in China, and the Chinese Government heavily jams our radio broadcasts.

In spite of this, China's firm control over access to information has been increasingly thwarted by the proliferation of cell phones and the Internet, and the Internet is particularly worrisome to the Chinese and offers opportunities for the BBG and other media to reach Chinese citizens.

Now, I will be happy when I yield in question time to go into the specifics of the BBG's realignment to China, but I need to make a couple things clear right at the beginning. We have not given up short-wave broadcasting to China. The VOA will not be broadcasting short-wave to China, but Radio Free Asia, which has been assigned the best frequencies and the best times, will continue broadcasting short-wave to China. Meanwhile, the Voice of America's very substantial resources will be focused on the Internet, and when we have time for some questions, I will tell you precisely why we decided on going in this direction.

But to get to the point, to get to the bottom line, this is a two-prong strategy. It is not the strategy that has been widely portrayed in the media, that the United States is going out of the short-wave business in China. It is nothing of the kind. We are continuing legacy short-wave broadcasts to China with one of our most powerful and dynamic short-wave broadcasters, and we are rein-

vesting in the Internet where the audience is migrating. And I will be happy to give you facts and figures on how that audience is migrating into those areas.

So in conclusion, my time is up. I am ready to answer questions and eager to do so.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You will get the questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wimbush follows:]

Testimony of the Broadcasting Board of Governors
Delivered by S. Enders Wimbush
Before the
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
Committee on Foreign Affairs
U.S. House of Representatives
April 6, 2011

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, it is our pleasure to be here today to speak to the role of U.S. international broadcasting in advancing U.S. national interests.

Just a few months ago in Tahrir Square, a nascent democratic movement that started in Tunisia blossomed on the streets of Cairo. Citizens took to the square to air their political and economic demands for change and justice.

The Arab-speaking world saw and heard the events unfold through reporters from Alhurra Television, on the scene and on the air, 19 hours a day, providing live coverage of these historical events. Radio Sawa's Egyptian stream expanded its newscasts to provide in-depth information on the latest news from Cairo, interviews with U.S. officials, demonstrators in the square, and noted analysts from U.S. and Middle Eastern human rights organizations and think tanks.

At the height of the demonstrations, pro-Mubarak protesters targeted international journalists, including those of Alhurra. They passed out flyers in the streets, naming Alhurra, saying "we are going to kick you out of Egypt." Thugs came to the Alhurra news studio in Cairo, threatening the journalists with bodily harm, and told them to leave. Alhurra's correspondents quickly relocated to another facility and continued reporting. For a time, as these threats against journalists continued, Alhurra was the only international satellite news network to broadcast live from Cairo.

Stories from the Square included a profile of Rami Gamal Shafik Ahmed, a young man who came out to protest in Tahrir Square to call for change. Rami was killed during the clashes; yet his family continued to protest each day to finish the fight he started.

From the beginning of the democratic movement in January, Alhurra and Radio Sawa's newsrooms received calls from Egyptian opposition leaders and citizen

protesters wanting to share information and their views. Representatives of Egyptian opposition parties – including Wafd, Ghad, and the Movement for Democratic Change – contacted the Alhurra newsroom. They wanted to appear on Alhurra because they knew people were watching and listening.

Alhurra's coverage was quoted around the world, including by CNN. The leading pan-Arab newspaper Al Hayat, wrote that "Alhurra was distinguished for its live and continuous coverage of the protest through its network of correspondents in the different Egyptian cities." Time.com commented on Alhurra's positive coverage, "exposing Yemenis to the support of the outside world."

Alhurra's coverage of Middle Eastern dissent continued in Libya, Syria, Bahrain, and Yemen. In Libya, a Radio Sawa correspondent accompanied the rebels as they advanced towards Tripoli and their eventual retreat under heavy fighting. In an attempt to deprive Libyans of an accurate portrayal of events happening in their country, Libyan authorities jammed the Alhurra signal on the popular Nilesat satellite system for almost a month. When the signal was initially jammed, Alhurra's newsroom received hundreds of phone calls an hour from Libyans saying they could not receive the channel's signal. In the meantime, state-controlled channels insisted that everything was normal and there was no insurrection.

On March 27th, in a cooperative transmission effort with the Department of Defense, direct broadcasts of Radio Sawa were beamed to Libya on an FM frequency from the "Commando Solo" airborne transmission platform. Commando Solo will provide approximately six hours per day of radio transmission from the aircraft. Prior to this breakthrough, Radio Sawa was only available in Libya via Internet streaming or satellite broadcast.

Using social media, Alhurra and Radio Sawa are soliciting citizen journalists to provide crowd source information to complement the reports provided by their correspondents. Audiences across the Middle East discussed the historic events across the region through social media. Comments to Alhurra and Sawa were discussed on the air. The networks regularly ask questions through Facebook, such as, 'will Libya become a democratic state or head into civil war,' and encourage viewers to share their opinions.

Over the last three months Alhurra has experienced an enormous increase in feedback from the audience. Using email, Facebook, and Twitter, Alhurra and

Radio Sawa have heard from their audiences in a way never previously experienced. Comments received from the audience include:

- Arabs discovered that Alhurra is one of the most credible channels. I'm sure that you will contribute to spreading the ideas of freedom and democracy.
- I would like to thank you for your honest view of the current revolution happening in Egypt.
- I watch Alhurra constantly because it is credible.
- "Thanks you for the most distinctive coverage and analysis of this great event and all the global and political developments on the subject."
- "Thanks for the genius Akram Khuzam who oversees and continues to convey to us everything from the field."

In a BBG flash survey of 500 respondents in Cairo and Alexandria from February 3 - 8, of the sources Egyptians said they were using for news and information about the protests and related developments, 98% cited TV, 76% friends and family, 52% radio, 51% newspapers, and 31% the Internet. Poll results indicate that Alhurra TV reached a large audience during this period, with 25% of respondents saying they had used the station to follow the events – far more than either BBC or CNN.

As the political events in Egypt and the Middle East unfolded, every BBG network provided reports on this aspirational story.

The Voice of America relayed the story around the world. RFE/RL and Radio Free Asia also carried the story, tailoring it to their audiences. In China, RFA focused mainly on China's reaction to the demonstrations, including the government ban on news of the unrest as well as Chinese cyber activists' calls for similar demonstrations. Similarly, Radio and TV Marti reported the story of Egypt and Libya to its listeners and viewers in Cuba.

The programming produced during these events is emblematic of the work that U.S. international broadcasting has done throughout its history. Over 60 years ago, our nation began laying the foundations to support the free flow of ideas around the world in support of democracy and freedom of thought. The Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty served American interests during the Cold War, bringing the power of a free press to populations under the thumb of ideologically driven information sources.

Today, the United States faces new threats, including that of violent extremism. We understand that we cannot combat extremism through force alone. It is critically important that we engage audiences in discussions about events on their soil and abroad, and provide the accurate news and information that supports freedom of thought and democratic development.

Throughout U.S. international broadcasting's long history, the tools and goals have been consistent: delivering consistently accurate, reliable and credible reporting that opens minds and stimulates debate in closed societies -- especially where local media fails to inform and empower its citizens.

The Subcommittee has asked whether America's foreign broadcasting is consistent with our nation's interests and commitment to freedom. We believe that it soundly is. The BBG's legislative mandate, spelled out in the U.S. International Broadcasting Act of 1994, defines the BBG's role and function in the national interest and the support of freedom. The Act finds that "Open communication of information and ideas among the peoples of the world contributes to international peace and stability and the promotion of such communication is in the interests of the United States." It requires that BBG broadcasts shall include "news which is consistently reliable and authoritative, accurate, objective, and comprehensive" and that broadcasting shall "be conducted in accordance with the highest professional standards of broadcast journalism."

The Act recognizes that accurate news informs the public, allowing individuals to aspire to freedom, and to make decisions based on what is true – rather than on what their governments may tell them.

This simple idea – that the objective truth serves the national interest -- has had profound consequences. Accurate, comprehensive news from VOA during World War II contributed to the defeat of German Nazism. During the Cold War, the same news product from the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty broadcasts helped end Soviet totalitarianism.

Today, U.S.-sponsored broadcasts, available through radio, television, the Internet and mobile devices, allow populations to learn the facts; share their experiences on the ground through Twitter, SMS text, and cell phone video; and become participants in the global community that is providing a new voice to those who have had none.

In those early days of the VOA and RFE/RL, broadcasts focused on Europe and the former Soviet Union. Today, four of the five broadcast networks under the supervision of the Broadcasting Board of Governors -- the Voice of America (VOA), the Middle East Broadcasting Networks (Alhurra TV and Radio Sawa), Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Asia -- provide programming for Muslim audiences.

Eighteen of RFE/RL's broadcast languages, almost two-thirds of the total, are directed to regions where the majority populations are Muslim, including to Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bosnia, Kosovo, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, as well as the majority Muslim populations of Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, and the North Caucasus in the Russian Federation.

BBG broadcast resources follow national security priorities.

- VOA's Persian News Network (PNN), the top international broadcaster to Iran, reaches 19.6 percent of the adult population watching at least once weekly, with the majority of those surveyed indicating the network has increased their understanding of events in the Middle East, Iran, and the U.S. The PNN website is one of VOA's most active. Its popular satire, *Parazit* (or "Static") attracts millions of Facebook page views, and was featured in the *Washington Post* and on the John Stewart show as a ground-breaking program.

- The Middle East Broadcasting Networks broadcast throughout the Middle East, to an audience of 35 million.

- VOA's Indonesian Service broadcasts to the largest Muslim majority country in the world and now reaches more than 26 million Indonesians each week.

- Broadcasting in a coordinated stream, VOA and RFE/RL provide news and information to Afghanistan and the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region in Dari and Pashto. RFE/RL and VOA together reach 65 percent of Afghan adults each week.

- Targeted programming by RFE/RL and VOA to the Pakistan-Afghanistan border region – in the Pashtun dialect of the region – reaches a critical audience that would otherwise consume Taliban radio.

- Every week, 73 percent of Iraqi adults—some 9.5 million people—listen to or watch one of the four BBG broadcasters serving the country: Alhurra TV, Radio Sawa, RFE/RL's Radio Free Iraq, and VOA Kurdish.

Advancing press freedom is central to the broadcast mission. Our broadcasts serve as both an alternative to censored media and a model of a free press. Our journalists around the world endure hardships and take great risks to bring news and information that is vital to our audiences. As the State Department honors its diplomats who have died while serving their country, the BBG's memorial to fallen journalists honors their cause. Our technical experts who combat censorship online and on the airwaves, play a continuous chess match of transmission interference circumvention.

BBG broadcasts serve a host of critical functions, including:

- Fostering respect for human rights;
- Strengthening civil society, rule of law, and transparency;
- Stemming religious and ethnic intolerance;
- Combating hate media; and
- Communicating what America stands for – our policies, values, and culture.

A VOA broadcaster once said that the impact of U.S. international broadcasting is "being there, every day." Audiences around the world depend on our consistent broadcasts. On Burmese opposition leader and Nobel Peace Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi's release from house arrest, she immediately sought to appear regularly on VOA and Radio Free Asia's Burmese Service programs.

Listeners were able to engage Aung San Suu Kyi on topics of their choice in a weekly series. In the first installment, Ms. Suu Kyi answered questions from listeners on her time under house arrest, global sanctions against Burma, free speech and human rights, and democracy.

Iran

In Iran, BBG networks continue to provide critical information to a population that must rely all too heavily on state-sponsored news reports. VOA's Persian News Network continues to grow in professionalism and its impact is seen in audience response. After Iran's disputed June 12 presidential election, citizen journalists in Iran sent cell phone videos and still photos directly to PNN, providing evidence of the chaos on the ground that could be shared with their countrymen throughout Iran. Those events triggered thousands of emails and phone calls to the network. In a flash poll taken in Iran shortly after the elections, 31 percent of those polled said they had followed the election controversy on PNN's "Newstalk" program.

Reporting on events within Iran, RFE/RL's Radio Farda continues to expose injustice, such as in its story on the plight of members of a Workers Union who were imprisoned for insulting the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei. Radio Farda's medium wave signal has been jammed since shortly after its inception. More recently, it was the target of a denial-of-service attack to swamp Farda's incoming phone lines and disrupt calls from its audience.

Given the high priority of broadcasting to Iran, the Board has performed close oversight of program capabilities, with the knowledge that these broadcasts must continue to meet the needs of the Iranian people and U.S. national interests.

New leadership at PNN is building on the network's earlier engagement with Iranian audiences. Program adjustments and enhancements are underway that will provide more investigative news, greater insights into American life, coverage of Iranian history and culture, in-depth economic reporting, and programs that create and moderate debate between representatives of major Iranian political and social groups.

Through programming that honors Iran's past, we can discuss Iran's 2,500 year legacy – one that the Iranian government intentionally diminishes. Our future-oriented programming will connect us to the aspirations of the Iranian people to connect with the world around them. Enhanced economic programming will expose government corruption, commodity cartels, and Revolutionary Guard economic dominance. Of even greater interest would be discussion of Iran's huge economic potential should its leadership abandon its nuclear program and malign activities in the region, and its government's decision to nonetheless hobble this potential at the expense of its citizens.

Ensuring Media Access

A prerequisite for success in PNN's transformation is achieving robust and secure satellite, radio and internet access for PNN's programming to Iran. The Iranian government routinely jams our satellite transmission as well as our radio programming, and takes a series of steps to inhibit access to our Internet materials.

The BBG also relies on satellite broadcasting to bring its TV and radio programming to audiences, such as in the Middle East and Iran. By and large, satellites are not jammed. However, there have been recent episodes of satellite jamming of Alhurra Television programming during the recent unrest in the Middle East, and more sustained satellite jamming of PNN by the Iranian Government.

Iran has employed two kinds of jamming techniques: Uplink jamming, which attacks all programming on the satellite transponder; and downlink or terrestrial jamming at or near the frequency of the receiving satellite antenna system. Iran has been using downlink jamming techniques for at least 10 years on a regular basis and is known to increase the intensity of jamming during and after internal political events in an effort to restrict outside influences.

Finding technical and diplomatic solutions to counter the Iranian government's measures is essential to achieving the BBG's mission.

China

The BBG sponsors two broadcast networks that reach China – VOA and Radio Free Asia. Both provide radio broadcasts to China and both have a substantial web presence. VOA also provides five hours of weekly television broadcasts.

As is the case in Iran, the broadcasts face substantial transmission hurdles. The BBG is unable to place its programming on any media in China, and the Chinese government heavily jams our radio broadcasts.

In spite of this, China's firm control over access to information has been increasingly thwarted by the proliferation of cell phones and the Internet. The Internet is particularly worrisome to the Chinese, and authorities have been

working on ways to limit its scope. Nonetheless, the Internet offers opportunities for the BBG and other media to reach Chinese citizens.

Web traffic to VOA's Chinese Service increased by 117 percent in March 2011 compared to the same period in 2010, to reach more than 1.1 million monthly visits. This number does not include all proxy traffic. This more than doubling in web traffic is attributed to fast, unique and accurate reports about the Jasmine demonstrations in China and events in the Middle East and the U.S. response. VOA also reached eight million recipients in February for its daily Chinese news emails delivered to the PRC.

Audiences for VOA's China Service programming can hear programming by Correspondent Zhang Nan in Beijing, questioning the hidden costs associated with events of the National People's Congress, and reports by Correspondents Nan Wang and Suli Yi in Oslo covering the Nobel Peace Prize events for Chinese dissident Liu Xiaobo.

A listener to Radio Free Asia might hear a report on the detention of longtime RFA supporter and interviewee Ran Yunfei. Ran, an activist and writer, was charged with "incitement to subvert state power." He was arrested after he published an article online detailing support for the Egyptian revolution which brought an end to the 30-year rule of former president Hosni Mubarak.

Social Media

As events in North Africa and the Middle East indicate, the communications environment around the world is changing rapidly. BBG and State Department sponsored independent research confirms the gathering momentum behind the use of digital media as a source of news and information, as well as the accelerating decline of radio – and particularly shortwave radio – in many parts of the world.

In this changing environment, the BBG needs to respond to this new global challenge with the same innovation and creativity that marked the U.S. response to the Cold War. The digital age offers new channels to disseminate our journalism. But it also offers the opportunity to interact with audiences, to share news and opinions, rather than simply handing down the news. Building online communities with our audiences offer the promise to actively engage in discussion on issues of mutual concern and interest. The agency's web anti-censorship program, using proxy sites and downloadable software, can sustain this web community.

In response to government censorship of the Internet, the BBG has developed a robust anti-censorship program to combat web blockage. This anti-censorship program is a small, but increasingly important, part of the agency's mission to provide news and information to audiences overseas.

The agency's Anti-Censorship Team employs existing technology to overcome web censorship, explores ways for our audiences to get past state-imposed censorship of websites and e-mails, and provides unfiltered access to information.

Our most used anti-censorship tools are web-based proxies with e-mail notifications of changed web proxy addresses. BBG broadcasters send large amounts of e-mails daily to interested users (primarily in China and Iran) that include both news summaries and proxy links. To get the e-mails through censors, we change keywords and modify the apparent sender.

The agency also partners with numerous academic and non-government organizations working on freedom of access to the Internet to develop and implement circumvention tools.

Traffic to BBG digital platforms and interactive dialogue with audiences has increased as young audiences seek information unavailable through local media. As digital traffic has increased, trends for radio listening are downward.

In 2006, 24 percent of Chinese adults owned and used radio for news and information. Results of a 2009 survey indicated that only 8 percent of Chinese adults are weekly radio listeners – half as many as in 2007.

Ownership and use of shortwave radio is in further decline. The BBG's 2010 survey showed that only .1 percent of respondents listen to VOA in Mandarin. Only 0.4 percent of respondents reported listening to any shortwave radio broadcasts in the previous week. Survey results showed hardly any acknowledged listening to any international broadcaster. Twenty-two out of 8,635 respondents reported having ever listened to VOA, while 7 had ever listened to RFA or BBC.

In contrast, the trend for use of the Internet and mobile technology is increasing rapidly. China has the largest number of Internet users in the world.

VOA Mandarin streams had 432,000 views in January 2011, and China is a consumer of VOA's English and Special English websites and media content - these websites are not blocked by the Chinese government. VOA's English learning website, "goEnglish.me" is also unblocked.

A recent survey showed that 38 percent of respondents said they own a computer, up from 30 percent in 2008 and 20 percent in 2007. Twenty-eight percent of Chinese are weekly Internet users – representing a sevenfold increase in China's Internet population since 2003.

The growth of mobile technology will offer additional means for content delivery to Chinese audiences. Seventy-five percent or more of Chinese mobile subscribers are projected to have access to the Internet within five years. By 2015, more than 550 million people are projected to have 3G subscriptions in China.

Conclusion

BBG networks play a critical role in countries that lack adequate press freedom and credible alternative media. We succeed when (a) we deliver the news our audiences want and need to make informed judgments about their societies, and (b) we deliver our content via the media our audiences prefer and can easily access. This is a simple formula but one that requires the agency to remain on top of media realities and trends, and position ourselves for the future.

Broadcasting is an independent yet integral part of a global U.S. government communications effort that seeks to advance U.S. national interests. In areas of critical U.S. foreign policy interest, there are numerous players in public diplomacy and strategic communications activities.

U.S. international broadcasting has a distinct niche – objective journalism. The power of a free press fuels and sustains the exchange of ideas and the struggle for individual thought and freedom.

We would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Ms. Stout.

STATEMENT OF MS. JENNIFER PARK STOUT, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, BUREAU OF EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ms. STOUT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Carnahan. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today and testify before you to discuss about our U.S. diplomacy efforts in China.

Before I get into my testimony, though, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank you very much for the comments you made at the outset of this hearing regarding the solidarity and support that we are showing our Japanese friends and the Government of Japan. On Monday will be the 1-month anniversary of the tragic earthquake and tsunami, and so our thoughts are very much still with the Japanese as they go through this recovery. So thank you for those comments.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You know what the greatest thing about being a Congressman is you can say things that are really important like that and that are weighing on your heart, and you can express them, and the message might even get through to some of the people in Japan. So you didn't need to thank me, but I appreciate that. Go ahead.

Ms. STOUT. Thank you very much.

We at the State Department very much appreciate Congress' longstanding interest in what we do to engage and inform and influence the Chinese public through a variety of means. In this endeavor we do face many hurdles. Within China we function in a highly controlled information environment, often with no option but to use platforms that are either run by the People's Republic of China or censored by the PRC.

Our challenge, and the one that we believe we are meeting with some success, is to build trust and understanding with the Chinese public. Although our two governments do not always see eye to eye, the United States and China have shared interests, as do the Chinese and American people. Our task is to emphasize those interests in a way that moves forward the U.S. global agenda on trade, rule of law, human rights, regional stability and combating terrorism.

We are unstinting in representing American values and sharing examples of our own democratic, transparent and law-based society. As we work hard to present these in a manner to which the Chinese people can relate—and we work hard to present these in a manner to which the Chinese people can relate rather than in a prescriptive manner that would be as poorly received in China as a prescriptive approach from a foreign country would be received by the American people. The U.S. domestic system and our global approach have resulted in a prosperity and a security that are respected around the world, and these successes lead our Chinese audiences to draw the right conclusions from those examples we present.

We are, of course, not naive about the challenges we face in our public diplomacy efforts in China from a government that sometimes blocks access to our messages to an oftentimes nationalistic public that has been taught to be weary of foreign influence. In our public diplomacy we remain forthright about discussing openly the

complexity of the bilateral relationship and those points on which our two governments agree, just as our leaders do. As the President and Secretary of State have done, we emphasize to the Chinese public that the United States welcomes the rise of a prosperous, stable China even as we state honestly our differences over various issues and our concerns with certain aspects of PRC policies.

We have many diplomatic tools in our public diplomacy toolbox. The explosive growth of the Internet in China has given us new avenues through which to reach out to the Chinese public that would have been inconceivable decades ago. Chinese bloggers enjoy a certain latitude that state-run television stations and newspapers do not, and we have used that trend to blog and microblog to reach millions of Chinese readers.

When President Obama held a town hall with students in Shanghai, 55 million Chinese Internet users visited the site. Chinese bloggers and microbloggers invited to a book store event with Ambassador Huntsman got over 100,000 hits to their site within just 2 hours of the event. Web chats with top U.S. Government officials often receive tens of millions of hits.

Our Embassy in Beijing is one of the busiest cultural and academic exchange offices in the world. We have more than 200 Americans and Chinese learning about each other's countries every year through Fulbright. We expect to bring 135 Chinese professionals, up-and-coming Chinese professionals, to the U.S. We fund the translation of U.S. law texts into Chinese for the use in Chinese law schools. On the basis of a successful opening of an American study center run as a partnership between Arizona State University and Sichuan University, we are moving forward with other pairings of American and Chinese universities to promote American studies on campus.

The State Department is securing private-sector support from many quarters for the 100,000 Strong initiative, which will encourage and help facilitate 100,000 U.S. students to study in China over the next 4 years. Our EducationUSA advising office in Beijing advises the huge and growing number of Chinese students who want to study in the United States. The nearly 130,000 students from China in the United States is our single largest foreign student contingent and represents a unique opportunity for the U.S. to influence the next generation of Chinese leaders. They are also tuition-paying customers who make no small contribution to our economy.

Before I close, I would just like to reemphasize a point I made earlier about the greatest asset of our public diplomacy, which is the attractiveness of the United States, including to so many in China, due to our power of our example and the appeal of our values. So while we do not underestimate the challenges that we face in conducting public diplomacy in China, I am confident of our continuing progress in that realm thanks to the strengths of our society, our form of government, the freedoms we enjoy and our culture.

Though any country's public diplomacy will benefit from more resources at the end of the day for public diplomacy to be successful, the country itself has to put forth the model that others aspire to

emulate, and that is certainly true of the United States and China. The U.S. public diplomacy mission, therefore, is to continue showing the very best of our Nation. Chinese citizens can glean from our examples a way to make their own society more just. Our efforts to explain U.S. policies aim to develop a common understanding that makes our countries readier to cooperate with one another on the global challenges we both face.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Carnahan, thank you for extending this opportunity to me to testify today, and I look forward to responding to your questions.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much for your testimony.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Stout follows:]

Testimony of Jennifer Park Stout
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State
Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs
U.S. Department of State

Before the
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
April 6, 2011

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Carnahan, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today on U.S. public diplomacy efforts in China. The State Department appreciates Congress' long-standing interest in what we do to engage, inform and influence the Chinese public through a variety of means.

In this endeavor we face many hurdles. Within China, we function in a highly-controlled information environment, often with no option but to use platforms that are either run by the government of the People's Republic of China (PRC) or are censored by the PRC. Our challenge, and one we believe we are meeting with some success despite the strictures, is to build trust and understanding with the Chinese public.

Although our two governments do not always see eye to eye, the United States and China have shared interests, as do the Chinese and American people. Our task is to emphasize those shared interests in a way that moves forward the U.S. global agenda on trade, rule of law, human rights, regional stability, combating terrorism, health, and a sustainable future. We are unstinting in representing American values and sharing examples from our own democratic, transparent, law-based society. And we work hard to present these in a manner to which the Chinese people can relate, rather than in a prescriptive manner that would be as poorly-received in China as a prescriptive approach from a foreign country would be received by the American people. The U.S. domestic system and our global approach have resulted in a prosperity and a security that are respected around the world – and these successes lead our Chinese audience to draw the right conclusions from the examples we present.

We should, of course, not be naïve about the challenges we face in our public diplomacy efforts in China, from a government that sometimes blocks access to our messages, to an oftentimes nationalistic public that has, in many cases, been taught to be wary of foreign influence. In our public diplomacy we remain forthright about discussing openly the complexity of the bilateral relationship and those points on which our two governments agree -- just as our leaders do. At the same time, as I mentioned previously, we believe that many of our most successful public diplomacy efforts are those that employ positive messages that appeal to the Chinese public through the power of our example and our values. For example, as the President and Secretary of State have done, we emphasize to the Chinese public that the United States welcomes the rise of a prosperous, stable China, even as we state honestly our differences over various issues and our concerns with certain aspects of PRC policies.

We have many tools in our public diplomacy toolbox in China. The explosive growth of Internet use in China has given us new avenues through which to reach out to the Chinese public that would have been inconceivable even a decade ago. Chinese bloggers enjoy a certain latitude that state-run television stations and newspapers do not, and we've used that trend to blog and micro-blog to reach millions of Chinese readers. When President Obama held a town hall with students in Shanghai in November 2009, 55 million Chinese Internet users visited the Web site. Chinese bloggers and microbloggers invited to an October 2010 bookstore event with Ambassador Jon Huntsman got more than 100,000 hits to their sites within two hours of the event. Webchats with top U.S. government officials often receive tens of millions of hits.

Our Embassy in Beijing has one of the busiest cultural and academic exchange offices in the world. More than 200 Americans and Chinese learn about each other's countries every year via the Fulbright program. In the current fiscal year, we expect to bring 135 up-and-coming Chinese professionals to the United States under the International Visitor Leadership Program. We fund the translation of U.S. law texts into Chinese for use in Chinese law schools. On the basis of the successful opening of an American Studies Center run as a partnership between Arizona State University and Sichuan University, we are moving forward with other pairings of American and Chinese universities to promote American studies on Chinese campuses.

We look forward to the April 11 start of the high-level Consultation on People-to-People Exchange meeting to be led by Secretary Clinton and Chinese State Councilor Liu Yandong in Washington, DC. The State Department is securing private sector support from many quarters for the "100,000 Strong" initiative which

will encourage and help facilitate 100,000 U.S. students to study in China over the next four years. This initiative will not only build America's next generation of leaders' understanding of this important country, but will give many thousands more Chinese opportunities to interact directly with Americans and thus dispel misconceptions.

Our EducationUSA educational advising office in Beijing is larger than ever and thus better able to advise the huge and growing number of Chinese who want to study in the U.S. The nearly 130,000 students from China in the United States are our single largest foreign student contingent and represent a unique opportunity for the United States to influence the next generation of Chinese leaders. They're also tuition-paying customers who make no small contribution to the U.S. economy while they are here.

Before I close, I would like to re-emphasize a point I made earlier about the greatest asset of our public diplomacy: the attractiveness of the United States, including to many in China, due to the power of our example and the appeal of our values. So, while I do not underestimate the challenges we face in conducting public diplomacy in China, I am confident of our continued progress in that realm thanks to the strengths of our society, our form of government, the freedoms we enjoy, our culture, and our very way of life. Though any country's public diplomacy – China's, ours, other countries' – will benefit from more resources, at the end of the day, for public diplomacy to be successful, the country itself has to put forth a model that others aspire to emulate – and that's certainly true of the United States in China.

The U.S. public diplomacy mission, therefore, is to continue showing the very best of our nation, society, culture and values. Chinese citizens can glean from our examples ways to make their own society more just. Our efforts to explain U.S. policies aim to develop a common understanding that makes our countries readier to cooperate with one another on the global challenges we both face.

Thank you for extending this opportunity to me to testify today on this important subject. I look forward to responding your questions.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And Mr. Dibble.

STATEMENT OF MR. PHILO L. DIBBLE, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, BUREAU OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. DIBBLE. Chairman Rohrabacher, Ranking Member Carnahan, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the Department of State's public diplomacy work on Iran. With your permission, I would ask that my written testimony be submitted for the record.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Without objection.

Mr. DIBBLE. The United States and Iran have not had diplomatic relations since 1980. We do not have an Embassy in Tehran. Our diplomats do not have regular contact with their Iranian counterparts. We have very few official avenues for dialogue, communication, influence or interaction with the Iranian people. For that reason, U.S. Government broadcasting and public diplomacy activities play a more crucial role for our policy on Iran than for virtually any other country.

The tools we employ to engage the Iranian people include broadcasting, social media, the Internet and traditional people-to-people educational and cultural exchanges. The witnesses from the Broadcasting Board of Governors can speak about U.S. broadcasting efforts to Iran, and they have. I would like to share with you the Department of State's public diplomacy outreach plans and efforts, including how we participate in the BBG's programs.

First, traditional media, meaning radio and television broadcasting, play an important role in our efforts. President Obama himself began his Presidency with a commitment to change the tone of the U.S. relationship with Iran. He did that on live television. Since his inauguration the President has conveyed this message personally and in a variety of ways, including through several New Year's messages directly to the Iranian people and to the government, again through broadcast means. Despite this increased outreach, the majority of Iranians continue to hold unfavorable views of U.S. policies, even as they acknowledge and appreciate the President's initiatives. And we have seen that the Iranian regime continues to reject the President's offer for meaningful dialogue.

But we cannot rely exclusively on the highest levels of our Government to convey all our messages to Iran. Especially since the elections of June 2009 and the evidence of popular unhappiness that followed, we recognize the importance of communicating directly with the Iranian people. Consequently, in order to do that and to make clear the support of the United States for the changes Iranians wish to see in their government, the Department of State created a plan to communicate our policy message via interviews by Persian-speaking U.S. spokespersons.

Those interviews clearly must include Iranian state-owned media. For years private-sector studies have shown that a majority of the Iranians, upwards of 80 percent, get their news from government-owned media. We are offering to those media appearances by U.S. official spokespersons on live Iranian TV and radio in Farsi. We hope that by engaging with all aspects of Persian-language media, private, Western, Iranian state-owned and, of course, Radio

Farda and VOA Persian, we will expand what Iranians hear about U.S. foreign policy and enable them to hear messages directly from U.S. sources. This long-term effort to engage in Persian-language outreach will become a part of our messaging strategy for all elements of Iran policy.

Second, I want to discuss briefly exchange programs, which have long been a staple of traditional public diplomacy. We have found that educational, cultural, sports and science exchanges are an effective means to engage Iranians and have produced significant results. Exchanges have started the process of reestablishing contacts between academic and scientific communities and helping reconnect ordinary Iranians to the West and to the United States specifically.

Exchanges over the past year have included, for example, a partnership with the National Academy of Sciences, which brought two groups of Iranian academics and professionals in solar energy and urban transportation to the United States for professional exchanges. Because Iran is an earthquake-prone country we funded a workshop on seismic risks in urban areas. American and regional academics as well as private-sector experts discussed practical applications for mitigating the impact of a future earthquake.

Finally, I think I need to refer to new media efforts, because I think that is where the future is, even if the present is with broadcasting. We recognize the importance of new media, especially to rising generations of Iranians. Hence, we also use Farsi language in social media sites to communicate directly with the Iranian people. The State Department's official Farsi language Twitter account at USAdarFarsi, launched earlier this year, already has more than 5,000 followers. Our Farsi-language Facebook page and YouTube channel both provide active platforms for engaging Iranian youth.

We employ native Persian speakers who engage on Internet forums and portals to communicate and clarify U.S. Policy to Iranian audiences. Two of these individuals were recently transferred to the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs to ensure close collaboration with policy makers who are already seeing the fruits of this collaboration.

Finally, I wanted to say a word about the Secretary's position on Internet freedom more generally. It is one of her greatest priorities, which is why we provide training and tools to civil society activists throughout the region to foster freedom of expression and the free flow of information on the Internet and other communications technology. Current projects support countercensorship, virtual communication and peer-to-peer technologies. The State Department is exploring means with the interagency and allies to combat cyber vandalism coming from Iran under the banner of the Iranian Cyber Army, and recent attacks have targeted U.S.-based e-mail servers that are used by many Iranians as well as the VOA Persian Web site itself.

Mr. Chairman, we are making use of every tool we can to reach out to the Iranian people to explain our policies in spite of the restrictions imposed by the government in Tehran, and to give the Iranian people the means to communicate with one another, and to organize to hold the government accountable for its actions. I ap-

preciate the opportunity to discuss these questions with the committee and look forward to the discussion. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much. I am sure there will be some questions about that as well.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Dibble follows:]

TESTIMONY OF
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE PHILO DIBBLE
HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS
"BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS: CHINA AND IRAN PROGRAMMING"
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2011, 2:00p.m.

Chairman Rohrabacher, Ranking Member Carnahan, members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the Department of State's public diplomacy work on Iran.

The United States and Iran have not had diplomatic relations since 1980. We do not have an Embassy in Tehran, and our diplomats do not have regular contact with their Iranian counterparts. We have very few official avenues for dialogue, communication, influence and interaction with the Iranian people. For that reason, U.S. Government broadcasting and public diplomacy activities play a more crucial role for our policy on Iran than for virtually any other country. The tools we employ to engage the Iranian people include broadcasting, social media, the internet and traditional people-to-people educational and cultural exchanges. The witnesses from the Broadcasting Board of Governors can speak about United States broadcasting efforts to Iran. I would like to share with you the Department of State's public diplomacy outreach plans and efforts.

Traditional Media Outreach

Traditional media—meaning radio and television broadcasting—play an important role in our efforts. President Obama began his presidency with a commitment to change the tone of the U.S. relationship with Iran. That was a commitment conveyed directly to the Iranian people on live television. Since his inauguration, the President has conveyed this message personally and in a variety of ways, including several New Years messages, directly to the Iranian people and to the government, again through broadcast means. Despite this increased outreach, the majority of Iranians continue to hold unfavorable views of U.S. policies—even as they acknowledge and appreciate the President's initiatives. And we have seen that the Iranian regime continues to reject the President's offer for meaningful dialogue.

But we cannot rely exclusively on the highest levels of our government to convey messages to Iran, and especially since June of 2009 we recognized the

importance of communicating directly with the Iranian people. Consequently, in order to convey more directly to the Iranian people the support of the United States for the changes they wish to see in their government, the Department of State created a plan last year to communicate our policy messages directly to the Iranian public via interviews by Persian-speaking U.S. spokespersons. And those interviews must include Iranian state-owned media: for years, private sector studies have shown that a majority of Iranians (upwards of 80 percent) get their news from government-owned media. We are offering appearances by U.S. official spokespersons on live Iranian TV and radio. We hope that by engaging with all aspects of Persian-language media – private, western and Iranian state-owned - we will expand what Iranians hear about U.S. foreign policy and enable them to hear messages directly from U.S. sources.

This long-term effort to engage in Persian-language outreach will become a regular part of our messaging strategy for all elements of Iran policy: participating in P5+1 discussions, explaining sanctions, and highlighting Iran's abuse of its citizens' human rights.

Traditional Public Diplomacy Programs

The State Department has also long engaged in traditional public diplomacy exchange programs in order to build bridges to the Iranian people. We have found that educational, cultural, sports and science exchanges are an effective means to engage Iranians and have produced significant results. Exchanges have started the process of re-establishing contacts between academic and scientific communities, helping reconnect ordinary Iranians to the West.

Exchanges over the past year have included, for example, a partnership with the National Academy of Sciences, which brought two groups of Iranian academics and professionals in solar energy and urban transportation to the United States for professional exchanges.

Because Iran is an earthquake-prone country, we funded a workshop on Seismic Risks in Urban Areas. American and regional academics, as well as private sector experts discussed practical applications for mitigating the impact of a future earthquake.

The American people, as we saw in Haiti, want to help those who suffer from natural disasters like earthquakes, so facilitating the exchange of expertise with Iranians in disaster mitigation remains true to those values.

We provided funding to support film festivals to amplify the voices of Iranian artists. These are but a few examples of our exchange programs.

New Media Efforts

We also recognize the importance of new media, especially to rising generations of Iranians. Hence, we also use Farsi-language social media sites to communicate directly with the Iranian people. The State Department's official Farsi language Twitter account @USAdarFarsi, launched earlier this year, already has more than 5,000 followers. Our Farsi-language Facebook page and YouTube channel both provide active platforms for engaging Iranian youth.

We employ native Persian speakers who engage on internet forums and portals to communicate and clarify U.S. policies to Iranian audiences. Two of these individuals were recently transferred to the bureau of Near Eastern Affairs (NEA) to ensure close collaboration with policymakers. We are already seeing the fruits of this collaboration, such as creating a Farsi-subtitled video of the President's Persian New Year message in late March. This message was pushed out to the most popular Farsi websites, resulting in more than 400,000 verifiable views in its first week.

The proximity of those Persian speakers to policymakers has also helped us convey our policies quickly in Farsi, and also rapidly counter misinformation about those policies. For example, during the uprisings in the Middle East, they have clarified the United States' support for universal rights, such as the right to demonstrate nonviolently and ask governments for needed reforms -- something the Iranian government is loathe to allow its own citizens to do.

Online, the Bureau of International Information Programs (IIP) has recently begun to reorganize to engage Iranians more effectively about U.S. policy, our society and values in today's crowded communications environment. IIP's new approach, which is still in development, will feature increased interaction with the Iranian blogosphere and on social media sites that are most popular among young Iranians.

The Secretary is a strong supporter of internet freedom and access to information throughout the world . That is why we provide training and tools to civil society activists throughout the region to foster freedom of expression and the free flow of information on the Internet and via other communication technologies. Current projects support counter-censorship, virtual communication, and peer-to-peer technologies. The State Department is exploring means with the interagency and allies to combat cyber vandalism coming from Iran under the banner of the "Iranian Cyber Army." Recent attacks have targeted U.S. based email servers that are used by many Iranians, as well as the VOA Persian website.

Mr. Chairman, we are making use of every tool we can to reach out to the Iranian people to explain our policies in spite of the restrictions imposed by the government in Tehran. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss them with the committee and look forward to your questions.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And Mr. Fakhravar.

STATEMENT OF MR. AMIR FAKHRAVAR, GENERAL SECRETARY, CONFEDERATION OF IRANIAN STUDENTS

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. Good. Great. Thank you.

Good afternoon, honorable Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen. I am honored and delighted to be among members of the House Foreign Relations Committee and distinguished guests who are testifying today. I don't want to torture everybody with my weak English and speak.

I spent more than 5 years of my life in jail and with a lot of torture, and I have the sign of torture in my hand and I love it. And after—I am talking today on behalf of the Confederation of Iranian Students. The CIS was recognized by the Congressional Research Service as one of the most important Iranian opposition groups since 2009 until now.

And I was arrested for the first time when I was 17 because of one of my speech in school about Supreme Leader. And I just said maybe we don't have that much freedom the Supreme Leader is telling us, that is it, and they put me in jail. And then for 14 years on and off, I was in jail, the revolutionary court, and the law school and medical school.

In 2005, I escaped from prison, a notorious Iran prison. And then for months before coming out of country, I was living underground, and I had chance to watch Voice of America and Radio Farda. First of all, that was a good feeling to hear some real news. And then after a few days I realized that some anti-American message is coming in the middle of the news. And then I realized more and more.

And after I escape from the country and came here in May 2006, Senator Tom Coburn invited me to testify on behalf of the—in front of the—what is that—Homeland Security Committee, U.S. Senate, and that was about the nuclear issues in Iran and next step. And I tried to put the spotlight on Voice of America and Radio Farda during my testimony. And I just mentioned that Voice of America and Radio Farda, they have a more potential and the great potential to promote freedom and democracy. And that is exactly their mission, the mission of Broadcasting Board of Governor and the mission of Voice of America, the mission of Radio Free Europe, to promote freedom and democracy and to tell the truth about the United States to make a better face of United States in the world. It is clear that is the mission.

And I said the Iranian people right now are confused because of these type of so-called balanced news. Because when the people for years, for more than three decades, they don't have any access to other source of media, and they, the government, they are brainwashing the people via state media. That is not fair to send some type of balanced news, and it is not balanced, it is anti-American, and make people confused.

And then I started to help Senator Tom Coburn. After that testimony, the Voice of America and Radio Farda, both they boycotted me and entire organization and all of my friends, and they didn't let us to talk at all. And they even criticized me on air several times.

And then we helped—me and my organization, we helped Senator Tom Coburn, and we reviewed some of the programming, and we helped them about monitoring the programs, and we collected a lot of facts. And in 2008, September 2008, finally, with the help of Senator Tom Coburn, the inspector general investigated the Voice of America Persian Service. And thanks God that management of Persian Service, they were removed, but nothing changed. The same people, they came to the power again, and for next 2 years again that was the same problem.

And then we had briefing on February 23, 2010, in House, and the Congressman Trent Franks after briefing told me—asked me about the U.S. taxpayers and some type of watchdog on Voice of America Persian Service, and I said you don't have anything. And then he said, okay, I will write a letter to President Obama, and I ask my colleagues to sign this letter. And he send this letter with 69 signatures to President Obama. And then after maybe 2 months, the second layers of the management of Persian Service, they were removed. But the problem was still there.

And then we had several meetings with Governor Enders Wimbush. And again, thanks God, he came to the power, and the new governors, the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and with their great experience, and we could see some hope about the future.

And then we started to talking with the Congressmens, and we had several meetings with you, Mr. Chairman, and with Congressman Ted Poe, Congressman Ed Royce, and Congressman Ted Deutch, and several Congressmen and Senators. And we discussed the issue, and we realized the problem is, first, not following the BBG and VOA mission by VOA Persian and Radio Farda. They changed the mission on their Web site. You can right now look at the Voice of America Persian Service, and you can see clearly they changed the mission by themselves. And the mission on BBG Web site is to promote freedom and democracy, and on the Persian Web site is our only duty is to report the news. This is not the mission. They changed the mission. And please find, Mr. Chairman, who changed this mission and who asked when they should follow this one.

And also, the second problem is broadcasting anti-American messages regularly without balance. We will give you, Mr. Chairman, a lot of facts and date and document about this with the document; and wasting money for unnecessary traveling and personal matters.

Four, nepotism. It is not hard to find a lot of family members and friends as an employee of Voice of America. And you can find mother and daughter and father, all of them, working together. And it is a lot of family business over there. It is really easy to find and investigate these things.

And also favoritism, number 5.

And 6, lack of background check. Again, give you several examples about the people without any background check. They came directly from Islamic Republic. They worked for state TV in Iran. Ms. Mana Rabeei, last year March 17, 2010, she asked Congressman Ed Royce about the sanction of the Revolutionary Guard. And she said, why do you want to put sanction on Revolutionary Guard; you

can't do that because they are protecting the Iranian people. And then we realize that 3 days after Neda was killed, she produced a video for the state TV in Iran, and she was working at that time for the Press TV in Iran, and she produced that video to tell the people how much the messages are the great people. And it is not hard to just Google her name and see who is this lady.

And lack of oversight and supervision, number 7.

Eight, misusing the power of media to support the political views of its employees.

Nine, boycotting and even slandering people they don't agree with. Our organization is one of the best examples for it.

And 11, not supporting and criticizing the U.S. policy.

And 12, acting as a political party that shores up those with similar points of views and tries to weaken others.

And 13, misusing VOA to support their——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Fakhravar, is that the last one?

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. I am so sorry. It is the end of it. And you know my English is not so good.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Your English is great.

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. Just give me 1 more minute.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You are over. But I do want you to ask you to reread one part. What was it you read? The change that took place in the mission statement. Could you reread that for me, please, and where you found that?

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. It is on BBG's Web site. You can find the mission is to promote freedom and democracy and to enhance understanding through multimedia communication of accurate, objective, and balanced news, and to tell the truth about the United States. And they change it to, our only duty is to report the news. You can find it really easy on the top of the Persian Web site.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. When did that—report the news—when did that change of mission take place?

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. 6 years ago. And they put this one as a mission on the top of their——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. So 6 years ago it went from promoting freedom and democracy to basically report the news.

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. Only report the news.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. Got it. All right. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fakhravar follows:]

The United States Congress

House Committee on Foreign Affairs

Is America's Overseas Broadcasting Undermining our National Interest and the Fight against Tyrannical Regimes?

April 6, 2011

Amir A. Fakhravar
Secretary General, Confederation of Iranian Students

Good Afternoon honorable members of congress, Ladies and Gentlemen;

I am honored and delighted to be among members of House Foreign Relations Committee and distinguished guests who are testifying today. My name is Amir Abbas Fakhravar, a writer, former political prisoner and the secretary general of the Confederation of Iranian Student (CIS) with over 8000 members inside and outside of Iran. CIS was recognized by the Congressional Research Service as one of the most important Iranian opposition groups since 2009 until now.

In 1992, I was seventeen when I was first arrested for a speech in which I criticized the Islamic Republic's Supreme Leader, Ali Khamenei. For the next fourteen years I was in and out of prison while I was trying to finish my studies in medical school and later law school. In all, I spent over five years in different prisons, eight consecutive months of which was in solitary confinement.

In 2005, I escaped prison and so I had to live underground for months before I left Iran. During that time, I had a chance to watch VOA TV and listen to Radio Farda. After receiving the news all my life from the propaganda machine of the Islamic Republic, I was excited to finally watch a Western news source, specially an American one. I expected news that was pro democracy, pro freedom and pro US policies. To my surprise, there was a clear anti-American tone in some of the programs especially those that covered the news in Iraq and Afghanistan.

VOA and Radio Farda both contacted me in those days and I had a couple of interviews with both of them. I openly expressed my pro-Western and pro-American views and my opposition to the totalitarian and incorrigible nature of the Islamic Republic. My following interview was canceled and instead, I saw two members of Tahkime Vahdat, a government sponsored student organization being interviewed on that program.

When I came to the United States in May 2006, and I found out that VOA/PNN and Radio Farda were paid for by U.S. tax dollars, I knew something was not right in these organizations.

Senator Tom Coburn invited me to testify before the Senate Homeland Security Committee on July 20, 2006. The subject was the nuclear impasse of the Islamic Republic, but with Senator Coburn's help I was able to also put a spot light on VOA PNN and Radio Farda. In my testimony at the time, I said," I do not think that the American taxpayers are happy to see their money being used for propaganda against the United States." "With the so-called balanced view of these two media, they have really caused nothing but confusion among Iranians." Needless to say that CIS and myself were boycotted from VOA/PNN and Radio Farda for more than four years. I was personally criticized and discredited on air on several

occasions. CIS and Iranian Freedom Institute conducted a thorough research into the affairs of VOA/PNN and Radio Farda from 2006 to 2008. This research included close monitoring of their programming, confidential interviews with employees who were willing to talk and a study in the background of employees. The results were submitted to Senator Coburn and BBG. For two years Senator Coburn and a team of his staff followed VOA/PNN's actions. As a result the entire management of Persian Service was investigated by Inspector General and the management at VOA PNN was removed in Sept. 2008. Even though this removal took place, nothing really changed because the new management team was simply a reshuffling of existing employees.

On February 23, 2010, after one of our briefings to members of congress, congressman Trent Franks wrote a letter to President Obama with 69 signatures of members of congress asking VOA PNN programs to be reviewed. Weeks later, the entire management of Persian service at VOA was removed in May 2010; however the void of management made matters even worse.
From 2006 to 2010, the managers of VOA/PNN started expanding the programs from 2 hours to 8 hours without any real plans or strategies only to create generous expense accounts and positions for their family members and friends. The number of employees grew threefold to over 200 people. The low quality of the added programming forced them to cut them back to a total of four hours again in November 2010. Curiously, not one employee was laid off. As a result of these low quality programs and its unprofessional staff, VOA/PNN lost much of its audience and Iranians turned to more reliable sources such as BBC Farsi.

In the early part of 2010, new members of Broadcasting Board of Governors were appointed by President Obama to solve the issues and improve the situation. By the middle of the year they were all confirmed by the Senate and Governor Enders Wimbush, who had a valuable management experience in Radio Free Europe, started to investigate the root of the problem in the Persian Service. CIS had several meetings with Governor Wimbush, executive directors and staff members of the BBG, and many Congressmen and Senators including members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Chairman Congressman Dana Rohrabacher (R), Congressman Ed Royce (R), Congressman Ted Poe (R) and Congressman Ted Deutch (D). When we shared our information on VOA with all of them, we all reached the conclusion that changing the management in and of itself is not the answer but the following problems should be addressed.

1. **Not following the BBG and VOA mission by VOA Persian and Radio Farda** The BBG , VOA and Radio Farda`s mission statement reads *"To promote freedom and democracy and to enhance understanding through multimedia communication of accurate, objective, and balanced news, information, and other programming about America and the world to audiences overseas."* however when you go to VOA Persian website you will see that the mission has been reduced to *"Our ONLY duty is to report the news!"*

2. **Broadcasting Anti-American messages regularly without balance**

- August 2, 2007, News and Views, Opposing USA when reporting about ACAN Conference and Korean Hostage
- August 9, 2007, News and Views, Setareh Derakhshesh, Hiroshima and Nagasaki and atomic Bomb, Report opposing USA
- May 8, 9, 10, 2007, Bombing in Iraq and reporting only the negative aspects and insinuating the mistake of the US war in Iraq

- August 21, 2007, Protest opposing Presidents Bush's trip to Canada and tarnishing the President with video and Picture
- March 8, 2007, Trip with President Bush on Air Force One to South America and promoting Hugo Chavez against Bush
- November 6, 2007, Hooshmand Mirfakhraie, Report against USA about atomic bomb and war in Korea
- November 2, 2007, Setareh Derakhshesh, the host and a reporter exchange comments that an atomic bomb is only something an American is capable of doing, and they quote a World War era US fighter jet pilot that said killing the Japanese during Hiroshima was a duty, and both conclude with cynical comments
- December 6, 2010, The night before one of the most important protest for the Green Movement, Setareh Derakhshesh interviews Anti-American Marxist-Stalinist, their dialogue is an understanding that implies the green movement is nothing short of a bunch of thugs in the street with no direction and created by the hand of "American Imperialism!"

3. Wasting money for unnecessary traveling and personal matters.
4. Nepotism. You can find many family members and friends with little or no journalism background among the personnel.
5. Favoritism
6. Lack of background check. Ahmad Batebi, was hired at VOA/PNN with a false resume. This person was given a special cell phone by the Islamic Republic's Intelligence service so he could provide critical information to them and receive direction from them. Mana Rabeei, another VOA employee was previously working for Press TV, the official English TV of the Islamic Republic, and was the producer of a program praising the Basiji forces that was aired three days after Neda was killed. No wonder on March 17, 2010, she asked Congressman Ed Royce "What right did the congress have to sanction the Revolutionary Guards?! They protect the Iranian People and the country!"

7. Lack of oversight and supervision
8. Misusing the power of media to support the political views of its employees
9. Boycotting and even slandering people they don't agree with.
10. Inadequate or late coverage of protests in Iran and complete lack of support for the freedom fighters. Lack of coverage of the green movement, on June 20, 2009, the video of Neda Agha Sultan's brutal murder was captured by a cell phone camera circulated around the world in a matter of minutes, however VOA PNN with the objection of Ali Sadjadi, (Chief news Editor) chose not to broadcast the video for three days allegedly because the video was not credible. Another example, on February 14, 2011 when after a long period of silence, Iranians took to the streets once again to show the world that the green movement was still alive. Two young men were killed by the regime, PNN instead continued with their biography of Jennifer Lopez and even in the news segment reported these protests as the eighth or ninth new item.

11. Not supporting and criticizing the US policy. Both VOA/PNN and Radio Farda only invite guests who are opposed to sanctions. Although there have been a great deal of reports on the success of the sanctions, they concentrate on comments by Ahmadinejad and others that make them seem completely ineffective, beneficial only to the Revolutionary Guard or harmful to the Iranian people. For example Even though the proposal of oil sanctions by some of the most influential opposition groups was

discussed in the U.S. congress and appears in the U.S. Congressional Reports, both VOA Persian and Radio Farda refused to even mention this important development.

With regards to the Cuban president's resignation, on February 19, 2008, News & Views allocated 12 minutes, in two separate segments, introducing Fidel Castro as a national, international hero, as well as a warrior against the Western powers. It further elaborated for nearly 50 years; Castro provided happiness, strength, and national health care, which also used his powers to establish 10,000 schools to eliminate illiteracy in the nation. Moreover, it emphasized the Cuban health care, and social security systems as one of the best in the world. As an example, the reporting stated that Castro has met with major world leaders, and later showed clips of Castro meeting with Hugo Chavez, Moamar Qadafi, and Mohammad Khatami of Iran. The question that arises is, are these really "major" world figures?

12. Acting as a political party that shores up those with similar point of views and tries to weaken others. Former elements of the Islamic Republic , such as reformists, and known lobbyists for the Islamic Republic have dominated the political programs of VOA Persian and Radio Farda since 2006. They have appeared weekly, sometimes daily and have portrayed the Green Movement as a reform movement or a civil right movement only and have insisted that the people of Iran strongly oppose regime change.

13. Misusing VOA to support their favored political parties during the US and European elections.

14. Promoting personal business of employees on air with taxpayer's money.

15. Undermining and demonizing the United States Army. Abjeez music video called ; Demokracy
The host, Luna Shad, April 22, 2007, devotes 35 minutes of air time to an anti-American band that had produced a CD, containing a song that mocks the U.S. troops, and declares them occupiers. The host actively campaigns on-air for the audience to purchase the CD and to support the band.

Solutions:

1. Watchdog Committee. This committee must operate under the BBG itself and must consist of people who speak English and Persian fluently, and are loyal to the United States and the BBG mission. This is a very easy and inexpensive solution and the mere presence of such a committee will prevent any infractions by the VOA and Radio Farda personnel.
2. Rehiring the Employees, especially those who were hired during the Corruption years (2005-2011). A thorough background check, a verification of the personnel's educational and professional backgrounds listed on their resumes, and a removal of unnecessary and unqualified staff.
3. Having a strong management team who can fully understand Farsi and English with a proven record of loyalty to USA and BBG's mission. Presently, Ramin Asgard who has the above qualifications has been appointed as the director of VOA/PNN. He must be able to create such a management team and Congress must watch this cleanup process closely. The same must be done for Radio Farda.

The Islamic Republic still remains the biggest foreign policy challenge of the United States. Diplomatic efforts have failed. The people of Iran have spoken loud and clear. They want a secular and democratic government. VOA/PNN and Radio Farda are two powerful yet so far neglected tools that can effectively tackle this challenge alongside oil sanctions. We must work to strengthen both before the only choices left are military action or learning to live with a nuclear Islamic Republic and its consequences.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We have a couple more witnesses, and then we will get to our questions and answers. And I am going to have to—Mr. Zhou.

STATEMENT OF SHIYU ZHOU, PH.D., VICE PRESIDENT, NEW TANG DYNASTY TELEVISION

Mr. ZHOU. Chairman Rohrabacher, Ranking Member Carnahan and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to join you this afternoon.

Since the mid-1980s when waves of immigrants came abroad from China, Beijing had been concerned about communication between the overseas Chinese and those on the mainland. Surveys have shown that Chinese living outside China still rely heavily on Chinese-language media as their information sources. As a result, people have seen over the past two decades the aggressive efforts made by the Chinese Government to expand the global presence of its own media and control the existing overseas Chinese media.

For example, CCTV's Chinese service alone is on 26 satellites around the world. Eight of them are over North America, including the DirecTV and Dish Network satellites. In the U.S., CCTV channels are carried by all major cable and direct-to-home satellite TV systems in both Chinese and English languages. In the meantime, using a vigorous campaign over the past two decades to infiltrate and influence third-party Chinese media, and at the same time suppress independent voices in the Chinese community, the Chinese Government has by and large successfully controlled the overseas Chinese-language media market and manipulated public opinion among the overseas Chinese population.

But Beijing's propaganda machine would rarely pass up a chance to rouse Chinese nationalism, sometimes mixed with anti-American sentiments. Just months ago the Chinese media under Beijing's control have successfully convinced many Chinese Americans that the ongoing inflation in China was caused by some plots of the U.S. Government, including Federal Reserve's QE2, to transfer the U.S. problems to China.

The Chinese-language media market has become very unique in the sense that one can hardly hear a different voice, especially on those sensitive issues most challenging to the Chinese Government. A free media in Chinese language should take up the social responsibility to be an alternative voice for the Chinese audience; however, sometimes when I read reports on those challenging issues by some U.S. Government-funded media, the reports repeated in great lengths rhetoric of the Chinese Government officials. I doubt people in China take great risks to break through the censorship to read or watch those reports just to find out what the Chinese Government's position is.

The damage this kind of reporting may cause to the Chinese audience could be much greater than that of the Chinese Government's own media, since the Chinese audience had hope and trust in such supposedly alternative voice.

Next I will use New Tang Dynasty Television, NTD, as an example to speak about the challenges facing independent Chinese-language media today. NTD was established in 2001 after September 11th by a group of Chinese American media professionals, Wall

Street investors and people in academia. At the time they were disappointed how Chinese-language media reported on the terrorist attacks and realized the importance of having an American media broadcasting in Chinese language that reflects American values and journalistic standards, and hence NTD came into being.

Over the past 9 years, NTD as a nonprofit media has grown to become a global television network with reporters in over 50 cities around the world today and broadcasts globally via satellite, cable and the Internet. Just over the Internet alone, more than 1 million visitors from mainland visits the NTD Web site every month, using Internet anticensorship software such as FreeGate and UltraSurf.

However, NTD's development has necessarily become a threat to Beijing's heavy-handed grip on media. Thus, over the years, the Chinese Government has launched an aggressive and relentless campaign to silence NTD.

Insiders have revealed that CCTV has made some major U.S. cable and satellite TV companies accept its lucrative business deals in exchange with the condition that these companies need to get CCTV's approval to add any additional Chinese-language channel to their broadcast platforms. Its target is NTD. As a result, NTD has suffered discrimination by and being excluded from many broadcast platforms in the U.S.

In May 2004, in partnership with Eutelsat, a Paris-based satellite company, NTD launched the very first 24/7 uncensored Chinese-language satellite broadcast into China. Within a year Eutelsat was under Beijing's business pressure and intended to drop NTD. Then BBG and the U.S. Congress supported Eutelsat to resist Beijing's pressure and brought VOA television service to the same satellite used by NTD, which comprised a protection umbrella for this open satellite window to China.

So Eutelsat continued to carry NTD and some other NGO broadcasters for 3 more years. However, it was unfortunate that in 2008, for some reasons, BBG moved VOA from Eutelsat to a Chinese Government-controlled satellite. Then Eutelsat shut down the open satellite window 2 months before the Beijing Olympics.

In the 21st century today, the Internet and satellite TV have become the two most important high technologies to tear down the censorship wall of the closed societies like China. According to official surveys, there are hundreds of millions of Internet users as well as satellite TV viewers in China. The user bases of different technologies in China seem vastly different. It would be important that we keep the door open for not only the Internet users, but also the satellite TV viewers in China to have free access to uncensored information.

The past experience have shown that without the support of the U.S. Government, no satellite companies in the world can resist the threat and the lucrative business deals of Chinese Communist Government to allow an uncensored TV channel to broadcast to China on their satellites.

It has been proven that BBG's Chinese-language service would be able to play another critical role consistent with the U.S. national interest and commitment to freedom. It can create a protection umbrella on the satellites it uses for China so that it allows other U.S. independent Chinese-language broadcasters to lease

channels on the same satellite to broadcast to the same target audience. This by far appears to be the only hope to create a protective platform for all independent Chinese-language broadcasters to reach the vast satellite TV audience in China.

Thank you.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Zhou follows:]

House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Hearing on "Is America's Overseas Broadcasting Undermining our National Interest and the Fight Against Tyrannical Regimes?"
April 6, 2011

Television Broadcast to China: Challenges and Hope

Shiyu Zhou, Ph.D.
VP, New Tang Dynasty Television

Chairman Rohrabacher, Ranking Member Carnahan, and members of this Committee:

Thank you for inviting me to join you this afternoon. First, I would like to speak about the general landscape of the Chinese-language media today, and the responsibility of free Chinese-language media.

Chinese-language Media Market and Responsibility of Free Media

Since the mid-1980s, when waves of immigrants came abroad from China, Beijing had been concerned about the communication between the overseas Chinese and those on the Mainland. Surveys have shown that Chinese living outside of China still rely heavily on Chinese-language media as their information sources. As a result people have seen over the past two decades the aggressive efforts made by the Chinese government to expand the global presence of its own media and control the existing overseas Chinese media.

For example, CCTV-4 is the overseas version of China's state-run television CCTV. At present, just CCTV-4 alone is on 26 satellites around the world, 8 of them are over North America including the DirecTV and Dish Network satellites.

In the U.S., CCTV channels are carried by all major cable and direct-to-home satellite TV systems, in both Chinese and English languages. The Great Wall TV package consisting of more than 20 channels from China was directly approved by China's State Administration of Radio, Film and Television, according to its website, and is on both Dish Network and KylinTV in the U.S.

About half a year ago, China's state-run China Radio International began its first 24/7 mandarin broadcast in the U.S. by leasing KSFN AM-1510 in San Francisco through an indirect investment.

In the meantime, using a vigorous campaign over the past two decades to infiltrate and influence third-party Chinese media through commercial pressure and business lure, and at the same time suppress independent voices in the Chinese community, the Chinese communist government has by and large successfully controlled the overseas Chinese-language media market and manipulated the public opinion among the overseas Chinese population.

In the U.S., all major national and local Chinese-language newspapers, radios, and televisions except a few are either totally controlled or heavily influenced by the Chinese government.

But, Beijing's propaganda machine would rarely pass up a chance to rouse Chinese nationalism, sometimes mixed with anti-American sentiments. Just months ago, the Chinese media under Beijing's influence have successfully convinced many Chinese Americans that the ongoing inflation in China was caused by some plots of the U.S. government, including the QE2 (Federal Reserve's Quantitative Easing 2), to transfer the U.S. problems to China.

The Chinese-language media market has become very unique in the sense that one can hardly hear a different voice especially on those sensitive issues most challenging to the Chinese government. A free media in Chinese-language should take up the social responsibility to be an alternative voice for the Chinese audience.

However, sometimes when I read reports on those challenging issues by some U.S. government funded media, the reports repeated in great length the rhetoric of the Chinese government officials. I doubt people in China take great risks to break through the censorship to read or watch those reports just to find out what the Chinese government's position is. The damage this kind of reporting may cause to the Chinese audience could be much greater than that of the communist government's own media, since the Chinese audience had hope and trust in such supposedly alternative voice.

Challenges Facing Independent Chinese Media

Next I will use New Tang Dynasty (NTD) Television as an example to speak about the challenges facing independent Chinese-language media today.

NTD was established in 2001 after 9/11 by a group of Chinese American media professionals, Wall Street investors, and people in academia. At the time, they were disappointed at how Chinese-language media reported on the terrorists' attack and the anti-America sentiment in the Mainland Chinese community. They realized the importance of having an American media broadcasting in Chinese-language that reflects American values and journalistic standards, and hence NTD came into being.

Over the past nine years, with the grass-roots support from worldwide Chinese communities, NTD as a non-profit media has grown to become a global television network with reporters in over 50 cities around the world today, and broadcasts globally via satellite, cable, and the Internet. Just over the Internet alone, more than one million Mainlanders visit NTD website every month using Internet anti-censorship software such as FreeGate and UltraSurf.

However, NTD's development has necessarily become a threat to Beijing's heavy-handed grip on media. Thus, over the years, the Chinese communist government has

launched an aggressive and relentless campaign to silence NTD using political and business pressures.

For example, in April 2009, when cable carrier RCN launched NTD on its platform, the senior VP of RCN received an unexpected hour-long phone call from the Chinese Embassy in Washington, D.C., demanding RCN to stop carrying NTD. Fortunately, RCN rejected the demand.

However, insiders have revealed that CCTV has made some major U.S. cable and satellite TV companies accept its lucrative business deals, in exchange with the condition that these companies need to get CCTV's approval to add any additional Chinese-language channel to their broadcast platforms. Its target is NTD. As a result NTD has suffered discrimination by and been excluded from many broadcast platforms.

CCTV also provides news and other programming content to all other U.S.-based local Chinese-language televisions for free, under the condition that they cannot broadcast the programming of NTD.

Commercial pressure and business lure have been among the most effective tools (if not the most effective tool) used by the Chinese communist government to influence, and in some cases control, the political and the business communities, including the Chinese-language media, around the world. But the U.S. government is proven to be the one who can dissolve such challenges.

In May 2004, in partnership with Eutelsat - a Paris-based satellite company – NTD launched the very first 24/7 uncensored Chinese-language satellite television broadcast into China, reaching millions of private satellite television dishes across the country.

Within a year, Eutelsat was under Beijing's business pressure and intended to drop NTD. Then BBG and the U.S. Congress supported Eutelsat to resist Beijing's pressure and brought VOA television service to the same satellite used by NTD – Eutelsat's W5, which comprised a protection umbrella for this open satellite window to China. So Eutelsat continued to carry NTD and some other NGO broadcasters for 3 more years. However, it was unfortunate that in 2008, for some reasons, BBG moved VOA from Eutelsat's W5 to a Chinese government controlled satellite AsiaSat-3S. Then Eutelsat shut down the open satellite window two months before the Beijing Olympics. We believe VOA's broadcast still plays a role and has its audience. But for people in China who are willing to take great risks, sometimes may even risk their lives, to install large dishes to watch censored satellite broadcast, what VOA has offered is far from enough.

Conclusion

In the 21st century today, the Internet and satellite TV have become the two most important high technologies to tear down the Censorship Wall of the closed societies like China. According to official surveys, there are hundreds of millions of Internet users, as well as satellite TV viewers, in China. The user bases of different technologies in China

seem vastly different. It would be important that we keep the door open for not only the Internet users, but also the satellite TV viewers in China to have free access to uncensored information. Nonetheless, in any case, the contents the U.S. government-funded media provide should serve the needs of Chinese audience for an alternative voice, not as an echo of the Chinese government.

The past experience has shown that, without the support of the U.S. government, no satellite companies in the world can resist the threat and lucrative business deals of China's communist government to allow an uncensored TV channel to broadcast to China on their satellites.

In 2005, it was of critical importance that BBG supported Eutelsat to resist Beijing's pressure so that it made history by saving the only open satellite window to China at the time. This proves that BBG's Chinese-language service would be able to play another critical role consistent with the U.S. national interests and commitment to freedom. It can create a protection umbrella on the satellites it uses for China so that it allows other US-based independent Chinese-language broadcasters to lease channels on the same satellite to broadcast to the same target audience. This by far appears to be the only hope to create a protected platform for all independent Chinese-language broadcasters to reach the vast satellite TV audience in China.

Thank you.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We have two more witnesses, and then we are going to questions and answers.

We have been joined by Mr. Rivera from Florida. Thank you very much. Also a new Member of the Congress, so we welcome you to the committee and to Capitol Hill.

Our next witness will be Dr. John Lenczowski.

STATEMENT OF JOHN LENCZOWSKI, PH.D., PRESIDENT, INSTITUTE OF WORLD POLITICS

Mr. LENCZOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Carnahan and members of the committee, I am honored to have the opportunity to contribute to Congress' deliberations on a matter of vital importance to our national security. I would like to begin by arguing why Internet broadcasting is so strategic, and then make some recommendations concerning current policy. These remarks are a summary of my prepared statement, which I would like to submit for the record, please.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So ordered, without objection.

Mr. LENCZOWSKI. Thank you.

International broadcasting is such an important instrument of U.S. foreign and national security policy that a strong case can be made that it played a more strategically decisive role in bringing down the Soviet empire than any other instrument of American power.

Broadcasting is the only means by which the U.S. can provide unfiltered information to hundreds of millions of people around the world who are denied access to a free press and to other media. Those tyrannical regimes that control information tend to be more aggressive and hostile to U.S. vital interests than other kinds of political order. Complete control over the media and their message

enable such regimes to establish political conformity and a psychological sense of futile resignation among the people when it comes to resisting political repression.

The rise of the Internet cell phones and other modern media has made communication of the truth, particularly among resistance forces, more possible than ever before.

But although broadcasting appears antediluvian in comparison, it possesses key properties that remain decisive and are even superior to modern digital technologies in a key respect: It is able to reach millions of people with instantaneous unfiltered information even faster than viral communications that remain vulnerable to tyrannical State control and manipulation. It remains the only method of reaching many large populations in the world and an essential compliment to reaching those who do have access to digital media.

Broadcasting combats tyranny's attempts to atomize and demoralize society. It connects America with oppressed people. It encourages and inspires them, making them feeling as though they are not alone. It enables us to have relations with millions of people and not just governments.

If those long-distance relations are well managed, we gain sympathizers, allies, and even intelligence sources. And if people living in a theater of war like Afghanistan understand the motivations underlying the presence of our troops in their country, they are less likely to be hostile.

So what is wrong today? Public diplomacy and international broadcasting have suffered from significant neglect at the national strategic level. This has resulted in inadequate national strategic coordination; funding that is inadequate to meet the strategic need; resource allocation among the broadcasters that does not adequately reflect national strategic priorities; removing entire language services from the Voice of America in the absence of serious national integrated strategic deliberation and coordination; the conflation of the VOA mission with the mission of the freedom broadcasters, such as RFE/RL; this conflation has resulted in misguided attempts to avoid so-called duplication of, say, a Chinese service in the VOA and the Chinese service in Radio Free Asia when the two services have distinct and intrinsically valuable missions; the failure to protect against the penetration of various language services by agents of influence from target countries; and the failure to monitor the quality and balance of programming to ensure high journalistic standards and compatibility with U.S. national interests.

Unfortunately, these consequences arise when the governance of the broadcasters is not part of an integrated national strategy. The fact that the Secretary of State is a BBG member appears to have little effect on many board decisions. This is due to the historic pattern of an almost complete lack of attention to broadcasting policy within the State Department. Ensuring that broadcast programming serves U.S. foreign policy interests is extremely difficult, given the BBG structure, which suffers from an absence of truly accountable executive power.

The absence of serious executive responsibility means that some of the most vexing challenges that have historically faced our inter-

national broadcasters have gone unaddressed. Prominent among these have been the ideological and factional struggles within the various language services. The task of balancing and managing such factionalism is a very hard thing. It may be the hardest thing in the U.S. Government to manage. But it is made all the more difficult by the vulnerability of these language services to the penetration by foreign agents of influence, whose activities can sabotage huge parts of our broadcasting effort.

Given the many problems faced by these most important of national institutions, I believe that the following reforms are necessary. And I am going to begin with macro reforms and get a little bit more specific.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Can you summarize those?

Mr. LENCZOWSKI. Yes. Very quickly, public diplomacy needs to be raised to the highest level of national strategic attention. I believe we have to create a new U.S. public diplomacy agency, which would be much more than an information agency. It would comprise all the major public diplomacy functions of the government, including the State Department, USAID, Peace Corps and BBG. And I believe that 50 percent of all nonpolitical ambassadorships should come out of that agency, and then you will see a rejiggering of the incentive structure in U.S. foreign policy so that the State Department will start taking public diplomacy seriously again.

The services of the BBG should be divided into two categories; one under the VOA umbrella and another under the freedom broadcasters umbrella. Each would have their own director. Radio Sawa and TV Alhurra, for example, should be placed under the freedom broadcasters umbrella. And the Arabic service, which was shut down in a fit of absence of mind, should be restored to the Voice of America. The Chinese service should not be gutted at the VOA. It should be preserved and strengthened. Disbanding it, in my view, is the height of irresponsibility, given the rise of China's power, its manipulation of the media that we have just heard, its espionage efforts in this country, its military build-up, its increasing territorial claims and so on and so forth.

Then the BBG should cease to have any executive power. It should serve the role formerly served by the Board for International Broadcasting; namely, it should be a programming oversight board. Here is where the bipartisan composition of that board can really make a difference. The executive director of that board would hire independent language-fluent scholars to do systematic program reviews to test for propagandistic content and so on and so forth. All broadcast services should be subjected to background checks by counterintelligence agencies.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And finally?

Mr. LENCZOWSKI. Yes. And finally, Congress should consider combining all foreign affairs spending with the defense budget into a so-called defense and foreign affairs budget so that America can fund the nonmilitary elements of our national defense at levels commensurate with national strategic needs.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Lenczowski follows:]

TESTIMONY OF
JOHN LENCZOWSKI, PRESIDENT, THE INSTITUTE OF WORLD POLITICS
HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

"IS AMERICA'S FOREIGN BROADCASTING CONSISTENT WITH OUR NATION'S INTERESTS AND OUR COMMITMENT TO FREEDOM?"

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2011

I am honored, Mr. Chairman, to have the opportunity to contribute to Congress' deliberations on a matter that I believe is of strategic importance to the national security of the United States. I would like to begin by arguing why international broadcasting is so strategic and then make some recommendations concerning current policy on the subject.

International broadcasting is one of the most important instruments of U.S. foreign and national security policy. A strong case can be made that it played a more strategically decisive role in bringing down the Soviet empire than any other instrument of national power.

Broadcasting is the only means by which the United States can provide unfiltered information to, and have relations with, hundreds of millions of people around the world who are denied a free flow of information and access to a free press and other modern media. Those tyrannical regimes that control information tend to be more aggressive and hostile to U.S. vital national security interests than other kinds of political order. Such regimes use a monopoly of information and propaganda as key elements of their internal security systems. Complete control over the media and their message enables such regimes to establish political conformity and a psychological sense of futile resignation when it comes to resisting political repression.

A monopoly of information enables the official lie to prevail. The lie conceals regime corruption, policy errors, human rights violations, and other crimes. When the people are compelled to repeat the lie, it is a demonstration of their loyalty or subjugation to the regime. As Russian author Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn explained, being fed a steady diet of lies becomes the most oppressive aspect of life in a totalitarian system: a monstrosity that deprives the individual of his or her human dignity. Under such circumstances, hearing the truth and telling the truth is not only a political act: it entails reclaiming one's human dignity.

Tyrannies fear the truth – for it is the truth that, more than anything else, threatens their internal security systems. It is for this reason that they make major efforts to control and monitor the various information media, including radio, television, the press, the internet, and other forms of personal communications. It is also for this reason that resistance forces in tyrannical countries seek to find and impart trustworthy information in any way they can.

The rise of the internet, personal computers and printers, fax machines, and cell phones has made communication of the truth – especially among resistance forces – more possible than ever before in modern history. But although broadcasting technology appears antediluvian in comparison, it should be remembered that broadcasting has properties that remain strategically decisive and even may be superior to the modern digital technologies in a key respect: it is able

to reach millions of people with instantaneous unfiltered information – even faster than "viral" communications though various social media – media that tyrannical regimes have shown an ability to impede and control.

The instantaneity of information greatly compounds the threat that truth poses to tyrannies. This is because it enables, and gives incentive to, resistance groups to form in the first place, and then to communicate their messages to their oppressed countrymen. This strategic reality can be seen in the way tyrannies – particularly totalitarian regimes – handle civil disturbances. Whenever there is a strike, a demonstration, a riot, or some other disturbance of any significance, the first step taken by the regime is to cut off all communications to the locality undergoing the disturbance. Then the police crush the demonstration. And if the rest of the country ever learns about it, it will be weeks or months later, and the news will be that the demonstration was crushed. However, if the demonstrators know that they have a means to communicate with the masses of their countrymen and the world, they will have the incentive to set up underground lines of communication to a sympathetic broadcaster such as the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, or Radio Free Asia, and the news can be transmitted to mass audiences within a matter of hours. This is exactly what happened with the Solidarity trade union strikers in Gdansk in 1980. Instead of their demonstration being crushed only to remain an unknown footnote to history, it sparked millions of Poles to join the union in "solidarity." When asked how important Radio Free Europe was to the rise of Solidarity, its former leader and, later, President of Poland, Lech Walesa, replied: "Would there be life on earth without the sun?"

Tyrannies, particularly of the totalitarian variety, have a special instrument by which to maintain their grip over society: atomization. Atomization entails creating such an atmosphere of distrust, especially by means of pervasive penetration of society by secret police informants, that the individual is left to face the all-powerful state on his own. Broadcasting can combat atomization by providing a platform for common interest between isolated individuals who are secret listeners to foreign broadcasts. Even music that can be heard uniquely over an American broadcasting station can supply the common thread that can unite an atomized people.

When people are alone and feel alone, they become demoralized. But hearing effective and inspiring broadcasts from abroad can come to realize that America is with them in spirit, is supporting them morally, and is even providing a form of sustenance – be it the truth, be it news about what is happening within their own country, be it religious programming, or be it the restoration of their country's officially censored history, and therefore their national memory, and therefore their national identity. They can come to realize that they are not alone. And with enough time, and with a large enough audience, the sense of futile resignation and demoralization that can deaden the spirit of resistance to tyranny can evaporate as more and more individuals connect with each other.

The question is: does America wish to have relations with the people of the world or only governments? Do we wish to connect with people living only in open societies with whom it is easy to have relations, or do we also wish to include people living under tyrannies? And do we wish to help people struggling for freedom against tyrannical regimes?

A strong case can be made that public diplomacy can be as important as, and even more important than, traditional government-to-government relations, especially over the long term. The collapse of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet empire demonstrates the strategic potency of public diplomacy – especially international broadcasting. Conversely, recent events in the Middle East and North Africa demonstrate the consequences of its systematic neglect.

When people took to the streets in Cairo: what was America to do? Were we to continue to support our longtime friend and strategic collaborator, Hosni Mubarak, or the people who were demanding political reform? The same question could be asked about any of the other countries in the region experiencing popular protests. According to the Department of State's methodology, which stresses government-to-government relations, it is very hard to make such a choice, because we know so little about the forces underlying the calls for reform. Because of the absence of public diplomatic relations, we neither have a finger on the pulse of society, nor contacts among opposition movements, nor reliable intelligence sources. In the case of a friendly government like Mubarak's, we rely for information on that government's intelligence and security services. And in the case of a hostile tyranny like Muammar Kaddafi's Libya, we don't have even that benefit.

If the United States had a greater, strategically guided public diplomacy program in these countries – and therefore a "double-track" policy of having separate relations with both the government and the people, it would allow us to hedge our bets in crises such as that which unfolded in Egypt. Without it, we first jumped to support Mubarak, our erstwhile ally, and statements were made by high-ranking U.S. officials calling for calm from the protesters and downplaying Mubarak's repressive system. Later, when the determination of the protesters became clear, we flipped and suggested that Mubarak step down in the face of the Egyptian people's just demands.

Consider, for instance, if our Egyptian policy over the last several decades had been one of quiet support for Mubarak accompanied by a public diplomacy campaign cultivating relations with the Egyptian people. When the political crisis erupted, we would have been under significantly less pressure to support one side or the other and would have had a way forward no matter which side prevailed.

In the two major theaters of war in which we are engaged, Iraq and Afghanistan, we have had minimal public diplomatic relations. In the case of Iraq, we failed to tell the Iraqi people why we invaded for at least a year after our initial entry into the country. It is still not clear if large numbers of Iraqis know exactly what our motivations were. In the case of Afghanistan, large percentages of people (in the case of Helmand province, it is over 90 percent) have never heard of the events of 9/11 and (in Helmand, 43 percent) have no idea of why American and coalition forces are in their country other than to sow death and destruction. The consequences of such failure to conduct adequate strategic communications are fewer sympathizers, fewer allies in country, fewer intelligence sources, greater hostility to the occupiers, and greater numbers of attacks on American forces.

In recent years, public diplomacy in general and international broadcasting in particular have suffered from significant neglect at the national strategic level. This has resulted in:

- inadequate national strategic coordination;
- funding that has been inadequate to meet the strategic need;
- resource allocation among the broadcasters that does not adequately reflect national strategic priorities – allocation that involves adding new language services, removing others, and raising or decreasing the budgets of others;
- the conflation of the America-centered broadcasting mission of the VOA and the surrogate domestic free press mission of the "freedom radios."
- the failure adequately to monitor the quality and balance of programming to ensure high standards of journalistic integrity and compatibility with U.S. national interests;

There are three sources of this larger national strategic problem: 1) a lack of knowledge of the power of public diplomacy in general and international broadcasting in particular as instruments of American influence abroad; 2) the absence of a culture of strategic influence within our main foreign policy making agencies – principally the State Department and the NSC; and 3) a flawed structure that aggravates that institutional cultural weakness.

The knowledge problem is so great within the U.S. government that one scarcely knows where to begin except, perhaps, at the top. One must strain to find a Secretary of State in the post-World War II period who had basic competence in public diplomacy and who paid any serious strategic attention to the subject. This is partly a function of the lack of study of, and experience in, this subject, and partly a function of the institutional culture of the Department, which concentrates on, and rewards excellence in, traditional government-to-government diplomacy. It is a culture of reporting, consultations, and negotiations as opposed to a culture designed to influence all the possible targets of political power abroad, such as opinion leaders of all sorts, including journalists, cultural figures, religious figures, business leaders, etc., as well as the public at large. It is a culture that is even allergic to public diplomacy, insofar as reaching out to publics over the heads of governments can "rock the boat" in bilateral government-to-government relations. For more detail on the systemic weaknesses of public diplomacy and solutions to overcome them, please see my newly published book: *Full Spectrum Diplomacy and Grand Strategy: Reforming the Structure and Culture of U.S. Foreign Policy.*

The specific problems with international broadcasting begin with the problem of the mission. The Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) has a specific mission: "To promote freedom and democracy and to enhance understanding through multimedia communication of accurate, objective, and balanced news, information, and other programming about America and the world to audiences overseas." This is a most worthy mission, as it comports with the broader thrust of U.S. foreign policy. However, because of the governing structure of the BBG, there is little to no ability for U.S. foreign policy authorities to ensure that programming from the various broadcasters under the BBG umbrella are actually serving U.S. foreign policy interests.

The regnant policy of eliminating "duplication" and placing a given language service within one or another of the broadcast services beneath the BBG umbrella has added to the confusion over mission. Some language services have lain both within the Voice of America (VOA) structure and the Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) structure or within both the VOA and Radio Free Asia (RFA) structures. But then there was the decision to remove the Arabic service from the VOA and replace it with the Radio Sawa/Television Al Hurra structure.

Now there is the proposal to remove the VOA Chinese language service entirely and rely exclusively on the eponymous service at Radio Free Asia.

The problem here is that, properly speaking, the VOA has, and should have, a different mission than those broadcasters that represent a "domestic surrogate free press" for countries denied such a free press (often known as the "freedom radios"). The VOA is the Voice of the American government and the American people and, in addition to world news and news and feature stories about America, it broadcasts official editorials on U.S. government policy positions. Meanwhile, the freedom (or "surrogate") radios have an entirely different mission: they involve, for example, Chinese broadcasters informing the Chinese public about events in China.

When the BBG eliminates an entire language service from one or another of the two alternative models, it is gutting U.S. foreign policy of a vitally important component of a full-fledged public diplomacy policy. In recent cases, it has been America's message to the world that has suffered most.

U.S. national interests are also ill-served by a well-known school of thought that holds that U.S. international broadcasting must simply amount to "good journalism" that should not be subject to censorship by the State or Defense Departments or the White House. The problem here is that there are many commercial media in the world that are involved in "good journalism" and, given this fact, why should the U.S. government pay for another equivalent of a commercial radio or television station? Our government pays for this precisely to serve U.S. foreign policy and national security interests.

Serving these national interests most assuredly need not involve either censorship or the manipulation of truth and falsehood which is customarily called "propaganda." However, it must be recognized that distortions of truth can take place if a broadcaster reports only certain stories (however objectively) to the exclusion of others which would portray a more honest and realistic picture. In light of this possibility, U.S. broadcasters must be subject to oversight such that they ultimately serve U.S. national interests and not the interests of either foreign adversaries or partisan factions whose activities may not redound to the benefit of U.S. national interests.

Some of the strategic decisions that are made by the BBG involve whether or not to continue or phase out certain language services, and whether a given language service will be under the VOA umbrella, under RFE/RL, or one of the other components of the BBG. These are foreign policy decisions of national strategic significance, and it appears that too many of them have been made without national, integrated strategic deliberation and coordination.

Foreign policy is like playing a symphony, as it necessitates using all the instruments of the "orchestra." For the BBG to decide to remove the Chinese language service from the VOA on the grounds that there remains Radio Free Asia and that many Chinese have internet access, is akin to letting a trombone blare loudly in the middle of just that portion of the symphony when the audience should be hearing the harp. Unfortunately, too many of the "conductors" of our foreign policy symphony appear to be unaware that there is even such a thing as trombone, much less how it should be harmonized with the other sections of the orchestra. The spectacle that we

are witnessing is a lack of national integrated strategy. The fact that the Secretary of State is a BBG member appears to have had little or no effect on many Board decisions. This can be explained by the historic pattern of an almost complete lack of attention to U.S. broadcasting policy within the Department of State.

Ensuring that the programming of U.S. broadcasters serves U.S. foreign policy interests is made all the more difficult given the BBG structure. The individual language services of these stations have long been the loci of intense factional and ideological struggle. The factionalism to which I refer is not that of American political parties: rather, it consists of political groups either from within the target country in question or from within that country's émigré community abroad. Management of these political and ideological struggles has long been one of the greatest challenges for the U.S. governance of these services. But the existing BBG governing structure makes this management task much more difficult than at earlier times in U.S. international broadcasting history.

This management challenge has also been made all the more vexing over the course of the last half century as a consequence of the penetration of many of these language services by agents of influence from the target countries.

For example, during the Cold War, agents of influence from the Soviet bloc countries succeeded in penetrating the staffs of several language services of both the VOA and RFE/RL. They engaged in several kinds of activities, some of which were far from evident and others of which could be detected only after examination of a long pattern of behavior. Here are three examples of such activity:

1) The agent of influence would broadcast stories that were echoes of, say, Soviet propaganda. Nothing could be more demoralizing to a secret listener in Russia. Here, the Russian service of VOA or RL could very well have been his lifeline, his source of hope for political change, and now he hears the same message that he reads in *Pravda*! He cannot but imagine that the KGB is everywhere, even in the heart of the freedom radios, and the American authorities are either unaware or unable to do anything about it. If America is not serious about resisting Soviet tyranny, how can he, one of the few dissidents in his region with a passion to work for political change?
2) An agent of influence could work to create inter-ethnic, inter-religious, or inter-generational conflicts within the staff of a given language service by initiating provocations such as personal attacks on individuals within the service. This creates dissension, hostility, demoralization, and ultimately incoherence in the service's programming.
3) Another agent could simply be involved in what appears on its face to be good journalistic reporting about America. He could report nothing but news that, taken out of context, makes America look bad. This genuine news can be reported with complete professional journalistic accuracy. But the agent's production would be so heavily weighted toward such bad news – crimes, corruption, etc. – that the foreign listener would have no idea that was anything approximating good news in America.

There have been enough examples of this kind of activity over the course of history and recent anecdotal examples of suspected activities of this type that a strong case can be made that our broadcasters need better controls over personnel hiring and better oversight of programming.

In the first case – the hiring of personnel – our broadcasters need to have serious counterintelligence protection. And this means national strategic coordination whereby the resources and skills of the FBI, CIA, and possibly other elements of the counterintelligence community, can be brought to bear to protect the various services from hostile (and even not-so-hostile) agent of influence penetrations. In the case of programming oversight, an entire new system of program evaluation of the kind that has existed in the past must be reinstalled.

Given the problems I have raised thus far:

- lack of national strategic attention and coordination;
- funding that fails to meet the standard of national strategic need;
- resource allocation that involves the removal of language services in spite of national foreign policy priorities;
- the elimination of language services from one or another uniquely valuable component of U.S. broadcasting structures and missions;
- failure to supply counterintelligence protection of the language services; and
- inadequate monitoring and quality control systems for broadcast programs;

the necessity of reforming the governing structure of our international broadcasters becomes apparent. Here, then, are some possible solutions.

1. Public diplomacy needs to be raised to the highest levels of national strategic attention. My recommendation is that Congress create a U.S. Public Diplomacy Agency (USPDA) within the Department of State which would consist of: all existing public diplomacy functions within the Department including the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor; USAID; the Peace Corps; and the BBG. USPDA's Director would have the rank of Deputy Secretary and would serve as a statutory observer in the National Security Council (similar to the position of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff). Such an agency would create a culture of excellence in public diplomacy and would reward its personnel accordingly. In order to jolt the Department into taking this entire function seriously, fifty percent of all ambassadorships for career personnel should come from this agency.
2. The broadcast services currently under the BBG should be divided into two sections: those under the VOA umbrella, and those under the "freedom broadcasters" umbrella. Each umbrella organization would have a Director who would exercise executive responsibility and accountability for the management of the services in his or her domain and who would ensure that programming was not inconsistent with U.S. foreign policy objectives.
3. Under this new broadcasting structure, stations like Radio Sawa and Television Al Hurra should be placed under the "freedom broadcasters" umbrella, and the Arabic service of the VOA should be restored so that it can continue its distinctive mission.
4. Similarly, the Chinese service at the VOA should be preserved and strengthened.

- Given the rise of China as a major economic power,
- given the breakneck pace of its military buildup,
- given its massive intelligence operations in the United States (according to the FBI, over 25,000 intelligence assets),
- given its increasing regional muscle-flexing and territorial claims,
- given the regime's absolute refusal to embark on any meaningful domestic political reform; and
- given the regime's ability to restrict modern social media,

the VOA Chinese service – a recognized and influential brand name in China – is an asset of U.S. strategic influence which we must not even consider abandoning. To believe that budgetary savings can be achieved by the elimination of such a strategically important service is the epitome of strategic short-sightedness.

5. The Broadcasting Board of Governors should cease to have any executive power, as its members, with their varying time commitments to the enterprise, cannot exercise coherent managerial decision making. Instead, the Board should fulfill a function that its predecessor, the Board for International Broadcasting (BIB), used to fill: programming oversight. Here is where the bipartisan composition of the Board can realize its true value. Under this arrangement the Board's Executive Director manages a systematic process of program evaluation according to the methodology formerly used by the BIB. Independent scholars, often resident at American universities, who speak the language fluently, and who have no equities in political factional struggles among émigré groups or political groups in the target country, should be given contracts to analyze a month's worth of programs to test them for propagandistic content, bias, journalistic quality, and whether or not the programs militate against U.S. foreign policy interests.
6. By bringing the broadcasters under the umbrella of a new U.S. Public Diplomacy Agency, the Secretary of State will be compelled, by the vast array of responsibilities concentrated in the new agency, to become a much more serious advocate for funding all public diplomacy functions, including international broadcasting, at levels that comport with U.S. foreign policy priorities.
7. Personnel hired by the various language services should be subject to systematic background checks by counterintelligence services with the resources to accomplish the task.
8. I strongly believe that Congress should consider combining all foreign affairs spending with the defense budget into a larger "Defense and Foreign Affairs Budget." This will enable the United States to fund the non-military, but utterly strategic, elements of national defense at a level commensurate with national strategic needs.
9. Finally, we should remember that America is in a global war of ideas against totalitarian Islamism. This is a violent ideology whose proponents are driven not by serious spiritual motivations but by radical political passions. We can either continue our current strategy of devoting disproportionate national resources to killing terrorists or we can devote more strategic assets to the central front in that war: the recruitment of new terrorists – a political, informational, counter-propaganda, and ideological warfare task. Unfortunately, because of the historic neglect of the role of ideology in international politics, a neglect that has multiplied since the end of the Cold War, no agency, save some elements within our international broadcasters, has any ideological warriors in this war. Instead, in the words of Prof. J. Michael Waller, we would sooner drop a JDAM

bomb on somebody's head rather than enter into his head to deprive him of the will to be our enemy. Given the stakes in the war of ideas, we can no longer afford to cede this central front of the war to the enemies of civilization.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you.

Dr. Lenczowski, it is very difficult for a Ph.D. to get this down to 5 minutes.

But how about Robert Reilly, who has more of a journalistic background, can you meet your deadline in 5 minutes today?

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT REILLY, FORMER DIRECTOR, VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. REILLY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Carnahan, members of the committee, thank you very much for this opportunity.

You are not going to get an awful lot of traction with your constituents by paying serious attention to these issues. But if you get them right, you are going to save American lives. And I thank you for the attention you are bringing to this. I would like to submit my extended critique of public diplomacy for the record.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Without objection.

Mr. REILLY. And restrict myself to—at least when I went over them last night, they were 5 minutes of remarks with a red California Zinfandel. I will try to replicate this, albeit——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It started 30 seconds ago.

Mr. REILLY. Indulge me in an imaginative exercise. If we were setting up a broadcasting service for the U.S. Government from scratch today, we probably would want to focus on the 10 most important countries and language groups in the world. In our hemisphere, say Brazil, the largest country, biggest economy; in Eurasia, certainly Russia; to the south, China; to the southeast, India; in the Near East, certainly the Arabic world. Our mission would be to tell these countries and audiences who we are, what we are doing, and why. If we want the world to be reasonable, we had better give it our reasons.

We might, in other words, create the Voice of America, whose purpose, by charter, is to do these very things. Now if an outside observer looked at what has happened to VOA over the last 10 years, he might discern a pattern that broadcasting to the largest, most important countries of the world has been eliminated. Portuguese to Brazil, gone. Hindi to India, eliminated. Arabic to the Arabic world, ended and replaced by a pop music station. Russian, eliminated. And now the Chinese service is on the block for extinction in all but its Internet presence, which is blocked.

The pattern is clear but the purpose is not. Why have we done this to ourselves? The excuse 10 years ago or more was that history had ended in the sense that the model of the democratic constitutional free market political order stood undisputed in its moral authority. But 10 years ago, at the price of 3,000 American lives, we found out this was not true.

Why then are we continuing on this path? Economic considerations might be one explanation, but they can't account for 10 years of this behavior. The elimination of Chinese VOA radio and TV broadcasting in Mandarin will save $8 million but lose an audience of at least 6 million. Do we need no longer explain ourselves to the world? Do we no longer need to give it our reasons?

Be sure that others are willing to give reasons for us. I invite you to the coverage of Chinese state media of U.S. policy in Libya

today. If that is the way we would like the Chinese to learn about what we are doing, we seem to be on that path.

The BBG rebuttal might be that we are keeping Radio Free Asia Chinese service, albeit diminished, and the VOA Web site. However, the Internet is highly vulnerable, and surrogate radio broadcasting, as very valuable as it is in itself, does not have the mission of explaining who we are, what we are doing, and why we are doing it. One of my predecessors, Geoff Cowan, told me that in meeting with foreign ministry officials in Beijing, they told him that the first thing they did every morning was tune to the Voice of America because they needed to know what the United States was thinking. They would not tune into RFA to learn that for the very good reason that its mission is to tell the Chinese about China, not about us.

This brings me to the most likely explanation for the elimination of VOA's services to the most important countries in the world, a loss of the sense of mission. The loss began with the end of USIA when USG broadcasting was placed under the BBG. As the BBG consists of eight CEOs, it is no wonder that confusion ensued. Rome had troubles with only two pro councils. Imagine the mess if they had eight. Very importantly, most BBG members have been highly accomplished individuals who made their fortunes in private sector media. They, therefore, sought to replicate their success according to commercial criteria. This meant large youth audiences and abandoning markets in which such audiences could not be attracted. Who listens came to be less important than how many listened or to what.

The diminished mission became news, not the full service radio that VOA offered, which also presented and explained U.S. policy, but news. Play music for 40 minutes an hour on Radio Sawa, if you must, so long as they listen to the news. After all, said the BBG chief of staff in 2008, "It is not in our mandate to influence." The new BBG chairman, Mr. Isaacson, said in a recent Alhurra broadcast that "we just want to get good news, reliable news, and credible information out." Reliable news was always part of U.S. broadcasting, but the mission was never reduced to just that.

When the Dalai Lama called the VOA Tibetan service "the bread of the Tibetan people" and when Aung San Suu Kyi called the Burmese service "the hope of the Burmese people," do you think they were referring to the news?

Hope is a theological virtue. It is not engendered by news. The Declaration of Independence was not a news release or report.

I think the United States has enduring interests in the world. I think we need to explain ourselves in the most persuasive way and by the most effective means, particularly to those peoples and countries whose futures are going to most affect our future. I think we need to begin again to think through to whom we should be broadcasting about what and with what. I think this needs to be done within the U.S. Government in a command structure related to our national security and not by an independent part-time board.

Failure to do this will be paid, I am afraid, in American lives. Better to win the war of ideas than have to win a war. That is simple economics. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Reilly appears in the appendix.]

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

And I appreciate all the witnesses today.

As I said before he got here, Russ, that I would be keeping the tradition that we started with what they call "The Bill and Dana Show," Bill Delahunt and Dana Rohrabacher, when Bill was the chairman. We want people to be able to get to the heart of the matter and to ask as many questions as is necessary and not to let the 5-minute clock, which we would like to bring it under, get in the way of actually seeking answers and getting to the proper questions.

And what I intend to do now is to—because the ranking member does have something to do in about a half an hour, I thought that we would let him go first into questioning. So you may proceed.

And I am going to let our new freshman take over the chair for about 5 minutes, and we will go from there.

Mr. Carnahan.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you to the panel. You really covered a lot of items here, and I want to try to jump into a few follow-up questions. Let me start with the last witness first.

And the chairman mentioned your background, working during the 1980s with regard to the former Soviet Union. I wanted you to compare the public and cultural diplomacy work that the U.S. engaged in then with the work today in Iran in terms of what worked, what didn't. You know, where you see similarities, where you see differences.

Mr. LENCZOWSKI. Congressman, I presume you are asking me about this because I worked on the Soviet Union.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Yes.

Mr. LENCZOWSKI. I think that it was vitally important that—I believe the radios—there were many different public diplomacy vehicles with the peoples of the Soviet empire. However, many of the traditional instruments, such as exchanges, which we tried to do, certain kinds of cooperative agreements, visitors programs and so on and so forth were extremely limited.

What was successful about our public diplomacy programs in the Cold War was that they helped, first of all, to combat the atomization of society. In a society like that, atomization is created where nobody can trust anybody else. And this is because of the pervasive network of informants, secret police and so on and so forth. And so the individual is left alone against the all powerful State.

And what broadcasting did, whether it was news, whether it was even music that could uniquely be heard, say, over Radio Free Europe rather than, let's say, Warsaw one and Warsaw two is that secret listeners who would sometimes risk their lives or risk being severely punished for being caught listening would hear something like that—a wonderful story is a guy who got on a bus in Warsaw and started whistling a song that he heard over Radio Free Europe that you couldn't hear anywhere else. And then somebody else 10 seconds later started whistling with him and somebody else 10 seconds later. Pretty soon, the whole bus was whistling it. They all looked at each other. They said, we are all secret listeners, and there is more of us than there is of them. And they could start establishing relationships of trust.

The radios—when Vaclav Havel came, the first president of post-Soviet Czechoslovakia, post-Communist Czechoslovakia, came he didn't come to the Department of State to thank them for all the negotiations and the arms control agreements. He went to the VOA and thanked them for keeping their national flame alive. The VOA was giving them history programs that restored the national memory that the regime was trying to flush down George Orwell's memory hole. And by destroying the national memory, they would try to change the national identity in order to create their new Soviet man, their new Communist man.

So, then, the radio supplied alternative ideas. They supplied religious programming, real religious programming, services of many different faiths. It wasn't a violation of the First Amendment to do that. And then they gave real information to expose the lies of the regime. And one of the great techniques of the dissident movements inside those countries was to try to tell the truth one day at a time and not repeat any of the official lies of the regime.

Solzhenitsyn said that when the lie—the daily force feeding of the steady diet of lies was the single most oppressive thing about life in that type of a political system, and that when the lie fastens its claws around your neck, it is not only a political act; it is an attack on your very human dignity.

And so these people thirsted for the truth more than they thirsted for food or the basics of life. Solzhenitsyn said that the power that resides in the airwaves, what we are talking about today, to kindle the human spirit is beyond the scope of the Western imagination. This is how it can be the bread for Tibet, the hope for Burma, and it is the hope for all of these people in China. This is a tonic—it is a gift that we give these people of incomparable magnitude.

And I don't remember the numbers today. But when I start thinking about economies and saving money in this business, at its zenith, the VOA had a budget that was the equivalent cost of five F–15 aircraft and that was the time when we were ordering 900 F–15s. This is cheap stuff we are talking about. Probably the single most cost-effective instrument of American national power, especially in dealing with these people.

When the instantaneity of information was huge, when you get a signal into a region, people have incentives to order resistance groups. If there is no signal, there is no incentive to organize the resistance group. This is because if they know they can get an underground line of communication to the headquarters of some of our radios, then if there is a strike, a civil disturbance or something like that, which is normally crushed. But part of the crushing involves cutting off all communications.

This is what happened with the Solidarity Trade Union strikes in 1980. They cut down all communications to the city, and they said that the hurricane blew down the telephone lines. But the Solidarity strikers had an underground line of communication to Munich to the RFE/RL headquarters, and within a matter of hours, the fact of the strike was broadcast to millions of Poles.

The normal modus operandi is, crush the strike; and then if the rest of the people learn about it, they have learned about it weeks or months later, and the news is that the strike was crushed. But

here, the news is, you can join it while it is still going. This is a huge threat to the——

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you for the great historical perspective that you bring to that and lessons I think that are very valuable in looking at what we are doing right now.

I wanted to turn to our witness Mr. Wimbush from the BBG to talk about what you mentioned, you had explained and that is why the shift of resources from VOA to RFA, how much of the population do you expect to reach via shortwave radio through RFA? And is the trend line that we can expect BBG to defund shortwave radio in China and other countries? What can we expect?

Mr. WIMBUSH. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member.

Let me begin answering that by stating that the BBG in making this realignment did not plan to make it easier on Chinese authorities. In fact, we planned to make it more difficult for them. We think the realignment of platforms tracks with good common sense, good strategy, and good budgeting, and I will tell you why.

In 2006, 24 percent of Chinese owned and used radios for news and information. In 2009, only 8 percent of adults were weekly radio listeners. That is a drop of one-half since 2007. With regard to shortwave—and the research and surveys we have got—these are not just ours. These are from the BBC from Deutsche Welle from Radio France International, from other radio broadcasters as well. Ownership and use of shortwave radio is in dramatic decline everywhere. Now, I am not saying we are going out of the shortwave business, and I will come back and give you specific examples of that in just a moment. The BBG's and others, 2010 showed that only 0.1 percent of Chinese listened to the Voice of America in Mandarin. Only 0.4 percent reported listening to any shortwave broadcast in any previous week. Survey results showed hardly any acknowledged of listening to an international broadcast.

But in contrast, the trend for use in the Internet and mobile technology is increasing rapidly. China today has the largest number of Internet users in the world. The growth of mobile technology will offer additional means for content delivery to Chinese audiences; 75 percent or more of Chinese mobile subscribers are projected to have access to the Internet within 5 years. By 2015, more than 550 million people are projected to have 3G subscriptions in China.

From a recent survey by the OpenNet Initiative Citizen Lab's report from MIT, it concludes that as of 2008, Chinese Internet users had grown 42 percent year over year, 42 percent year over year; 90 percent of these have broadband access. There are about 600 million cell phone users currently. Here is a critical piece: Although the rural-urban divide remains substantial, at the end of 2008, rural Internet users, according to the MIT survey, made up almost a third of the entire online population, a jump of over 60 percent. And this was driven by a policy goal that every village has access to the telephone and every township has access to the Internet by 2010.

Expansion of infrastructure development has given access to 92 percent of the townships already. Web site registrations grew 91.4 percent since 2007. Almost a third participate in online chats. If you look at this strategically as somebody who is trying to make

it more difficult for the Chinese to filter the flow of information to their own population, it is not—one can debate the merits of different approaches, but the long-term approach is pretty clear. The Internet, which can be filtered, is going to play an increasingly important role. Shortwave, which can be totally blocked, is going to play a less important role. That is just the way it is going all over the world.

When we announced this realignment, it became almost an urban legend that the BBG was proposing to go out of the shortwave business. We are not proposing to go out of the shortwave business. We have a weekly listenership of about 165 million; 38 million of those listen in shortwave, some exclusively in shortwave. And they are in critical target audiences: Burma, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, North Korea. We are not going to touch any of those. We are not going anywhere near those.

The realignment was intended to take advantage, to get scarce resources into exploiting this burgeoning digital technology as best we can while maintaining our legacy shortwave broadcast capabilities to the extent that we feel that that is justified. We think that we have got the balance about right. I am sure we are going to be debating it a lot going forward.

But the reality is, we are not going out of shortwave in China. We are going heavily into digital because that is where the audience is and particularly that is where the demographic is that we seek to reach.

And I agree totally with Bob Reilly on this, although I would dispute the idea that we are necessarily going to lose 6 million listeners. That assumes that none of them are going to tune in to VOA on the Internet or to Radio Free Asia, which has Internet capabilities as well. Thank you.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would like to just follow up to that. Is it possible for a government to track down who is listening to a shortwave broadcast? Is it possible for a government to track down someone who is involved in an Internet exchange? I think the answer to the first one, I believe, is no. And I believe that the answer to the second question is yes, thus what we are saying is, we are eliminating the communications channel that cannot be traced, and we are depending on the channel that can be traced.

Mr. WIMBUSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am glad you brought that up because it raises a very important point. I think you are probably correct on the first part that it is very hard to track who is listening in shortwave, if they can receive the shortwave.

However, it is not always the case that you can track who is listening on the Internet. One of the BBG's most important efforts here is in the anti-Internet circumvention technologies, which we are deeply involved in. This is a network of proxy servers, which obliterates the identification.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. Well, let me yield one more question to my ranking member. But let's just note I am on the Science Committee, and one of the things I know about is the Chinese are investing heavily in how to track people on the Internet and some of our Internet CEOs have shown their dedication to democracy by helping them out.

Mr. Carnahan.

Mr. CARNAHAN. My last question I wanted to direct to Deputy Assistant Secretaries Stout and Dibble and to really follow up on this very issue with regard to Internet censorship by both the Iranian and the Chinese Governments. I would like you to talk about the most effective form of public diplomacy in your respective regions and also what steps are being taken to counter some of this Internet censorship.

Mr. DIBBLE. I will start, if it is okay. Thank you for your question.

First, with respect to Internet censorship, this takes us from the issue of public diplomacy and public communication into I think an area the chairman referred to earlier, namely support for freedom and democracy in, in my case, Iran. It is absolutely true that the Iranian authorities make enormous efforts and have developed sophisticated means to try and find out first to block access to Internet sites, find out who is visiting and to interfere with the ability of average Iranians to use the Internet to communicate with one another and to organize.

The State Department is investing heavily itself in ways to combat that. One of those is the kind of circumvention technology that Mr. Wimbush mentioned. But it is also important that, as the chairman pointed out, to recognize that people who use the Internet can be tracked. Therefore, they need not just the ability to access certain Web sites, but they need the ability to protect themselves as they do that, and they need the ability to hide, essentially, whatever they have downloaded from the authorities who may be seeking it.

It is that kind of not just technology but training in security practices and other similar aspects of the portfolio that the State Department is working on. So that is sort of part of an answer to the first part of your question.

On the effective form of public diplomacy, I think we need all of them, certainly with respect to Iran. We need to be able to get our message across. We need to say, as Mr. Reilly pointed out, what we stand for, what we are trying to do, how we are trying to do it, what our objectives are.

We need to be able to demonstrate to the Iranian people that we are not the great Satan, that there is value in people-to-people exchanges between the United States and Iran and that, for that reason, they need not to trust what the government says about U.S. policies, at least begin to sell some doubts about that.

And I think what we also need to do in order to accomplish the objectives of Iran Freedom Support Act is to enhance the ability of Iranians in Iran to reach out, not just to access information but also to reach each other and to organize. I think that is one of the lessons of Tahrir Square was the value of the kind of technologies that the Egyptians used to mobilize. That would be my answer.

Mr. CARNAHAN. And Ms. Stout.

Ms. STOUT. Thank you, Congressman.

I would associate myself closely with my colleague's comments regarding Internet freedom and the Internet circumvention technologies that the State Department has been looking at and supports. With respect to public diplomacy in China, our public diplo-

macy mission in China is our largest and most robust. In terms of what is most effective, obviously, we are dealing with, you know, an environment where we have certain restrictions that we need to be mindful of. So, therefore, our communication directly with the Chinese public is, I would say, our most vital goal. We do so in a variety of ways. The State Department and the Embassy run a number of microblogs, Twitter feeds, that communicate with the Chinese people through the social media platforms that we have in indigenous Chinese languages.

We have over 400,000 Chinese followers on those blogs and those Twitter feeds. That is our way of communicating directly with the Chinese people about our values, our goals and our U.S. policy interests.

In addition to that, we have, as I mentioned in my testimony, a number of other programs that our mission in China is actively engaged in. The 100,000 Strong program represents a desire to correct a major imbalance in terms of the number of U.S. students we are sending over to China. We would like our next generation of leaders here in the United States to have a better understanding of Chinese language and culture so that they can come back here and be more competitive in their futures.

We have a very robust speakers program that goes and supports both the U.S. Government nonprofit private-sector individuals to go to China, not just the urban centers but outside into the rural centers, and promote democracy, civil society, human rights, corporate social responsibility, a number of things. And we feel that those are all elements of a very strong public diplomacy program.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you all very much.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And thank you, Mr. Carnahan.

And I know that, at some moment, you are going to have to sneak out because you have another meeting, but we appreciate your participation. I have got a few areas to cover, and I don't know if Mr. Rivera will be coming back, and so we will make sure he gets a chance to ask some questions as well.

There are a number of issues that we need to discuss. Mr. Zhou, am I pronouncing it correctly?

Mr. ZHOU. It is more like "Joe."

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I am sorry. I really have trouble with these. With a name like "Rohrabacher," an American name like that.

Mr. Zhou, did I hear you right that you are saying that the BBG uses a Chinese Government satellite?

Mr. ZHOU. It is a satellite that is controlled by the Chinese Government because China has the biggest share of that satellite, and it is based in Hong Kong.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is made in Hong Kong. Now is that correct?

Mr. WIMBUSH. It is a satellite owned by an international consortium of which the Chinese Government has a piece.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. What kind of piece?

Mr. WIMBUSH. Not all of it, I can tell you that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I didn't say all of it. All you need is 51 percent, and that makes you, you own the pie. And of course, some of the companies in Hong Kong that probably own the other part of the pie rather than just the Chinese Government may, well, be

sympathetic, let's say, to the regime. It sounds like to me that if we are relying on that satellite, that is going to make jamming easier and perhaps even the identification of opposition easier, certainly easier than shortwave. Go ahead.

Mr. WIMBUSH. Mr. Chairman to my knowledge, that satellite has not been jammed. One of the things that makes it harder to jam for the Chinese is that General Electric and others are part of the consortium. I mean, it is not total immunity.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I have got you. But I will have to admit, I have been so impressed with America's CEOs' commitment to democracy over my career. They have just rejected signing any agreements with tyrants. You know, I remember when IBM rejected their opportunity to deal with Adolf Hitler. And I remember during the 1960s and 1970s, how our businessmen would refuse to sell commodities to Russia when they were indeed—hell, I remember all those things.

Oh, wait a minute. I am wrong. I was wrong about—my memory must be slipping. The CEOs actually made deals with dictatorial regimes before. Okay. Enough of that.

Let's go into a little bit about China, and then we will do a little bit about Iran. Let me suggest that I am a free trader, which always disturbs people. But my motto is free trade between free people. And what I think we have with China is a one-way free trade, but we also have, consistent with that, a one-way free information.

Do you recognize this paper? This is published by the Communist Party of China. It is distributed widely. I think it comes to every one of our governmental offices. Do we have a similar publication that goes to the people who are in the Chinese Government?

Mr. WIMBUSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Point very well taken. The Voice of America, Radio Free Asia, whomever is dealing with China, cannot get access to China. They won't accredit our journalists. We have a single office in Beijing, which is allowed no programming. They won't give us visas. We have not a single affiliate broadcast relationship in China, which is the way normally you do it. You beam something up to a satellite. You bring it down, and you rebroad it cast it in F.M. Or A.M., which is the preferred method of listening.

Meanwhile, the Chinese, as you have just pointed out, are all over the world. If you think they are big in here and in Galveston and in places like that, you should see them in Africa. It is a huge investment going into the billions of dollars. We are not challenging them with anything comparable to that. And even more regrettable in my sense is that we are not even challenging them seriously to get our own media access to their market.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. There you go. And let me just note that this is totally consistent with the other type of negotiations that we have with China. You know, we have sent Peewee Herman over to do our negotiating when we should have sent Arnold Schwarzenegger or somebody. The bottom line is that there are negotiations on a number of issues in which we lose. We basically accept giving the Chinese dictatorship what it wants. I will go back to China in a moment.

But I would like to ask about Mr. Dibble's point that the majority of the Iranian people don't like the United States, is that right?

Mr. DIBBLE. No. They love us.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Maybe you could tell us a little bit. Here is someone who went to jail there. In Mr. Dibble's world—I am sorry. I will let you comment on it. But I am taking it out of context. But I seem to remember you saying in your testimony that what you had found is that the Iranian people don't like the United States.

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. And maybe the employees of Voice of America Persian Service, yes, they don't like America that much. But about the Iranian people inside Iran, I am talking about the more than 70 percent under the age of 35 and 81 percent under the age of 40, they love the United States.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So we have a huge group of young people who would be susceptible to our freedom message. And maybe, Mr. Dibble, you could tell me why it is important that we broadcast to those young people and put the Mullahs on to explain their own position.

Mr. DIBBLE. Let me first correct what is clearly a misimpression. What I said was that they don't like U.S. policies, not that they don't like the U.S.

In fact, it is sort of a common place in Iran policy circles has that Iran is the one country in the Middle East where the people like us better than the government.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, let me note for the record that our student leader here from Iran is shaking his head "no." But we will go right ahead.

Mr. DIBBLE. In any case, I think it is important for us to broadcast to the younger generation in Iran because they—one, it is the preferred means of getting news.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right. And so how is us putting the Mullahs directly on with them, how is that going to help us get our message across?

Mr. DIBBLE. What we are proposing is not to put the Mullahs on.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, the Mullah spokesman on.

Mr. DIBBLE. To put our U.S. Government Persian-speaking spokespeople onto Iranian media.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. But you are not suggesting that we have a spokesmen for the Mullahs being covered by our broadcasting?

Mr. DIBBLE. No, not at all. We are proposing to have our guy——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. Fine. I have heard criticism of that in the past. So that isn't happening.

Mr. DIBBLE. Certainly not in our plans.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Not what?

Mr. DIBBLE. It is not in our plans to do that. Our plan is to put our guys——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. But is it happening now? It is not in our plans to do something.

Mr. DIBBLE. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. Is anyone on the panel aware that we have put the Mullah spokesman on? Because some people had come to me with that charge.

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. On Voice of America Persian Service, yes. Sometimes there are some people from the inside government they came

to speak, and they had a super bad attitude with the host and anchors, and it happened.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. And to your knowledge, it is just not a policy, but that just happened once or twice?

Mr. DIBBLE. As far as I know, yes.

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. But it is not bad, Mr. Chairman. It can be. But let us to have the ability to talk with them and make them some balance. Maybe something. But it is not fair to boycott the part, that it is the side of people and just give the other part to speak.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay.

Mr. Dibble and Ms. Stout, is it your position that the conflict between our countries is based on a misunderstanding of our cultures of each other? Or that it is based on the fact that the Chinese Government is the worst human rights abuser in the world and it continues to put religious believers in jail and murdering them, could that have something to do with the fact—their basic value of their government political value rather than all the other values of our cultural values?

From listening to your testimony, you seem to be saying that it is a misunderstanding of their culture. And let's have a sports exchange. And you know Hitler had that really good. I remember all these videos of, what, the 1936 Olympics, was it? Is that your position, that we are talking about a misunderstanding of culture?

Ms. STOUT. No, sir. With respect to our relationship with the People's Republic of China, I think what I was trying to say in my testimony was, in our communications directly with the Chinese people, we would like to build a better understanding of our values, of our way of life, of our promotion of democracy. This is between the U.S. Government and the people of China.

I do not dispute at all you know our—in terms of the human rights abuses that the Government of China has engaged in, we have been quite vocal about our concern. We raise our concerns at the highest levels with the forced disappearances, the arrests, the treatment of our journalists, people who come out and speak up against repression. We have been very open and candid with our Chinese interlocutors about this.

We do not hide the fact that this continues to be an irritant in our relationship.

Mr. DIBBLE. And all the more true in the case of Iran.

This is not a question of cultural misunderstanding. We are not shy at all about criticizing Iran's human rights record, and we have any number of strategic disagreements, disputes, hostilities with respect to Iran.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Uh-huh.

Mr. DIBBLE. We do have an interest in ensuring that the Iranian people continue to look to the United States as a repository of the values that they have as distinct from their own government. And I think much of our public diplomacy is aimed at fostering that feeling. And to the extent that my friend at the end of the table is correct, we have been successful.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. Well, let me ask someone who used to be director of Voice of America, Mr. Reilly, his reaction to what has been said, specifically in terms of China.

Mr. REILLY. Well, to China, I would like to—you held up a Communist Party publication. I would like to quote from one, too. May I? It is the Global Times, published by the People's Daily. And this is the reaction to the elimination of the VOA TV and radio broadcasting service: "The cut demonstrates a blow to the ideological campaign that certain countries have waged for over half a century. Representative Dana Rohrabacher——"

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Uh-oh.

Mr. REILLY [continuing]. "California Republican whined that the U.S. is cowing before China." And you are quoted, Mr. Chairman, as saying, "The Chinese people are our greatest allies, and the free flow of information is our greatest weapon," with which I totally agree.

The article ends saying, "Their Chinese service is coming to a historical end with their mission unfinished."

At least I agree with that latter part. If I may respond to a couple of things that my friend Enders Wimbush said, a person whom I respect greatly. I don't think we should be faced with an either/or in broadcasting platforms.

If we see U.S. broadcasting as a national security asset, it requires redundancy. If you can't reach them one way, you need to be able to reach them another. The Internet in China is policed by hundreds of thousands of Chinese police and other hundreds of thousands of Internet bloggers who write on behalf of the government or the party. In 2009, in Xinjiang province, the Chinese Government shut the Internet down completely for a month, and they also eliminated international telephone service for that month.

Shortwave broadcasting, I would dispute, despite the enormous expense of jamming it on the coastal areas nonetheless does get through. There are almost 1 billion people in China without the Internet today. And if the choice were, we have to get rid of one of these services, Radio Free Asia or the Voice of America, why would you choose the service with the largest audience and the service that is obligated to present who the United States is, what it is doing, and the reasons for it?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, Mr. Wimbush's argument is that it is the most effective way to do it. And we will let him express that and then Mr. Lenczowski will jump in.

Mr. WIMBUSH. With respect to my good friend Bob Reilly, who is the smartest intellectual on public diplomacy anywhere and the very best, and I seldom have a disagreement with him. But when you are talking about the most popular versus the less popular and the numbers are 0.1 percent and 0.3 or 0.4 percent, there is not a whole lot to choose between them.

I personally like the idea of getting Radio Free Asia onto the shortwave in prime times on the best frequencies because I came out of a surrogate service—surrogate radio, and I know how powerful those can be.

Clearly not everybody is going to get everything. And I agree with Bob entirely. It is not an either/or situation, but we haven't proposed an either/or situation. We have proposed a two-pronged situation. Can it be recalibrated? Can it be adjusted? Yes. And it almost certainly will be. But it is headed in the direction that the listenership is headed.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Dr. Lenczowski.

Mr. LENCZOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to add one point about the relationship between our overall diplomatic approach to a place like China or Iran and our very specific public diplomacy programs. I think that the normal public diplomacy programs of the kind that Deputy Assistant Secretary Stout has described are very useful in order to try to promote American values.

But I also believe that when people are feeling oppressed and when you have a country that has now had, as I understand it, somewhere around 75,000 civil disturbances within the last year or so throughout the country, people who feel oppressed need to have some kind of sense of solidarity with those who are free and who might be sympathetic with them. I would venture to say, without the intent of embarrassing you in your old role as a speechwriter for President Reagan, that Presidential rhetoric was an enormous weapon of public diplomacy in the Cold War and is highly relevant today to our relations with tyrannical governments like the Chinese and the Iranians. And this means our national leaders have to stop censoring themselves with regards to the human rights violations, the massive espionage operations, over 25,000 Chinese intelligence assets in the United States today, the huge military build-up, you know, the continued existence of the Laogai and all of these other things. And it was when President Reagan started saying the truth about that they would lie, that they would steal, they would you know commit any crime to further the goals of communism, there is a lot that American national leaders could be saying about China and could certainly threaten to say in the course of trying to modulate the tone of those relations when it comes to other diplomatic matters.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And when the President of the United States makes statements, it is a message to everyone else who works within the executive branch as to what the policy will be.

I was honored to work with President Reagan who made no beans about it what the Communist regime and the Soviet Union was all about. And he also, I might add, when he went to China, if you read his full speeches—and I helped work on them with him—the freedom component is a very important part of his speeches in China. I was just recently—when President Hu visited, I asked Secretary of State Clinton whether or not the issue of forced abortion, where we have millions upon millions of women who are being forced to have their unborn babies ripped from their bodies—we probably have the most wholesale murder in the history of humankind, except maybe for the Jewish Holocaust during World War II—was that mentioned at all? I said, did that come up? And frankly, there was a promise to get back to me and the administration never got back to me with an answer, whether or not President Obama even mentioned it. Well, when you have a—leadership will filter down, and what I am afraid of and let's just say, we will have many of these hearings to find out what the real policy of our Government is. I think we have had some very good testimony today.

Mr. Rivera is coming back.

Mr. Meehan, you have not had a can chance to comment and I am going to give you a free hand. Here I am talking about my views. And certainly, I want to give you a chance to get on the record with yours.

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity. And we really appreciate at the BBG the chance to focus in on things that we can do better and things that we can work with you, the Congress, to improve that and our colleagues in other government agencies.

But this BBG Board came about, this new Board—we all got there in July. It is a part-time Board. I have a full-time job that is something else. But we came here—so does the rest of the Board actually, as does vendors.

And so I wouldn't disagree with some of the comments that sort of structural management issues need to be on the table, but we are putting them on the table because I don't think that Michael Meehan should part-timely run a television station for the U.S. Government. I shouldn't. But are there things with the kind of expertise that Enders Wimbush brings to the table should be part of it? It should.

You asked at the beginning of your remarks that we have asked for additional sums of money. Endersand I cochair the budget committee, and we have gone through 75 of the 100 countries that we do services in now, and by June we will finish all of them and ask what can we do better with the U.S. taxpayers' dollar. And each time they come back with this program works, this one doesn't work, this one should be changed.

Now, I am very sympathetic to the short-wave, but if we started the BBG today, and the Congress said, here is $110 million, would you put $100 million into short-wave and $10 million into the Internet when there is 235 million users of the Internet in China? I am sympathetic about the tracing. But the thing that our guys at the BBG do really well with a $1.5 million budget is figure out how to get around some of the government censors in China, in Iran, in Cuba. You name the place, they have figured it out. And with that little amount of money, they have gotten to—10 million people have gotten around these firewalls in these various places.

The State Department got $5 million recently from the Congress they didn't ask for. They sent us $1.4 million. As of yesterday the BBG sent out to two companies—450 million people use this Internet circumvention proxy for $1.4 million to get around the firewall to go to Facebook, yes, but to go to also VOA Persia, PNN.

So I am with you. I don't think it is an either/or, because in this changing technologies that we have, we have got to go where people are and where they can hear us.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much for that. And I appreciate your contribution to this discussion. All of you have made this.

We are going to ask Mr. Rivera to—and then I am going to have a very short closing statement. But, Mr. Rivera, you may proceed.

Mr. RIVERA. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, all of you, for being here.

I recognize in the audience my former boss from my USIA days, U.S. Information Agency. I worked at USIA for 9 years under the

auspices part of that time of Mr. Dick Lobo, a great American, a great patriot, and a great broadcaster.

I see my good friend Bruce Sherman, and my former colleague as well, very nice seeing you.

A couple of questions related to the international broadcasting. And what I recall from my years in international public diplomacy is the issue of surrogate broadcasting and the surrogate mission. And I wonder—my understanding of the surrogate mission, of course, is prioritizing information which is denied to the people in indeed what I will call captive nations by their captors, by the regime. Is that the—is that priority still in play today in the mission with the China service and with the Iran service? And I will go to Mr. Meehan and Mr. Wimbush. The surrogate mission, is that still a priority?

Mr. WIMBUSH. Yes. Thank you, Congressman. This is a very good question. It is good because the answer to this is not as crystal clear as it was 10 years ago or 15 or 20 years ago.

Let me put it this way: If you drive through almost any part of the world today that has got reasonably free media, take the Middle East, take Turkey, someplace like that, you can go through any small town, look at any apartment building, and you will see two or three satellite dishes on every balcony. And that means that they are receiving 200 to 400 channels of something.

The idea that most people in the world are deficient in information today can't be sustained. There are some places where they are totally deficient. Radio Free Asia is a perfect example in our network of broadcasters of a totally surrogate station. It does the information and the analysis and the reporting on local events, local dynamics, local things of importance that those people could expect to receive if they had a free media of their own. The Office of Cuba Broadcasting is another one, although it is beginning to loosen up.

But what we are beginning to see more and more is a kind of hybridization. Some places get tons of information and still don't know how to process it very well. So our mission, in a very funny sort of way, it comes back and focuses on precisely where we were during the Cold War when we were a monopoly of outsiders going in. It is creating the analytical context, the larger picture, the larger view, which can help people take a lot of information that might not mean something and stimulate their critical thinking in ways that help them get to the right decisions when the decision point comes. There is no better example of this right now than the Radio Martis, which are under—have been totally renovated and are really doing a remarkable job.

But to give you—I mean, to give you an idea of how complex this is, TV Alhurra one thinks of as a global international broadcaster. But what do we hear from the Alhurra audience? We want you more local. We want you to be surrogate. In this respect John Lenczowski is absolutely right. It is part of—it is more part of the surrogate mission than it is of the other. But it is not totally surrogate.

We are experimenting right now with creating an all-Egypt stream. The station was developed as a Pan-Arab station. We are in the process of developing an all-Egypt stream at this point, and

my guess is that we are going to go more and more in that direction toward more local content.

So the idea of surrogate originally was give them what their local media won't give them. Today the idea of surrogate is—in many places it is give them what the global media won't give them about themselves. So it is a difficult balancing act.

What this Board is attempting to do with its strategic reviews and other things is to get away from the harsh definition between official broadcasters like the VOA and surrogate broadcasters like the "radio frees." We are trying to get audience-focused here. There are some audiences that will take one kind of product, and other audiences will take a different kind of product, and some that will take something that looks a little bit like both.

But we are—John Lenczowski is absolutely right in pointing out we have got a structural problem. We have got a structural problem. You won't find—as Michael said, we are prepared to put these issues on the table. You won't find a single member of this Board who believes that the BBG is a particularly sharp instrument and is necessarily the right instrument for this highly complex media world with rapidly changing technologies.

Mr. RIVERA. Well, that is going to happen maybe in a more concise form. Let me use—in terms of your response, let me use the example of OCB Radio and Martin Gutierrez as a template for my question. Because in south Florida I can hear Cuban Government broadcasts because they make efforts on media Wave to broadcast into south Florida. And what Cuban Government broadcasts entail are mainly the great production of the harvest and the sugar and the great things that are going on in Cuba.

So my question is when it comes to China or Iran from Chinese broadcasters or the Iran broadcast services, is it a priority to make sure that it is not just what the mullahs are saying that is given to the audience, but what they are denied, information that is denied to them domestically, domestic information, what is going on, what is really going on in Iran that the Iranian Government denies them, what is really going on in China that the Chinese Government denies them, as well as what is going on in the world that the Iranian and Chinese Government deny their people? Is that a priority?

Mr. MEEHAN. It is a priority. But we are an agency that its job is to be communications platform-neutral. And so if you gave us a TV station in China, could we produce a great show? Yes. If the Cuban Government let our TV show Radio/TV Marti be seen, which probably it doesn't—we know it doesn't, very few people see it—you would say yes.

Mr. RIVERA. You have other ways of getting information out of Iran and China. You don't need to open a TV station in China or a TV station in Iran or a TV station in Cuba to know that there are political prisoners. You don't need to open stations in those countries to know that there is human rights abuses or denials of civil liberties, or that there are no free elections. You know that without having a physical presence in those countries. Conveying that information, is that a priority as a surrogate function today in 2011 for these stations?

Mr. MEEHAN. Yes. Every day, every day it is a top priority to convey that information, that governments that don't allow the media to talk to their own people, we—no matter how we can figure it out, Internet, radio, short-wave, medium-wave, FM, AM, from another country, barring another country, off the top of military towers, flying a plane over Libya today, we are committed to putting out information that their governments won't tell them about.

Mr. RIVERA. So the surrogate function.

Mr. MEEHAN. So the surrogate function.

Mr. RIVERA. Now, you have heard—physically you have been there listening inside knowing what these stations are broadcasting. Do you believe from what you heard that the surrogate function of these stations, which I believe is a congressional mandate or mission, was a priority of the broadcasts?

Mr. FAKHRAVAR. Without the surging service, the Voice of America and Radio Farda, until now, no. But the good things that Governor Meehan and Governor Wimbush they say, I agree with them, because the day Governor Wimbush was appointed as a Broadcasting Board of Governor, he did a great job. We had a meeting, and I gave him some suggestion about how the problem can be fixed. And he said, we need the watchdog, we need to follow people. They can understand Farsi and English fully, and they can prove their loyalty first to the United States, and through BBG and VOA's mission needs to promote freedom and democracy first. And he said yes, and he started that mission.

And then they forced the Voice of America to have the new manager. He is a great guy. He just came last month. He has done a great job right now to clean up the Persian cities. We need to have these things, to see these type of things in Radio Farda, definitely. These two things, and rehiring the all the employees that they came during last 5 years, 6 years, to just check their background and their application again to see which part of these people they lied, and it is a lot.

But I am sure the Governor Wimbush and the Governor Meehan and the new BBG—I am talking about the new BBG because the old BBG, I didn't want to say the word terrible, but that was terrible. The new one is doing a good job, and we hope—we need them to follow the mission to promote freedom and democracy.

Mr. RIVERA. And I agree with that. But the way my understanding is, correct me if I am wrong, the way we promote freedom and democracy in the national public diplomacy, international broadcasting is by providing objective, balanced, comprehensive information, news and information. And a surrogate function, the objective, balanced, comprehensive information, "balanced" means providing that information denied to that audience by their own government.

That is how we promote freedom and democracy in terms of the broadcasting function. And I want to know, I want to know here today, that that surrogate function, providing that audience the information and news that is denied to them by their own government, that that is a priority of all the broadcast services; that at least Voice of America, because Voice of America has a different

mission, the surrogate function; the radio frees, the TV frees, that those have that priority.

Mr. WIMBUSH. They do have priority, Congressman, absolute priority. And I wouldn't even call out the VOA here. The VOA does a lot of this, too, a lot of it.

Mr. RIVERA. But it is not country-specific. These are country-specific. Information denied to those people in those country, China, Iran, tell me that that is—let me know how that is a priority.

Mr. WIMBUSH. It is. It is a huge priority. This is what these radios were put in place to do. They were put in place to do precisely this. There are services at the Voice of America which one might even think of as surrogate services. The Tibetan service, for example, it operates effectively like a surrogate service. There are surrogate services at the Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty. OCB is almost entirely a surrogate service. RFA, Radio Free Asia, is entirely a surrogate service at this point.

The trick going forward is going be able to get inside this larger universe of services, of providers, of capabilities and adjust in the direction of audiences that might be changing. And this is not an easy thing to do.

Mr. RIVERA. I understand that. I just want to make sure the message and the mission is adhering to that principle of surrogate service.

Mr. WIMBUSH. Absolutely.

Mr. RIVERA. Do I have another moment?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You sure do. But we will be done here in 10 minutes, and the chairman needs at least 1.

Mr. RIVERA. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Audience measurements, are you able to—how do we measure audiences in what we continue to call captive audiences like China or Iran—let us stick with China and Iran for now.

Mr. WIMBUSH. I really am not the person to speak to that. But the person who can speak to it is sitting right behind me, Bruce Sherman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Oh, Bruce, okay.

Mr. WIMBUSH. He knows more about this than anybody else at the BBG because he runs all of this.

Mr. RIVERA. I would like to know if we can——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Are you sure he is going to be the only witness?

Mr. WIMBUSH. But what I would like to suggest, Congressman, is if you use a very sweet tone, I will bet you Bruce will come up and give you a full briefing on this.

Mr. RIVERA. Will you tell me, we do try to measure audience, but I understand it is very difficult to do so.

Mr. WIMBUSH. It is not just audience size, but the largest contract the BBG lets across anything is its research and audience development contract. It is about $50 million per 5 years, $10 million a year. Measuring audience size is fairly simple in a lot of places; it is harder others.

Mr. RIVERA. I want to stick to China and Iran, in closed societies.

Mr. WIMBUSH. It is harder, it is harder. It can be done.

Mr. RIVERA. Would you say it is imprecise?

Mr. WIMBUSH. I will let Bruce discuss measures.

Mr. RIVERA. Well, these are societies that people live in fear, so I would suspect it is very imprecise to determine audiences in captive nations where countries are living in fear. If I go back to the Radio Free Europe, my understanding is irrespective of those efforts to measure audiences in these countries, we continued to broadcast behind the Iron Curtain notwithstanding the fact that we could not necessarily determine the audience during the Cold War. And probably today as well we cannot determine in China or Iran the audience size. Would you agree with that, Mr. Reilly?

Mr. REILLY. Absolutely.

Mr. RIVERA. Well, then, let me ask you this, because we have a colleague of mine who recently issued a dear colleague letter saying that Radio/TV Marti should be shut down because the audience levels are low. And my recollection is that in a closed society where people live in fear of opining on anything, like China and Iran and Cuba, you cannot utilize an audience survey to justify the continuation of broadcast services to these closed societies. And I would like to know who would agree with that, Mr. Reilly, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Wimbush?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, if the gentleman would hold just a moment. I think the point you are making is that if you live in a dictatorship like Cuba, if you get a phone call and say, do you listen to Radio Marti——

Mr. RIVERA. You are going to hang up the phone.

Mr. MEEHAN. It is enormously imprecise. It is enormously difficult to measure. The most recent survey we have attempted in China is about 8,600 people. Some of it was done on line through a proxy service. It is not completely accurate, and that is some of the best data.

Mr. RIVERA. Would you agree not to use that as a measure of the worthiness of broadcast services?

Mr. MEEHAN. I completely agree with the chairman. Hi, this is the government calling. Are you doing something illegal? No. You know, you would hang up the phone and go. So, yes, it is enormously imprecise, and that is a big challenge.

Mr. RIVERA. Would you agree that it should not be the justification of other measurements in justifying broadcast services to these closed societies?

Mr. REILLY. I would, sir. And I would add that the BBG's own figures for Voice of America Mandarin had 6 million for TV and radio. They themselves say is an underestimate precisely because of this problem.

I think the standard should be not how many are you reaching, because you can't find that out, but what is it you need to reach them with. And part of it is that vital surrogate function you mention.

By the way, VOA Chinese spends 40 percent of its time, as Enders Wimbush indicated, with local Chinese news, but the rest of it fulfills the rest of the VOA charter, U.S. policy and life and explanation thereof. That is why I think it is a terrible mistake to close down that service in favor of the Web site that today is completely blocked by the Chinese Government.

Mr. RIVERA. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, thank you very much.

One last question, and then I have a closing statement. And, Mr. Zhou, we just heard that there is a $50-million research budget. And I understand you have been developing some kind of software to help people get around the blocks that are put in them for receiving, I guess, the Internet or broadcast signals. What has been the reaction to that type of product that you have developed?

Mr. ZHOU. So I believe the Board of Governors mentioned $1.5 million they assigned to break through the firewall system was assigned to us to do that. And indeed, the work this Internet Freedom Consortium has done is enormous, and it is great.

And now, I just want to also add——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So you receive support, it is in the record, to try to develop a software that is necessary to break through these blocks.

Mr. ZHOU. It is to expand the scale of the operation, not to develop software. The software has already been developed.

I want to echo Mr. Rivera's comment on this. The importance of the content of the domestic news in those who live in repressive regimes, NTD developed a program called China's Forbidden News, and that program is among the highest-rated programs on the Internet from China. Every day there are tens of thousands, maybe sometimes even hundreds of thousands, of visitors to that program alone. Indeed people need to know what happens around them, and this kind of software in a censorship platform indeed plays a critical role to provide such success to those people.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

I will be—this is my final statement, and that this has been a very interesting afternoon. This is in keeping with the tradition that we started, as I say, with Bill Delahunt that we really try to be less formal so we can actually get to the points and have interaction between the witnesses.

I would just like to leave you with one story. And you have to remember I worked for a guy who taught me all about writing. Let me tell you a little story, and Reagan always had a little story. Well, this is a little story about when I worked for Reagan. It was mentioned about how Reagan did not—by the way, he was always saying, "Be very tough when it comes to policy; be very nice and good to people, to other human beings." So he is tough on the Communist ideology and the policy, but he is very good to these people who were not on the other side of the table.

But we all remember his very solid, solid statements condemning not just acts, but the nature of communism as being evil. And Natan Sharansky in our administration was traded—Natan Sharansky was a political prisoner in the gulag in the worst possible conditions. He was asked to sign a statement saying Russia is a democracy, and he could get out. He refused to sign that. A real hero of that era.

And then we ended up trading him. And, John, you might have been the guy who arranged the trade, I don't know, but we traded Sharansky. We got Sharansky for some Soviet spy. And we got the best part of the deal, obviously, and we got a saint for someone who was probably working for the worst gang around.

So Sharansky, when he made his way out of that gulag and was free, he came to the West, and he went to the White House. One

of the first things he did was go to see President Reagan. And the speechwriters were all tuned in. And there is a closed-circuit TV in the White House. And so when people come out of the meeting with the President, they meet with members of the press, and it is closed-circuit TV to all of our offices.

So the press asked Sharansky about his meeting with the President, and they said, well, what did you tell the President? And he said, well, I told the President the most important thing was not to tone down his speeches. And, of course, the speechwriters, you know, champagne started popping and all the rest, and began to celebrate. And they said, well, what is that all about? He said, well, in my darkest moments when I was in prison, somebody smuggled me a little note that said the President of the United States has just called the Soviet Union an evil empire, and once I knew that, I had hope, and I did not give up and would not give up. And how many other Sharanskys throughout the Communist world felt the same way, and how did that have an impact on peace and freedom on this planet?

And Reagan was condemned soundly. I mean, he—after using the word evil empire, if you remember, they called him belligerent and the rest of it.

Well, the day after this incident Sharansky—there was a reception for Sharansky at the Israeli Embassy. And I remember he was coming down—I was sort of over in the back, and he was coming down these long stairs. He was a real short guy. And I found in my life that the bravest people are short and bald. They just really are. And so anyway, there he is coming down there, and all these people are surrounding him. And all of a sudden it sort of opens up like this, and he is sort of looking in my direction. He walks right across the room right to me, and he looks up at me and says, I understand that you write speeches for President Reagan. And I said, yes, I do. And he says, I have often wondered who you are.

And it all comes back to this: There are a lot of people who don't know who we are. Our Founding Fathers didn't know who we would be, but they know there are good people, there are good and decent people on this planet, and we have to affirm that for those people who are in desperate situations, and through our broadcasting is what it is all about, so thank you all very much.

[Whereupon, at 5:16 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

Material Submitted for the Hearing Record

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFAIRS

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
Dana Rohrabacher (R-CA), Chairman

March 30, 2011

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to be held in **Room 2200 of the Rayburn House Office Building (and available live, via the WEBCAST link on the Committee website at http://www.hcfa.house.gov):**

DATE: Wednesday, April 6, 2011

TIME: 2:00 p.m.

SUBJECT: Is America's Overseas Broadcasting Undermining our National Interest and the Fight Against Tyrannical Regimes?

WITNESSES: **Panel I**

Ms. Jennifer Park Stout
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State
Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs
U.S. Department of State

Mr. Philo L. Dibble
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State
Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs
U.S. Department of State

The Honorable S. Enders Wimbush
Board Member
Broadcasting Board of Governors

The Honorable Michael Meehan (available for questions)
Board Member
Broadcasting Board of Governors

Panel II

John Lenczowski, Ph.D.
President
Institute of World Politics

Mr. Shiyu Zhou
Vice President
New Tang Dynasty Television

Mr. Amir Fakhravar
General Secretary
Confederation of Iranian Students

Mr. Robert Reilly
Former Director
Voice of America

By Direction of the Chairman

The Committee on Foreign Affairs seeks to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. If you are in need of special accommodations, please call 202/225-5021 at least four business days in advance of the event, whenever practicable. Questions with regard to special accommodations in general (including availability of Committee materials in alternative formats and assistive listening devices) may be directed to the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON *Oversight and Investigations* HEARING

Day *Wednesday* Date *4/6/11* Room *2200*

Starting Time *2:53 pm* Ending Time *5:15 pm*

Recesses [ ] (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____)

Presiding Member(s)

Chairman Dana Rohrabacher (R-CA)

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session [✓]
Executive (closed) Session [ ]
Televised [✓]

Electronically Recorded (taped) [✓]
Stenographic Record [✓]

TITLE OF HEARING:

Is America's Overseas Broadcasting Undermining our National Interest and the Fight Against Tyrannical Regimes?

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Rohrabacher, Ranking Member Carnahan, Rep. Rivera, and Rep. Cicilline

NON-SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: *(Mark with an * if they are not members of full committee.)*

none

HEARING WITNESSES: Same as meeting notice attached? Yes [✓] No [ ]
(If "no", please list below and include title, agency, department, or organization.)

STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD: *(List any statements submitted for the record.)*

Robert Reilly, "No Substitute for Substance"
Prepared Statement from John Lenzowski, Ph D
Prepared Statement from DAS Jennifer Stout
Prepared Statement from DAS Philo Dibble
Prepared Statement from S. Enders Wimbush, BBG
Prepared Statement from Shiyo Zhou, Ph D
Prepared Statement from Amir Fakhravar, Confederation of Iranian Students

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____
or
TIME ADJOURNED *5:15 pm*

Subcommittee Staff Director

House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

"Is America's Overseas Broadcasting Undermining our National Interest and the Fight against Tyrannical Regimes?"

Robert R. Reilly, 25th VOA Director
April 6, 2011

Indulge me in an imaginative exercise: if we were setting up a broadcasting service for the US Government from scratch today, we would probably want to focus on the 10 most important countries and languages groups in the world: in our own southern hemisphere Brazil; in Eurasia, certainly Russia, and then China to the south, India to the southwest, and then swinging around to the Middle East, certainly the Arab world with its 300 million people.

Our mission would be to tell these countries and audiences who we are, what we are doing, and why – say, out of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, as the Declaration puts it. If we want the world to be reasonable, we had better give it our reasons. We might, in other words, create the Voice of America, whose purpose, by government charter, is to do these very things.

Now, if an outside observer looked at what has happened to the VOA over the past 10 years, he might notice a pattern – that broadcasting to these largest, most important countries of the world has been eliminated—Portuguese to Brazil gone, Hindi to India eliminated, Arabic to the Arab world ended, and replaced by a pop music station; Russian gone; and the Chinese service is now on the block for extinction in all but its internet presence (which is blocked).

The pattern is clear but the purpose is not. Why have we done this to ourselves? The excuse 10 years ago, or more, was that history had ended in the sense that the model of a democratic, constitutional, free market political order stood undisputed in its moral authority. But 10 years ago, at the expense of 3000 American lives, we found out that was not true. Why, then, are we continuing the pattern?

Economic considerations might be one explanation but they cannot account for 10 years of this behavior, or for the enormous amount of money that has been poured into Radio Sawa, the pop music station to the Arab world. The elimination of Chinese VOA radio and TV, broadcasting in Mandarin, will save $8 million but loose an audience of at least 6 million.

Do we no longer need to explain ourselves to the world? Do we no longer need to give it our reasons? Be sure that others are willing to give reasons for us, as the China is doing now with its biting criticism of US policy regarding Libya.

The Broadcasting Board of Governor's rebuttal might be that it is keeping Radio Free Asia, a Chinese surrogate service, albeit with diminished hours, and the VOA web site. However, the internet is highly vulnerable and surrogate radio broadcasting, as very valuable as it is in itself, does not have the mission of explaining who we are, what we are doing, and why. One of my predecessors as VOA director, Geoffrey Cowan, told me that Chinese foreign ministry officials said that they began the mornings by listening to the Voice of America, because they needed to know what the United States was thinking. They would not tune in RFA to learn that for the very good reason that its mission is to tell the Chinese about China – not about us.

This brings me to the most likely explanation for the elimination of VOA's services to the most important countries in the world: a lost of the sense of mission. This loss began with the end of USIA, when US government broadcasting was placed under the BBG.

As the BBG consists of 8 CEOs, it is not wonder that confusion ensued. Ancient Rome had trouble with 2 proconsuls. Imagine if it had 8. Very importantly, most BBG members have been highly accomplished individuals who made their fortunes in private sector media. They, therefore, sought to replicate this success according to commercial criteria – this meant large youth audiences, and abandoning markets in which such audiences could not be attracted. Who listens became less important than how many listened, or to what.

The new diminished mission became news – not the full service radio that VOA offered, which also presented and explained US policies – but news. Play music for 40 minutes an hour on radio Sawa if you must, so long as they listen to the news. After all, said the BBG chief of staff in 2008, "it is not in our mandate to influence." (Don't other people offer the news?)

The new BBG chairman, Walter Issacson, said in a recent Al-Hurra broadcast that, "we just want to get good news, reliable news, and credible information out." Reliable news was always a part of US broadcasting, but the mission has never been reduced to just that. When the Dalai Lama called the VOA Tibet service "the bread of the Tibetan people," and when Aun San Suu Kyi called the Burmese service "the hope of the Burmese people," do you think they were just talking about the "news"?

Hope is a theological virtue; it is not engendered by news. The Declaration of Independence was not a news report.

I think the US has enduring interests in the world. I think we need to explain ourselves in the most persuasive way we can, and by the most effective means, particularly to those peoples and countries whose future is going to most affect our future.

I think we need to begin again to think through to whom we should be broadcasting, about what, and with what. I think this needs to be done within the US government in a command structure related to our national security – and not by an independent, part-time board.

Failure to do this will be paid, I'm afraid, in American lives. Better to win the war of ideas, than have to win a war. That's simple economics.

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR SUBSTANCE

Robert R. Reilly

The primary purpose of U.S. public diplomacy is to explain, promote, and defend American principles to audiences abroad. This objective goes well beyond the public affairs function of presenting and explaining the specific policies of various administrations. Policies and administrations change; principles do not, so long as the United States remains true to itself. Public diplomacy has a particularly vital mission during war, when the peoples of other countries, whether adversaries or allies, need to know why we fight. After all, it is a conflict of ideas that is behind the shooting wars, and it is that conflict which must be won to achieve any lasting success.

Yet, U.S. public diplomacy is generally acknowledged as a failure—and since 9/11, an especially egregious one. This is particularly clear to those on the battlefield, who understand the importance of an active U.S. effort in the war of ideas to the safety of their troops and comrades-in-arms. Meanwhile, those whose very job, one would have thought, *is* to "influence" will not even admit this is their mission. At an October 2008 strategic communications conference, Jeffrey Trimble, the chief of staff of the Broadcasting Board of

[NOTE: The rest of the article submitted by Mr. Robert Reilly is not reprinted here but is available in committee records or may be accessed via the Internet at: http://www.securityaffairs.org/issues/2009/17/reilly.php (accessed 5/11/11).]

○