THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY: A MID-TERM ASSESSMENT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

FEBRUARY 27, 2019

Serial No. 116–10

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Available: http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/, http://docs.house.gov, or http://www.govinfo.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

35–367PDF WASHINGTON : 2019

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York, *Chairman*

BRAD SHERMAN, California
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
KAREN BASS, California
WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
AMI BERA, California
JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
DINA TITUS, Nevada
ADRIANO ESPAILLAT, New York
TED LIEU, California
SUSAN WILD, Pennsylvania
DEAN PHILLIPS, Minnesota
ILHAN OMAR, Minnesota
COLIN ALLRED, Texas
ANDY LEVIN, Michigan
ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, Virginia
CHRISSY HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania
TOM MALINOWSKI, New Jersey
DAVID TRONE, Maryland
JIM COSTA, California
JUAN VARGAS, California
VICENTE GONZALEZ, Texas

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas, *Ranking Member*
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
TED S. YOHO, Florida
ADAM KINZINGER, Illinois
LEE ZELDIN, New York
JIM SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin
ANN WAGNER, Missouri
BRIAN MAST, Florida
FRANCIS ROONEY, Florida
BRIAN FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania
JOHN CURTIS, Utah
KEN BUCK, Colorado
RON WRIGHT, Texas
GUY RESCHENTHALER, Pennsylvania
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee
GREG PENCE, Indiana
STEVE WATKINS, Kansas
MIKE GUEST, Mississippi

JASON STEINBAUM, *Staff Director*
BRENDAN SHIELDS, *Republican Staff Director*

CONTENTS

THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY: A MID-TERM ASSESSMENT

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:11 a.m., in Room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Eliot L. Engel (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ENGEL. The committee will come to order.

Without objection, all members may have 5 days to submit statements, questions, extraneous materials for the record subject to the length limitation in the rules.

I must say, Madam Secretary, I have been on this committee a long time, and I have never heard it so quiet at the start, so I think that is a tribute to you and everybody feeling that we want to hear what you have to say. And it is almost as if royalty stepped in here for a little while. So thank you so much for being here.

As we have so far, this committee will continue to grapple with the most immediate and critical challenges around the world. At the same time, I think it is important that we take a step back and look more broadly at the overall state of American leadership and foreign policy and to lay out our own vision and ideas.

As we conduct that assessment of the Trump Administration's foreign policy, we are honored to welcome one of our country's most accomplished and thoughtful foreign policy minds, former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

Thank you, Secretary Albright, for joining us today to share your insight. Welcome back to the committee. Welcome also to members of the public and the press.

It will be no surprise that I have deep concerns over the direction American foreign policy has taken in the last 2 years. We have been walking away from international obligations. It has called into question America's commitment to our alliances and core values. It has alienated our friends, emboldened our adversaries, and cozied up to strongmen and dictators and the people on the front lines of American foreign policy. Our diplomats and development experts have been pushed to the side.

It is also a foreign policy that weakens and isolates the United States and makes us feel less safe. When we are not respected around the world, when we denigrate allies and flout international norms, it makes us less able to build the partnerships and coalitions that are essential for advancing our interests and, more importantly, ensuring our security.

Now, it is easy to stand on the sidelines and complain, but I think if we are going to criticize what we do not like, we also have a responsibility to offer an alternative. And there are a few big things that I think would shape such an alternative. They represent what I consider to be the pillars of a successful, uniquely American foreign policy.

The first has to do with American values. When we are at our best, American values are at the center of our foreign policy. Of course, we always have to prioritize the security of the American people, and one of the ways we do so is by supporting and advancing human rights, democracy, the rule of law. Our foreign policy should reflect our country's spirit of generosity and compassion, the foreign assistance and development efforts that help countries and communities lift themselves up. These are the right things to do. They improve people's lives and burnish the values that make our country an inspiration. They show the world our character and bring other countries on to our side as partners.

And that brings me to the second major thing: working together with other countries. For American foreign policy to succeed, we need to be able to work with a wide range of friends and allies. Our alliances and partnerships underpin our ability to diffuse crises, to respond to disasters, to push back against aggressive regimes, and other threats. Multilateral organizations and agreements helped shape the world in the second half of the 20th century, and the United States has traditionally played a leading role under administrations of both parties. As powerful as our country is, we are even stronger when we work with others focused on the same priorities. We are better at combating threats from overseas, whether it is violent extremism, a deadly pandemic, or climate change, when we are standing shoulder to shoulder with our friends and allies.

And finally, the third theme. How will we pursue our foreign policy goals, and who will be responsible for it? The way I see it, we need to elevate diplomacy and development, because whether or not they are treated this way, they are absolutely essential to our national security. Seeing more and more traditionally civilian diplomatic responsibilities slip away to the Pentagon or the intelligence community has always been a major frustration for me. In all fairness, this trend started well before the current administration. We would not ask our diplomats to do the job of our uniformed servicemembers, and we should not be asking our servicemembers to do the things that our diplomats and development experts are trained to do, from conflict prevention to security assistance to face-to-face negotiations.

In the last 2 years, a bad situation has gotten worse. The administration has chased some of our most seasoned diplomats to the exits. They have left important senior national security positions vacant. They have ignored the expertise of career officials and sent morale plummeting at the State Department. These committed men and women are on the front lines of American foreign policy. What can they possibly think when the people calling the shots try to slash their budget by a third?

We need to make it clear to these dedicated public servants and to the rest of the world that the United States understands the

value of diplomacy, and we need to give our personnel the support and resources they need to carry out this important work.

I intend to pursue an agenda built around these three major themes. I look forward to working with our members to find ways to do that, and I am eager to hear Secretary Albright's views on where we go from here to build a successful foreign policy. Secretary Albright has always been my favorite, the words, the pearls of wisdom that come from her mouth... just a wonder to behold. It is good to hear it.

So we look forward, Madam Secretary, and I will yield to my friend, the ranking member, Mr. McCaul of Texas, for any opening remarks he might have.

Mr. MCCAUL. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome, Madam Secretary. It is good to see you again. I look back on our dinner at the Munich Security Conference last year, and I cherish that a great deal. We appreciate you being here today to impart your wisdom on this committee.

Over the last 2 years, I think the President's administration has implemented a forward-leaning foreign policy agenda. Right now, the President is in Vietnam to meet with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un. North Korea has launched—has not launched a missile or tested a nuclear device since the end of 2017. They have freed American hostages and returned the remains of missing soldiers. These are all positive developments. However, previous administrations, as you know, have negotiated with North Korea unsuccessfully. The regime in P'yongyang has a record of making empty promises in return for sanctions relief.

I strongly urge the administration to continue the maximum pressure campaign we have for complete verifiable and irreversible denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. I remain hopeful but also realistic and somewhat skeptical. There are few threats as dangerous as nuclear weapons in the hands of a rogue regime.

On Iran terrorism in Israel, I strongly support the decision to withdraw from the Iran deal. This was a flawed agreement, in my judgment, that provided over $100 billion to the world's leading sponsor of terror. The inspections were not aggressive enough, set clauses that provided legitimacy for a future nuclear program, and the last administration, I believe, wanted a deal too badly, and we are less safe today because of that.

This administration has also made crushing Islamist terrorism a top priority. As a former chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I have seen the rise and fall of the so-called caliphate. Now ISIS truly is on the run, but it is still a very real threat. I urge the administration not to withdraw our forces from Syria and Afghanistan until ISIS and al-Qaeda are completely destroyed.

Any strategy for the Middle East must also include maintaining strong ties with Israel. I look forward to moving important legislation with the chairman to do just that.

On China and Russia. There are many dynamic threats in the world today, and we are increasingly under threat from China and Russia. The Chinese Government steals our intellectual property, threatens Taiwan, preys upon underdeveloped nations through their Belt and Road Initiative. China is an adversary, and I am

pleased that the current administration is confronting Beijing over its trade practices and military adventurism.

Under Vladimir Putin, Russia has invaded Georgia and Ukraine and attacked the democratic systems of other countries, including our own and our own elections. I fully support the sanctions placed on Russia for meddling in the 2016 election.

A great deterrent to Russian aggression is a strong NATO. Thanks to pressure from the President, more of our allies are beginning to increase their defense spending. This is bad news for Vladimir Putin and a great policy achievement for the West. Finally, I applauded the administration's decision to withdraw from the INF Treaty due to lack of Russian compliance, and it is interesting that our NATO allies agreed.

On Venezuela, the current crisis in our Western Hemisphere. In our own hemisphere, the current situation in Venezuela is deeply disturbing. The socialist dictator policies of Nicolas Maduro have turned the country into a failed mafia cartel state. With little food and medicine, millions of people fled the country. Maduro's armed thugs are now doing everything they can to stop the delivery of humanitarian aid. They have blocked bridges and roads. They have shot innocent civilians and set aid packages on fire. And yet as Venezuela burns, there are still people in America and around the world who defend and promote socialism.

To see the dire suffering that comes from socialism, look no further than the chaos in Caracas, or the Soviet Union, or any history book. I commend the President for supporting the people of Venezuela in their quest to take their country back from Maduro and his crimes. I believe our Congress needs to directly recognize Interim President Juan Guaido and support his calls for a free and fair election. We are committed to the personal safety as well of Guaido, which I am very concerned with, and his family. In fact, we met with the Vice President yesterday who expressed his concerns about the safety of President Guaido. And I am sure all of us here share those sentiments.

Madam Secretary, again, it is a great honor to welcome you here this morning. You have been a tireless diplomat for many years, and your personal story is inspiring really to all of us, so I look forward to hearing your testimony. As the chairman and I always say, partisanship on this committee should end at the water's edge. These hearings give us a chance to put these politics aside and offer solutions to very, very complex issues in what is becoming an increasingly dangerous world.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. McCaul.

So let me start with the introduction. Our witness needs no introduction, but I will introduce her anyway. Madeleine Albright, first and foremost, is a great friend of mine, and I am honored to call her my friend. She served as Secretary of State from 1997 to 2001, the first woman in American history to be nominated as America's top diplomat. She had earlier served as our Ambassador to the United Nations and was a member of President Carter's National Security Council.

She is now chair of Albright Stonebridge Group, a global strategy group here in Washington, as well as a professor in the practice of diplomacy at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service; chair of the National Democratic Institute, or NDI, for International Affairs; and president of the Truman Scholarship Foundation. She sits on the Department of Defense's Defense Policy Board, as well as the board of the Aspen Institute.

So, Madam Secretary, we are delighted to have you with us this morning, and I now recognize you for your opening statement.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT (FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE)

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Chairman Engel and Ranking Member McCaul, members of this committee, thank you so much for having me here, and good morning. And I do want to start out by saying I believe in a bipartisan foreign policy. I think it is very important. I am pleased to be here, and I appreciate the chance to offer my perspective on the many challenging issues before the committee, and so let's begin with some context.

We live in a world being reshaped for better and for worse by two major interrelated trends. The first is globalization, which has brought people closer together than ever before and enabled us to travel, trade, and share ideas at an unprecedented rate. But for all its benefits, globalization is also threatening and faceless. Many people worry that they will lose their livelihoods to foreign competition and their separate identities to some vast, faceless, multicultural sea. And while I believe patriotism is a virtue, I am very concerned about the rise of a kind of nationalism that equates an affinity for us with a hatred of them.

The second trend is the constant march of technology, which has helped the world to become more efficient and broadened access to knowledge, food, medicine, and markets. Whenever I am in Africa, for instance, I am amazed at the difference that cell phones have made to farmers and entrepreneurs and healthcare professionals, especially women. But technology, too, has a downside.

A network that can disseminate truth can spread lies just as rapidly. And the rise of social media has enabled people everywhere to share their grievances both instantly and globally.

We thought technology would help democracy by amplifying people's voices, but it has also disaggregated them. It fueled protest movements such as Tahrir Square in Egypt, but did not help those protesters make the transition to governance. In fact, technology has made governing more difficult and given demagogues another tool to build emotional bonfires out of the kindling of lies, prejudice, and paranoia.

These megatrends, for better and worse, are making the world more turbulent and generating disorder in practically every region. They were in evidence long before the advent of the Trump administration and, beginning in 2017, would have confronted any new Commander in Chief with vexing foreign policy challenges.

But the question before the committee today is where does America stand in 2019? And more especially, what has President Trump's foreign policy meant for the security and prosperity of the United States?

Now, as you have been told, I am a professor at Georgetown, and if I were grading Mr. Trump, I would begin charitably and mark many of his efforts as incomplete. For example, he kept his promise to negotiate a revised trade deal with Canada and Mexico, although he did create a lot of animosity with our closest neighbors. His administration's heavy-handed approach to China could produce gains, and there have been signs of progress in recent days. His engagement with North Korea and Kim Jong-un has yielded scant dividends to date, but talking is definitely better than fighting. And I hope that the summit that is now underway in Vietnam will, unlike the earlier one in Singapore, generate real and tangible progress toward the denuclearization of North Korea.

Afghanistan is another area where, to its credit, the administration is now pursuing a diplomatic strategy. But it is far too soon to tell whether we can responsibly end the conflict with a political settlement that would benefit the Afghan people and, therefore, America's interests. In the Middle East, the administration has been promising for 2 years to unveil an innovative plan for peace, and we cannot judge what we cannot yet see.

Finally, in Venezuela, the administration is right to press for democratic change, and we can all see the situation there is tense and complicated. The United States should not do anything that inadvertently strengthens Maduro's hand. We should continue to work closely with colleagues in the region, while upholding the principle that the Venezuelan people alone have the right to determine their future.

Now, that is the good news. In other areas, the administration's record is marked by confusion and inconsistency, a lack of diplomacy and, in some cases, a complete abdication of responsibility.

On Iran's nuclear program, climate change, Trans-Pacific trade, and the INF Treaty, this administration has chosen to renounce the efforts of previous administrations, both Republican and Democratic, and I believe each of these decisions was a mistake. Much of the Middle East is a tinderbox, and even the most seasoned foreign policy experts have trouble keeping track of who is on whose side as powers such as Russia, Turkey, Iran, and the Gulf States compete for influence.

On Syria, we appear to be pursuing several policies simultaneously, confusing our allies, delighting our adversaries, and putting at risk the significant gains made since 2014 in the fight against ISIS.

In Saudi Arabia, the President and Secretary of State have aligned themselves with a leader thought by our own intelligence agencies to have authorized the murder of a journalist. Henry Kissinger used to talk about the importance of diplomacy of constructive ambiguity, but there is nothing either ambiguous or diplomatic about a bone saw.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, having just been with many of you at the Munich Security Conference, I can attest to my sadness at the state of relations between the United States under this Administration and our allies in Europe. I do not, by any means, absolve Europe of all blame for the disagreements and misunderstandings that exist. We are right to ask more of them, especially in the form of contributions to our common defense. I do

think, however, that we can make our points more productively without bullying, name calling, and threats. If we are not friends with our friends, to whom will we turn for help?

In that context, even many in the administration are in the dark about the President's conversations with Vladimir Putin. Meanwhile, Russia continues to play a spoiler role in the Middle East, while working to undermine democracies around the world. And China must be getting very fat because its One Belt, One Road initiative is larger and larger, having influence in regions such as the Middle East and Africa that are crucial to the future of the global economy.

I have more general concerns. The course I teach is about foreign policy decisionmaking process. My students look at how information has been gathered, options weighed, and actions decided on at key points in American history.

Today, I am not sure we have a policy decisionmaking process. Vacancies persist across the spectrum of national security agencies. We still have no Ambassadors in, among other very important countries, Egypt, Jordan, Mexico, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Thailand, and Turkey. With the dangerous confrontation underway between two nuclear armed States in India and Pakistan, we may soon get to see whether this administration is equipped to manage a serious international crisis.

I recently attended a U.N. conference on migration. Among those present were high level representatives from China and Russia. The chair set aside for the United States was empty. Worldwide, there are more refugees huddled in camps than there have been since the Nazi surrender almost three-quarters of a century ago, and yet the United States is less welcoming to the international homeless than at any point in modern history.

Throughout the lifetime of my generation, people around the world have been able to look to the United States as the single most powerful leader on behalf of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. We have never been perfect, but we have always been present. And we have always taken our responsibilities seriously because we have seen firsthand the cost of abdication, holocaust, and global war.

Today, the enemies of freedom smell something in the air that gives them hope, the odor of America's absence, and the impression that our leader shares their disdain for democracy. All in all, the situation is both sad and dangerous. This administration still has time to awaken, but my greater hope is with you, the men and women of the new Congress.

Again, as I tell my students, many of the tools we have available to advance our interests in the world, including sanctions, trade agreements, and the use of military force, depend on Congress to be activated. Congress also plays an essential role by providing resources for defense, diplomacy, development, and democracy programs, which are crucial to the success of our foreign policy. I have met with enough Members of Congress from both parties to know that you did not come to Washington to preside over an abdication. You want America to lead.

And as you know, the powers of the legislative branch are set out in Article I of the Constitution. Well, 2019 is Article I time. You

can, you must help us put us on the right path. So I urge you to use your powers of oversight and your influence with the public to ask the right questions and to hold the executive branch accountable.

I commend this committee and Chairman Engel for your leadership in working to end U.S. involvement in the war in Yemen, as well as the bipartisan legislation which recently passed reaffirming U.S. support for NATO. I ask you to continue to protect essential funding for diplomacy, development, and democracy in the face of the administration's efforts to defund the State Department.

As chairman of the National Democratic Institute, I have seen the benefits of these programs firsthand and can tell you that they are some of the most cost-effective ways of advancing our interests around the world. I ask you to reassure our allies in Europe that America will continue to stand with them and for the democratic values that are at the heart of the Trans-Atlantic Partnership. Engage with foreign counterparts wherever possible, including through official travel delegations. I so believe in the codels.

Finally, never forget that when we work together across party lines, we set an example for other democracies, both established and emerging.

At the beginning of the year, I had the pleasure of traveling down to Williamsburg for the congressional Research Service Orientation, which new Members of both parties attended, and it was so interesting. People had their badges on with their names and their States but not their parties. We had very interesting discussion.

There is no masking over some of our differences, but I do believe in the importance of bipartisanship and the powerful signal that such cooperation can send to the world, and that is why I have recently invested time and effort in two initiatives that may be of interest to this committee.

The first, a Declaration of Principles for Freedom, Security, and Prosperity was launched at the Munich Security Conference with the goal of rallying the democratic world on behalf of common values. More than 70 years have elapsed since the Atlantic Charter was issued and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted. Perhaps we started taking some of these principles for granted. So the time is right to renew our vows and to engage a new generation in freedom's cause.

The second initiative is the U.S. Institute of Peace Task Force on Extremism and Fragile States, which is co-chaired by Governor Kean and former Congressman Lee Hamilton. Yesterday, we launched a report which called on the United States to adopt a long-term strategy of prevention, addressing the underlying conditions that fuel extremism in the first place by better coordinating U.S. efforts and pooling international resources to support partners in fragile States.

In the interest of time, I would like to submit both documents, the Declaration and the Task Force report, for the record, and I would be very happy to answer questions about either of these efforts.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member McCaul, members of the committee, we meet at a moment of great uncertainty and global tur-

bulence. We are in a new era, and we need to work together to build a consensus on what America's position should be in the world. For my part, I believe that America must remain the indispensable Nation, but there is nothing about the word "indispensable" that means alone. We can and must act in partnership with like-minded countries to advance our common interests, to build a world that is more prosperous, secure, and free, and your continued leadership is essential if we are to achieve that goal. It is Article I time.

Thank you very, very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Albright follows:]

EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERY

Submitted Statement of Secretary Madeleine K. Albright
"The Trump Administration's Foreign Policy: A Mid-Term Assessment"
House Foreign Affairs Committee
Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Chairman Engel, Ranking Member McCaul, members of the committee: good morning to you all.

I am pleased to be here and appreciate the chance to offer my perspective on the many challenging issues before this committee.

Let's begin with some context.

We live in a world being reshaped – for better and for worse – by two major inter-related trends.

The first is globalization, which has brought people closer together than ever before and enabled us to travel, trade and share ideas at an unprecedented rate.

But for all its benefits, globalization is also threatening and faceless. Many people worry that they will lose their livelihoods to foreign competition, and their separate identities in some vast, faceless, multicultural sea. And while I believe patriotism is a virtue, I am very concerned about the rise of a kind of nationalism that equates an affinity for "us" with a hatred of "them."

The second trend is the constant march of technology, which has helped the world to become more efficient and broadened access to knowledge, food, medicine, and markets. Whenever I am in Africa, I am amazed at the difference cell phones have made to farmers, entrepreneurs, and health care professionals – especially women.

But technology, too, has a downside. A network that can disseminate truth can spread lies just as rapidly. And the rise of social media has enabled people everywhere to share their grievances both instantly and globally.

We thought technology would help democracy by amplifying people's voices, but it has also made governing more difficult and given demagogues another tool to build emotional bonfires out of the kindling of lies, prejudice and paranoia.

These megatrends, for better and worse, are making the world more turbulent and generating disorder in practically every region. They were in evidence long before the advent of the Trump Administration and, beginning in 2017, would have confronted any new commander-in-chief with vexing foreign policy challenges.

But the question before the committee today is where does America stand in 2019? And more specifically, what has President Trump's foreign policy meant for the security and prosperity of the United States?

As many of you know, I am a professor at Georgetown, and if I were grading Mr. Trump, I would begin charitably and mark many of his efforts as incomplete.

For example, he kept his promise to negotiate a revised trade deal with Canada and Mexico, although he did create a lot of animosity with our closest neighbors.

His administration's heavy-handed approach to China could produce gains, with signs of progress in recent days.

His engagement with North Korean dictator Kim Jong-un has yielded scant dividends to date, but talking is better than fighting. I hope that the summit now underway in Vietnam will, unlike the earlier one in Singapore, generate real and tangible progress towards the denuclearization of North Korea.

Afghanistan is another area where, to its credit, the administration is now pursuing a diplomatic strategy. But it is far too soon to tell whether we can responsibly end the conflict with a political settlement that would benefit the Afghan people and therefore America's interests.

In the Middle East, the administration has been promising for two years to unveil an innovative plan for peace; we cannot judge what we can't yet see.

Finally, in Venezuela, the administration is right to press for democratic change. As we can all see, the situation there is tense and complicated. The United States should not do anything that inadvertently strengthens Maduro's hand. We should continue to work closely with colleagues in the region, while upholding the principle that the Venezuelan people alone have the right to determine their future.

That is the good news. In other areas, the administration's record is marked by confusion, inconsistency, a lack of diplomacy, and, in some cases, a complete abdication of responsibility.

On Iran's nuclear program, climate change, trans-Pacific trade, and the INF treaty, this administration has chosen to renounce the efforts of prior administrations, both Republican and Democratic. I believe each of those decisions was a mistake.

Much of the Middle East is a tinderbox, and even the most seasoned foreign policy experts have trouble keeping track of who is on whose side as powers such as Russia, Turkey, Iran and the Gulf States compete for influence.

On Syria we appear to be pursuing several policies simultaneously, confusing our allies, delighting our adversaries, and putting at risk the significant gains made since 2014 in the fight against ISIS.

In Saudi Arabia, the president and secretary of state have aligned themselves with a leader thought by our own intelligence agencies to have authorized the murder of a journalist.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, having just been with many of you at the Munich Security Conference, I can attest to my sadness at the state of relations between the United States under this administration and our allies in Europe.

I do not, by any means, absolve Europe of all blame for the disagreements and misunderstandings that exist. We are right to ask more of them, especially in the form of contributions to our common defense. I do think, however, that we can make our points more productively without bullying, name-calling, and threats.

If we are not friends with our friends, to whom will we turn for help?

In that context, even many in the administration are in the dark about the president's conversations with Vladimir Putin. Meanwhile, Russia continues to play a spoiler role in the Middle East while working to undermine democracies around the world.

I have more general concerns. The course I teach is about the foreign policy decision-making process. My students look at how information has been gathered, options weighed, and actions decided on at key points in American history.

Today, I am not sure we have a foreign policy decision-making process.

Vacancies persist across the spectrum of national security agencies. We still have no ambassadors in, among other very important countries, Egypt, Jordan, Mexico, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Thailand, and Turkey.

I recently attended a UN conference on migration; among those present were high-level representatives from China and Russia. The chair set aside for the United States was empty.

Worldwide, there are more refugees huddled in camps than there have been since the Nazi surrender almost three-quarters of a century ago, yet the United States is less welcoming to the international homeless than at any point in modern memory.

Throughout the lifetime of my generation, people around the world have been able to look to the United States as the single most powerful leader on behalf of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. We have never been perfect, but we have always been present; and we have always taken our responsibilities seriously because we had seen first-hand the cost of abdication: Holocaust and global war.

Today, the enemies of freedom smell something in the air that gives them hope, the odor of America's absence, and the impression that our leader shares their disdain for democracy.

All in all, the situation is both sad and dangerous.

The administration still has time to awaken, but my greater hope is with you – the men and women of this new Congress.

Again, as I tell my students, many of the tools we have available to advance our interests in the world – including sanctions, trade agreements, and the use of military force – depend on Congress to be activated.

Congress also plays an essential role by providing resources for defense, diplomacy, development and democracy programs which are crucial to the success of our foreign policy.

I have met with enough members of congress from both parties to know that you did not come to Washington to preside over an abdication; you want America to lead.

As you know, the powers of the legislative branch are set out in Article I of the Constitution. Well, 2019 is Article I time. You can – you must – help put us on the right path.

So I urge you to use your powers of oversight and your influence with the public to ask the right questions and to hold the executive branch accountable. I commend this committee and Chairman Engel for their leadership in working to end the U.S. involvement in the war in Yemen, as well as the bipartisan legislation which recently passed reaffirming U.S. support for NATO.

I ask you to continue to protect essential funding for diplomacy, development and democracy in the face of this administration's efforts to defund the State Department. As Chairman of the National Democratic Institute, I have seen the benefits of these programs first-hand and can tell you that they are some of the most cost-effective ways of advancing our interests around the world.

I ask you to reassure our allies in Europe that America will continue to stand with them and for the democratic values that are at the heart of the transatlantic partnership. Engage with foreign counterparts wherever possible, including through official foreign travel delegations.

Finally, never forget that, when we work together across party lines, we set an example for other democracies, both established and emerging. At the beginning of the year I had the pleasure of traveling down to Williamsburg for the CRS orientation, which new members of both parties attended without wearing their party label on name badges. There is no masking over some of our differences, but I do believe in the importance of bipartisanship and the powerful signal that such cooperation can send to the world.

That is why I have recently invested time and effort in two initiatives that may be of interest to this committee.

The first, a Declaration of Principles for Freedom, Security, and Prosperity, was launched at the Munich Security Conference with the goal of rallying the democratic world on behalf of our common values. More than seventy years have elapsed since the Atlantic Charter was issued and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted. Perhaps we started taking some of those principles for granted. So the time is right to renew our vows and to engage a new generation in freedom's cause.

The second initiative is the U.S. Institute of Peace's Task Force on Extremism in Fragile States, which was co-chaired by Governor Kean and Former Congressman Lee

Hamilton. Yesterday we launched a report which called on the United States to adopt a long-term strategy of prevention -- addressing the underlying conditions that fuel extremism in the first place by better coordinating U.S. efforts and pooling international resources to support partners in fragile states.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member McCaul, members of the committee: we meet at a moment of great uncertainty and global turbulence. We are in a new era, and we need to work together to build a consensus on what America's position should be in the world. For my part, I believe America must remain the indispensable nation. But there is nothing about the word indispensable that means alone.

We can and must act in partnership with like-minded countries to advance our common interests and to build a world that is more prosperous, secure, and free. And your continued leadership is essential if we are to achieve that goal.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to your questions.

# # #

Chairman ENGEL. Well, thank you very much, Madam Secretary. As usual, I so appreciate your remarks and so agree with virtually everything you said.

You mentioned that you had just come back from the Munich conference, as I did, and we saw each other there. And then afterwards, I went to Brussels, with the Speaker, to look at NATO and interact with NATO and the European Union. And one of the things that really saddened me and worried me at the same time is the message that we are sending or the administration is sending to our friends and allies, our closest friends and allies across the world that somehow or other, we do not value the alliances, that somehow or other, we want to go it alone. We do not want to work as closely with them as we have in the past.

The President, when he first became President, said that NATO was obsolete, and we found a palpable concern about our allies—with our allies who are confused as to where the United States stands. Are we actually pulling away? Do we not take NATO or the European Union to heart the way previous administrations in both parties, frankly, have done in the past?

So I am wondering if you could just give us your observation of what you saw in Munich and what you heard from our allies, the concerns, the worries. I would appreciate it very much.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I was born in Europe, and I came to the United States when I was 11 years old. NATO was created as a result of what was happening in central and eastern Europe as the Russians were putting together their empire, and it was not until the coup, the communist coup in February 1948 in my native Czechoslovakia that NATO came into existence. I have been a believer in NATO from day one, and I was very honored to have been asked to work on the 60th anniversary of NATO on a new strategic concept.

I think NATO is an essential alliance, and our part in it is obviously key. I think we have confused our allies, and that is something that is very troubling. And by the way, we used NATO, with your help, in the Balkans. It played a very important role in ending ethnic cleansing, and I think that we are stronger in that partnership.

What was very troubling for me at the Munich conference this time, and I have been to many of them, is we are always the subject of discussion but never kind of a sense that who are we, what are we doing, what are our goals? And therefore, I think it was so important that there were so many of you there, 50 Members of Congress that were there, I think in order to explain that America is America. And we do know that we have shared responsibility and that the NATO alliance is very important.

What is interesting is that when we were doing the 60th anniversary of NATO, it was when all the NATO activities were what is known as out of area. NATO is now back in area trying to deal with the threats that are coming from Russia. And so it is, in many ways, back to some of the beginnings of it and more important than ever. And I do think that it is very important for all of us that believe in partnerships to deliver that message, because I was very worried about what I saw in Munich.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you. In your testimony, you talked about confusion at the State Department. I want to address that,

because this committee has gone on record as opposing these draconian cuts, 31 percent, and in fact, in negotiations with the House, we were able to restore almost all of the cuts that we did not like. Both parties did it, because we had a Republican majority in Congress last time, and they fought this just as much as we are fighting it now.

But what has happened is morale at the State Department has really plummeted, and the number of Americans seeking to join the U.S. diplomatic corps has declined during the Trump administration to its lowest level since 2008, according to State Department numbers reported this week. And we continue to hear reports of individuals at all levels choosing to leave their careers at the State Department because of low morale. I mean, the State Department is diplomacy. You want to fund diplomacy so there is not war. We have had the opposite, funding the defense. And I am for a strong defense, but the fact of the matter is hand in glove, you need to also have strong diplomacy.

So I am also bothered by the lack of action by the State Department to address reports of retaliation against Department employees for their perceived political views, national origin, or sexual identity, and left unaddressed, these allegations have a chilling effect on recruitment and retention, and fuel a tense climate that makes it that much harder for our diplomats to accomplish their work.

You led the State Department's work for us for 4 years. What is your assessment of these recruitment and retention declines, and what can be done to reverse these trends? And also, what do you think is the impact of unchecked retaliation against members of the Department's career work force and their ability to conduct diplomacy on behalf of the United States?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I am very troubled by what I have seen, and I am grateful to Congress for having restored some of the money that was cut. You can not do diplomacy without diplomats, and I do think that—I am very saddened by what I hear and read about the State Department.

When I left office, I made very clear how jealous I was of those that were able to stay and do diplomacy for a different administration. And I thought, they get to do foreign policy all the time and I have to leave. And the bottom line is what I found in them were people that are professionals that want to serve our country. They are not partisans. They are not people that need to be criticized for various things.

I did something my children call eavesing, which is eavesdropping on a conversation, and I heard some people say, well, we have to get rid of those people in the State Department, they are not loyal Americans, at which point I had to admit that I had been eavesing and said I disagree totally. And I think that we cannot, in fact, punish the people at the State Department, and I am very troubled by the number of people that have left.

I also am troubled by something else. As I said, I teach at the School of Foreign Service. It is not the foreign service. It is a school that really principally is trying to train young people to go into international relations. The number of students that have come to me and said, I am not sure I want to take the Foreign Service

Exam, given what is going on; what should I do? And I say, actually, you are not going to be making policy at the beginning. You are going to be stamping visas. But if you do not get into the system, there is going to be a break in the pipeline.

And so it is not just a matter of what is going on now but what will happen if we do not have trained diplomats. And so I am very troubled. I am grateful to all of you. I think that we need to encourage—it is a tool. It is the major tool in our toolbox, and it does take trained diplomats to carry out American policy. So I am very glad that you are focused on that.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. MCCAUL.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, let me thank you, Madam Secretary, for your service to the country, but also your service recently on the Institute of Peace Task Force. The chairman and I were at a press conference yesterday with Senator Graham, Senator Coons, Governor Kean. As a former chairman of Homeland Security, I think we have done a good job protecting the homeland and being on the offense with our military, but the prevention side is where we need to really focus. And I think the recommendations of that task force should be very helpful to Congress.

Shifting gears to Venezuela. There are so many hotspots to talk about, but when we talk about humanitarian crises erupting in the globe today, I cannot think of a worse one than Venezuela, where trucks are attempting to get into the country to provide humanitarian aid and Maduro's forces are lighting them on fire and killing people. I know the U.S. is seeking the U.N. Security Council vote on a resolution calling for Venezuela to allow this humanitarian aid and hold free and fair elections. I hope to work with the chairman on a resolution from the Congress, speaking on behalf of the American people, in support of what is happening down there against Maduro and for humanitarian assistance.

But to the point of recognizing Interim President Guaido, this has come up quite a bit, 54 other nations directly recognize him as a legitimate Interim President. Would you support this as a resolution from Congress? And do you support his efforts toward a peaceful transition?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I do think that the situation in Venezuela and the region is very dangerous and a horror show in so many ways in terms of what it has done to the people of Venezuela and the region, so there are various parts that I would support. I actually do think it is a good idea for us to recognize, but I also am very glad that there is a multilateral approach to it, a regional one, with the Lima Group, and then more and more supported by the Europeans, so that it is not just——

Unfortunately, the U.S. does not always have a great reputation in terms of our policies in Latin America over decades. And so I think having a multilateral effort on this is very, very important, and I hope we align ourselves more with the multilateral approach.

I also do think, and this has something to go back on on the task force in many ways. The countries around Venezuela are ones that need help. Colombia. Those of us that worked on a bipartisan effort on Plan Colombia understand how many issues are going on there.

Then in the Northern Triangle and then people that are emigrants that are leaving Venezuela are putting a lot of pressure on those countries.

I hope that we look at how to increase humanitarian assistance and development assistance to those countries because they are under a lot of threat. And so my approach to this would be multilateral, diplomatic. Sanctions, I think we might want to think about.

What is concerning about a Security Council resolution, given what the Russians and Chinese are doing in support of Maduro, one has to be careful about what they might do in the Security Council.

Mr. MCCAUL. That is a good point. I agree with you. The Lima Group. This is viewed as South America, not the United States trying to do this alone but, rather, a unified effort.

North Korea. The President is meeting with Kim Jong-un. He met with him this morning. I want to get your—well, over the past prior administrations, three of them, we made concessions, but they are now to the point where they have developed an intercontinental ballistic missile we think possibly with a miniaturized nuclear warhead that could be delivered as far as the United States Continent.

What advice would you give to the administration as to how to move forward with this?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all, it has been a very long-term problem. I am very glad that we are following a diplomatic approach at this point. I think it is very important, and I was not exactly for fire and fury. I, until recently, was the highest level sitting official to have gone to P'yongyang. I went there in October 2000 and met with Kim Jong-un's father, Kim Jong-il. We were working on the issue of missile limits and a number of different things. And by the way, just a note, Kim Jong-il, the father, had said it would be fine if we left our forces in South Korea.

And I think that, unfortunately, those talks were not carried on, and I think we have gone through any number of different talks and promises. And I do think that what is very important is to make sure that whatever steps are taken by the administration are done in a way that is worked out in a way where we are not giving away things without something in return.

I was troubled by the Singapore summit, and I was asked whether it was a win-win or a Kim win. I think it was a Kim win because we gave up our exercises with South Korea and Japan, our allies, and did not get what we needed, which was some definition of denuclearization, some verification aspects, and that, I think, is the most important part. President Reagan said trust but verify, and so I do think that that part is important, and then some kind of a roadmap. This is going to take time. It is a dangerous situation.

I think it is very difficult to have a discussion about it, as President Trump is sitting there now, in terms of how this is working, and I think one has to be careful not to interfere in that. I do think what I see as far as this summit is concerned, more diplomatic preparation with what Secretary Pompeo has been doing and what Steve Biegun has been trying to do. So I think that there needs to be reciprocity in the steps and simultaneity to them of one step or

another and for us not to give away things before we know exactly what is coming from the other side.

Mr. MCCAUL. And I agree. Do not make concessions without getting something in return; defining what denuclearization means, because it means something different to them than it does to us; and I think inspection of sites; and then, finally, a roadmap. And I think those are the three elements.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I also do think that the fact that the North Koreans seem to be big transmitters of technology to other countries, which is why the sanctions are so important, and multilateral sanctions on that.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. MEEKS.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, it is delightful to see you and hear you as always. And I am reminded, in looking on my last flight over to Europe, I read your book, "Fascism: A Warning," and it reminded me that words matter. And our allies listen to all of the words that are said, particularly our allies and our enemies, by the President of the United States of America.

And I must admit that I am deeply concerned about what is taking place in that I show as an example, for example, while we were over at the Munich Security meeting, the President tweeted out, in regards, he said that European countries should take back and put on trial hundreds of ISIS fighters who have been captured in Syria. Quote, "Time for others to step up and do the job that they are so capable of doing," the U.S. President tweeted, and that was last Saturday night. And he warned that ISIS is ready to fall, but more than 800 prisoners could be made their way to Europe, and he would just release them if they did something.

Those are his words at a time over there with our allies. There is one person that said that they are American citizen that wanted to come back and stand trial, and he said that they are not going to let her back in. So contradictory in terms.

We look at what is taking place in Venezuela, and it is bad. We see millions of people crossing over to Colombia and Brazil and Peru, and we compliment them, but people who are also suffering in Central America, trying to come to the United States, he wants to build a wall to prevent them from coming in. Contradictory in nature.

He says he wants to have a peace agreement on denuclearization of North Korea with nothing that is concrete, but yet he pulls out of the JCPOA that was with multilateral individuals that could be verifiable and people on the ground on a daily basis. So he points on one end where there is nothing verifiable; on the other end, complete verifiable. He pulls out of a climate change agreement and then says—and has the language of America first against all others. That concerns me with reference to our allies especially.

Do you think that the words of the President of the United States really matter? And how should we then combat that as Members of the Congress as you talked about it is time for the First Amendment here in the United States—in the Constitution?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I am concerned about what is being said, and let me just say about my book. One of the best quotes in there is from Mussolini, or attributed to him, which is if you pluck a chicken one feather at a time, nobody notices. So there is a lot of feather plucking going on. By the way, it is hard to say those two words together too quickly.

But, basically, the kind of points that you have made are part of the international feather plucking where people do doubt what we are doing. And I think so much of international policy does depend on the relationship and what you say. People take very seriously what is said by anybody, but certainly by the President of the United States.

And the issues in terms of—I have to say, for me, I happen to have supported the JCPOA, because in many ways, it dealt with the most serious aspect of Iran's behavior, which is troubling across the board, but their capability in terms of developing nuclear weapons. I find passing strange that the President has put himself kind of into a box, because if that kind of an agreement could be worked out on North Korea, not dealing with everything that the North Koreans are doing wrong, it is pretty much of a good blueprint on that. And then also, by pulling out of an agreement, it has undermined our relationship with the other members of the P5+1 in terms of can we be trusted on agreements? And it does go to the point of if we want to do something with allies and friends in Venezuela, can you trust America's word? Or on the North Korea, it is going to take more than us to deal with some of the issues on sanctions.

And so it is undercutting our own policy, and therefore, I think that it is very important to call it out. And part of the problem truly is that I do believe in a bipartisan foreign policy, and I will tell you what I find personally hard. It is not appropriate for a former diplomat to be abroad and criticize one's own country, but also, most of us have to continue to have some credibility by telling it like it is. And I think that when all of you were, many of you in Munich, I think people need to know what the role of Congress is and how many Americans feel, that we cannot go into this by ourselves and keep plucking the feathers.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. CHABOT.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank Mr. Smith for allowing me to switch places. I am the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, and we have a hearing at 11, so he has allowed me to do that, and I greatly appreciate that.

I also want to thank you, Madam Secretary. You may not remember this, but when you were Secretary of State, I had a constituent, Tom Sylvester. He had a daughter named Carina, and it was an international child abduction case. She had been taken to Austria, and he had been trying to get her back. He went all the way to the Austrian Supreme Court, prevailed there. Went to The Hague, under the Hague Convention, prevailed there, and could not get his daughter back, and you were kind enough to be involved. You met with he and I down at Foggy Bottom, and so thank you.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you.

Mr. CHABOT. International child abduction cases, they rip your heart out. And if you are involved in one, whether you are the person who has been adversely impacted or anybody involved, it is just a very sad thing. It does not get enough attention, so thank you for caring enough. I really appreciate that.

Second, you mentioned you are a professor, I believe, at Georgetown, and you said, if you were grading the President on international affairs matters, you said you would give him an incomplete. And just in fairness to the President, this is—you know, he has been in office 2 years, so it would be half of his first term, and if he has a second term, it would be a quarter of his term. So I think he has made progress in different areas, but it is unknown where we end up with North Korea or a whole range of things.

And I would just—you know, I think we should recognize that, for example, Ronald Reagan, who many criticized for being a warmonger early in his Presidency, it was later on in his second Presidency that he and Gorbachev essentially changed the course of history, and the Pope and others as well, so it did not happen right away. It took time for that to happen and the cold war to come down—or the Berlin Wall to come down and a whole range that was under, obviously, the next administration, but Reagan is the one who set it up.

And even Bill Clinton, you know, he literally as he was heading out the door, was trying to get an agreement with the Palestinians and the Israelis and ultimately failed in that, but he sure tried hard. And that was in the eighth year.

So I think just to be fair to the President, you know, he has been there a relatively short period of time, and he is trying in a whole lot of areas, and he has had other things on his mind. I am sure there is another committee today who is looking at things, and that has got to be real challenging for the Commander in Chief.

But let me shift to another area, and that is Taiwan. I happen to be one of the co-founders of the congressional Taiwan Caucus. And President Xi recently said that he would not renounce the use of force in reunification, and I know Taiwan and the relationship, they are an ally of the United States. They are a democracy. The PRC, China, is our rival, our adversary. They are a potential enemy if they do things, they continue to do things like build islands and then militarize them.

So in that very important relationship, which I also think does not get nearly enough attention being the hotspot that it could potentially be, would you comment on Taiwan and the importance of the U.S. maintaining that strong relationship and where you see the PRC ultimately ending up on this?

Thank you.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I was in the White House when normalization with China happened. I was a staff member of the National Security Council actually doing congressional relations. And so I went to Taiwan—I mean to China with a codel before normalization with Senator Muskie, and it was exactly 40 years ago. And one of the things that I thought was very important as we got normalization was the Taiwan Relations Act, and it is something that has guided our relationship and the importance of maintaining it.

Whenever I am asked about this now, I really do think that that is a very important piece of legislation in the relationships that we have. And I was very troubled a couple of days ago to read about some of the threats, again, that Beijing is making against Taiwan and missiles and a variety of things, and I do think that we need to stand up for what is in the Taiwan Relations Act and make very clear that that relationship is an important one. We would like to see some kind of a peaceful way of dealing with our China policy, but I do think it is not—that we cannot forget what our obligations are.

And it is interesting that it has been 40 years and kind of think about the things we learned about China's behavior. I do think that the whole issue of our relationship with China at this point needs to be looked at. I am very concerned. I talked in my Statement about where we are at the current time, and I hate to see the United States withdraw from the international scene because the Chinese are filling the vacuum. And to have Xi Jinping all of a sudden be the proponent of climate change and multilateralism kind of does not make much sense to me.

We are the leaders of the world. I believe in American leadership, and I am very concerned about our absence in places because, as I said, the Chinese are getting fat as the belt and road keeps getting larger, their influence in Venezuela, any number of things. I think we need to figure out what the right relationship is with the Chinese on this. They are a threat.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you very much.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. SIRES.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, and thank you for being here today. One of the things that really worries me about this whole situation in Venezuela is the destabilizing factor that it is going to have throughout the region. I mean, these countries cannot absorb the amount of people that are coming over. Quite frankly, Colombia has done a great humanitarian job in trying to help these people, but it seems that now—it seems that, for example, Peru has 700,000 Venezuelans. That is a great pressure on their economy.

And for the first time since I can remember, I am happy to see that the countries of the region are taking on Venezuela. I have never seen so many countries in the region get together to try to bring us some sort of a resolution, but then I worry about the direction that some of these countries are going. I worry about the direction that Brazil is going. I worry about the direction that Guatemala is going. They just threw out CICIG, an anticorruption commission that was there, they just expelled them, got rid of it, disbanded it. So it seems like this is always the land of extremes. You have these dictators. They hide under the socialist label, and then you have the right wing dictators.

So how do we, with our history in this region, talk to these countries and not so much take the lead but work with them and let them take the lead?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think it is very important for us. The Lima Group, really, I think is a very good grouping. I think we need to look at the functions of the OAS a little bit more in terms of how

they could be helpful on this. I also do think that we need to be supportive of the neighboring countries. And also, I have to say, to be more generous in terms of the immigrants from Venezuela by extending the TPS for Venezuelan refugees.

I think that we cannot all of a sudden be telling other countries to take people and we are cutting our numbers in so many different ways. And so if we want to be a good partner in the Western Hemisphere, then I think we need to work with partners, the OAS system, and then with others.

And I think the hard part about this is we would like this to be solved immediately. It is going to take a while. And I do think the following thing: Americans are the most generous people in the world with the shortest attention span. And we need to remember that this is going to take a while, that we need to put in the efforts with our diplomats, with our economic tools, and with the partners in a multilateral setting. Also, Americans do not like the word multilateralism. It has too many syllables and it ends in ism, but all it is is partnerships.

Mr. SIRES. Well, I like the partnership idea because of the history that we have had in this region.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SIRES. We have to work with these groups. And now that we have all these countries banding together, we could be a partner with them, but I worry that we are going to try to take the lead, and some of these countries are going to start fading away.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SIRES. I worry about that.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I mean, we have to be an active partner. By the way, the most revolutionary thing I did as Secretary of State was to move Canada into the Western Hemisphere. According to the State Department, it was in Europe, and so we wanted to have more democracies in the hemisphere. They actually are in the hemisphere, but having the Canadians as a part of this multilateral approach is also important.

Mr. SIRES. Can you talk a little bit about this fake constitution that was voted in Cuba?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I have—it is very interesting because kind of the things that had been being done before was how to live up to a constitution, and meanwhile, the Cubans have gone another direction, so I am concerned about that.

Mr. SIRES. All right. Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And, Madam Secretary, welcome again——

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH [continuing]. To the committee, and thank you for your service. Time permitting, there is only 5 minutes. Just two basic questions, if I would—if you could answer.

The first is with regards to China. When President Bill Clinton delinked human rights performance and MFN in May 1994, I and others were shocked. As a matter of fact, Nancy Pelosi and I joined together and worked very hard to try to get that reversed. It sent a signal that profits trumped human rights. When the President fa-

mously linked it a year before, we applauded him to the nth. I mean, it was just such a good move, and the people of China would have benefited had we stuck to our guns.

Today, as you know, Xi Jinping on all areas of human rights abuse is in a race to the bottom with P'yongyang in every single area you look at, especially in the area of religious freedom. The ruling Chinese Communist Party has undertaken the most comprehensive attempt to manipulate and control or destroy religious communities. And under this new policy called centralization, where every single believer, every single institution must comport with communist ideology or else; you know, Gulag, laogai, torture. We look at what they are doing to the Muslims, the weaker Muslims in the autonomous region, a million people in Gulags.

What would be your strong statement to the Chinese Government right now on human rights in general, but especially what they are doing on religious freedom? They are rewriting the Bible. They are tearing down churches. What they do against the Dalai Lama, and of course, his people in Tibet, the Buddhists, is just absolutely appalling.

Mr. SMITH. Second, if I could ask you how you would rate, you give incomplete scores generally to President Trump. But, as you know, I was the prime author of the Trafficking Victim's Protection Act of 2000, and we are always glad that the President signed it, but getting there was extremely hard.

Secretary Howard Koh sat just where you sat and was against the sanctions in the regime, wanted to have—rather than having the TIP report that comes out every year, the gold standard that does a narrative on every country on prevention, prosecution, and protection, the three Ps, he said fold it into the Country Report on Human Rights Practices, that the burdens of this reporting and this bureaucracy of the TIP office was just superfluous and we did not need it. He was also against the sanctions, which I think—just like in our own civil rights law, Title IX, why did Title IX work so well? Because it was a sanctions regime against college and universities that would not have women's sports, and that is all of our civil rights laws, in my opinion, work because of a sanctions regime. We have robust sanctions, and he testified against that as well.

But, again, it was signed. How would you rate the President on this? I have read this report cover to cover. Secretary Pompeo, again, put China on the worst list, Tier 3, where they belong, because they have horrible, horrible abuses on both the labor side and the sex trafficking side in that country. So, if you could, on those two issues.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all, let me applaud you for everything that you have done on human rights and on immigration issues, I have to say. I do think the following thing: There was not a time that I had a meeting with the Chinese, either at the U.N. or later, that I did not raise the issue of human rights. It has to be raised all the time. The question is, under what circumstances, when do you do it publicly? President Clinton and I did raise it publicly.

I am concerned about the fact, at the moment, as far as I can tell, the issue has not come up between President Trump and Xi

Jinping. And I think it is very important in terms of the values that we have to always raise it. I think the hard part always is, is how in diplomacy are you able to raise those issues and then still continue to have a relationship. And to look at the larger relationship and when do you use sanctions and when do you not.

Your point about the MFN, part of it was that, every year, we had to pull up the plan to see if it was growing to kind of see what our relationship was going to be with China, and we were for bringing them into the WTO in order to get some kind of regularity in it. The Chinese have to be pushed on all of this constantly.

But I am concerned generally about our relationship with them. They are a threat. There are times we have to work with them, we are going to count on them to be helpful on North Korea. And the question—the art of diplomacy is trying to figure out what you do when and how, but there should never be a meeting of any kind with the Chinese where human rights are not raised in it.

Mr. SMITH. And how would you rate the President on trafficking?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, on human rights in China?

Mr. SMITH. No, on trafficking the——

Ms. ALBRIGHT. On trafficking, I have not seen a lot of activity on that, frankly. Incomplete. By the way, my grading, since I do grade, an incomplete is actually a friendly grade, because one can give a lower grade. And so it gives the opportunity, I think, for a change in behavior. I am about to meet with my students, I have a couple that I think are incomplete, and I am going to say, we are in the middle of the semester, do something.

Mr. SMITH. But have you been able to read this?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I have not, I am sorry.

Mr. SMITH. I mean, in every country—we are promoting this as a country——

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I would very much—I will make a point of reading it.

Mr. SHERMAN [presiding]. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will skip myself and recognize the gentlelady from California.

Ms. BASS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I really appreciate you allowing me to speak.

Madam Secretary, it is an honor to hear you, and I just really want to acknowledge our appreciation, our country's appreciation, for your long history and your contributions.

I wanted to ask you where you think U.S.-African relations are. I chair the Subcommittee on Africa and deal with African diplomats all the time. I often make a distinction between where Congress is, which Africa is a very bipartisan issue, but I do not have much to say when it comes to where the administration is. I cannot really offer an explanation, especially when our President is on—has been known to refer to African countries in such a derogatory way or make up the names of countries that do not exist.

I also wanted to ask you about how the rest of the world was viewing how we are handling our own border. And then, finally, if you could comment about your book in terms of your concerns about our country. You raised the specter of fascism, and you make

the point that, currently, authoritarian regimes actually started off as being elected. So if you would not mind expanding on those.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I am very concerned about the lack of attention to Africa in many different ways. It is a continent that, it is interesting, people say Africa, when there are an awful lot of differences among the country.

Ms. BASS. Like it is a country.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. And really, there are some really good news stories and some that are pretty tough. You have been very kind. You have gone on some codels with the National Democratic Institute, and I think that there really is an important aspect of trying to understand what the different evolutions are in Africa. I just had an interesting meeting, actually it was in Morocco, but there was a discussion about the fact that we should stop talking about northern Africa and——

Ms. BASS. Thank you.

Ms. ALBRIGHT [continuing]. The Sahel, and that there really—it is an artificial line that we are drawing.

Ms. BASS. Right.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. And I think that we need to see where we can be more helpful. For instance, I am very pleased that during the Clinton Administration, that we did the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, and that that is something that needs to be expanded on to see the opportunities. And so I think there is a lot of work to be done. It helps if you know where the countries are. But there are very many aspects of it, and your help on it has been very important.

I also do think, I am not here representing—on behalf of the National Democratic Institute, but we do in fact have a lot of programs there. I think one has to look at whatever has just happened in the Nigerian election; Nigeria is a key country. So to pay more attention to it.

I am troubled—I go back, and it goes back to kind of the way I see the world at this point. We are in a very, very different phase, for all the reasons that I mentioned. And I am troubled by the fact that divisions in our societies, whether it is in the United States or other places, are being exacerbated by those who identify themselves with one group at the expense of another, and that there is always kind of the other, are the immigrants. One of the things that we know is when you begin to develop scapegoats, and that is part of the thing of blaming the immigrants in whatever country. The Europeans have been doing it.

I am stunned. I am an immigrant, and so, when now our—we have fewer numbers of people coming in than ever before. I think it is just stunning. So I do think that I am worried about the divisions in our society that then become exacerbated, where instead of trying to find common answers, we are kind of pushing us against the other. The thing that, frankly, blew my mind as I was doing research on this book, is that all the countries, beginning actually with Mussolini, they were—Mussolini and Hitler came into power constitutionally.

The countries that we are worried about now, whether it is Turkey or Hungary or Poland or Venezuela, the Philippines, those people were all elected, and then take advantage of it and then exacer-

bate. And so I think that is why we need to begin to look. I think the social contract is broken. I think there are very serious issues going on everywhere due some to technology and globalization.

Ms. BASS. Thank you.

Mr. Chair, let me just say that I really have appreciated my experiences with NDI. I went to Zimbabwe last year to be an election monitor, and Kenya the year before that. It does put us in a little difficult situation because people do ask us about our elections.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes. By the way, when I was—we were doing some work in Egypt, and I was telling people—I was meeting with some Egyptian parliamentarians, and I said, democracy really depends on compromise and coalition building. And they said, you mean like you guys?

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you. Perhaps we need a parliamentary system of government in the United States, but that is beyond the scope of our hearing.

I recognize the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Madam Secretary, I was really grateful to be with you at Munich last week. I was very impressed, and again, your statements today about bipartisanship and foreign affairs. And then I particularly want to congratulate you on NDI. I have worked with IRI, International Republican Institute, and just as Congresswoman Bass, I have had the opportunity to be an election observer and how meaningful these programs are.

And I also was very pleased last week to be with you for the rollout of the declaration. And I had hoped that it would get more attention. If you could tell everyone what the declaration is and what the significance of it is and how we can best promote the declaration.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. OK. First of all, let me just say, I love working with IRI. I became very good friends with Senator McCain, and Senator Sullivan and I are really kind of working through things now. So thank you very much for your support.

I think the declaration of principles is very interesting because part of it was sponsored by the Atlantic Council, and I have to say that I was kind of skeptical at the beginning, but it is kind of going back to basics in terms of the kinds of things that bring our societies together, looking at what the role of the people are, what the responsibilities are. There are a number of statements to do with it that in a way are not just renewing our vows from 70 years ago, but also trying to outline what needs to be done.

One of the things that we are going to be doing is reaching out and talking to people all over the United States, and a lot of the—it was international. So in terms of talking about what the basic principles are and bringing the younger generation into it. I have said that institutions and people at age 70 need a little refurbishing. So this is basically a way to go back and see what is germane now in terms of the role of the private sector, how countries work together, how people work together, the role of governments and individuals. I would be very happy to distribute those.

Mr. WILSON. And it was impressive to me, the public, private, and also the different international organizations working together for the declaration.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. I was really grateful to have led a delegation on May 14 for the opening and the relocation of the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem. And I felt like it was just so uplifting to be there. We have an extraordinary Ambassador with Ambassador David Friedman. With President Trump, it was promises made, promises kept.

What is your view about the opening of the embassy in Jerusalem?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, let me say, I have been a supporter of Israel forever, and I also spent a lot of time working on Israeli-Palestinian issues. The status of our embassy in Jerusalem is a final status issue, and I happen to think it was a mistake to do it at this point. That it has made things more complicated. And then also, I have been troubled by the fact that funding has been stopped to a lot of Palestinian groupings, which makes it very difficult. The Palestinians do not—now we have a very serious problem in terms—I am looking forward to see whatever peace plan is coming out of this, and I do believe in a two-State solution.

So I do think that every country has a right to recognize where its capital is, but this was a final status issue and I think should remain—should have remained in that category.

Mr. WILSON. Well, I just—we have seen the consequence. There were warnings that there would be mass violence that did not occur. We were warned of so many different consequences, and I just appreciate President Trump having the courage to proceed. Also, I appreciate in 2000 your meeting with Kim Jong-il, and that we can have progress in diplomacy with North Korea.

Over the past 2 years, North Korea has not launched a missile in 457 days, it had not had a nuclear test in 543 days. There have not been threats against the people of Guam by way of missile testing. The President's initiatives have secured the release of four Americans detained in North Korea. DPRK has made a promise to destroy the missile engine test site in Kusong. And the remains of 55 American remains of servicemembers have been released.

Over and over again, there has been progress, and of course, the real concern, and you have identified it, and this can be part of what is going on in Hanoi today, and that is the correct definition of denuclearization. Thank you very much.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I do think that it is important to be carrying on these diplomatic steps. I appreciate the steps that you have mentioned that have been taken, but we are a long way from where we need to be, and I think that we need to have diplomats working on this things prepared. And I hope that the talks today are successful.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you for your efforts in 2000.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you.

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you. I should point out that during the Clinton Administration, there was not 1 year but rather a several-year period of no testing, and that well over 100 remains of our soldiers were returned, all without giving Kim or his father the status of a face-to-face meeting with the President of the United States.

Madam Secretary, at our earlier meeting, I heard you talk about the importance of Article I of the Constitution. The most important part of that article is the right to declare war that is vested in the

Congress. Now, the War Powers Act, also known as the War Powers Resolution, is the preeminent statute designed to define the role of Congress when it comes to the most important aspect of the use of foreign policy, and that is, the deployment of military force.

But administration after administration has honored it, at most, in the breach, and sometimes deliberately violated it. When they have presented reports that are called for by the Act, they are always submitted consistent with the Act, making a point that the administration does not believe the Act is a statute or a law that they have to follow. Whereas, other reports are submitted pursuant to an act.

You are now no longer in the executive branch, you can look back at it as a professor and scholar. Do you believe that the War Powers Resolution is binding on the President, or in contrast, do you believe that a President can simply ignore it and deploy troops on long-term operations without an authorization to use military force?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Just as you were starting out, I made a note to myself, consistent with. And I do remember every time I testify to be absolutely clear to say consistent with, not pursuant to. So I literally just wrote it down before you said it.

I do think that the Constitution is definitely an invitation to struggle on this particular issue. And I have gone through—I cannot—I do not know how much my students appreciate this, but the whole history of how these things have gone on and why the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution created this issue and how it has been carried out.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, you can go back to Jefferson's deployment of the Marines on the shores of Tripoli.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Right. So I think the question is the following. And I, frankly, do think it is strange to be operating by an AUFM that came out, you know, like a long time, you know, as long as I have been out of office. But basically this is my question, and I know this is something that you have been working on is, how does one decide whether one gives ultimate authority to the President or limits it in such a way that——

Mr. SHERMAN. I want to move on to other questions. But is the President the emperor who can deploy our troops anywhere in the world without authorization from Congress? Is that what our Constitution——

Ms. ALBRIGHT. The Constitution does not say that. And so I do think the consultation and work together on this——

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, consultation is what the czar did with the Duma back in 1905. Does Congress have power or are we just an advisory——

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think Congress has power, I do.

Mr. SHERMAN. OK. I want to move on. You are right about the envoys—about all the open positions in the executive branch. Perhaps the most glaring vacancy right now is that we do not have a coordinator special envoy for human rights in North Korea. But I do want to focus on India-Pakistan.

This is the only place in the world where two nuclear powers have gone to war with each other, or at least kinetic military battle, and that has recently resumed or been initiated. What can the

U.S. do to reduce tensions in South Asia? And what do we do about the fact that Pakistan seems to at least tolerate, if not support, certain terrorist groups while, of course, opposing others?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. You are not going to believe my answer to this, because my father was a Czechoslovak diplomat who, in 1948, represented Czechoslovakia on a first commission to deal with India and Pakistan over Kashmir. And he was the one that arranged the cease-fire for the end of the first fighting. And so I am old, he is dead, and the issue is worse than ever.

Also, in my class, we do a role play. And even before the most recent thing, the scenario is India and Pakistan with nuclear issues. So I will let you know what my class decides on this, but I do think——

Mr. SHERMAN. We all have brilliant students in our respective districts. Do we have any guidance from the professor?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I do think that we do need to figure out some way to make sure that we do not have a nuclear confrontation. I think the U.S. needs to get involved in this. And I think that it is—it would be a good idea, actually, to have some kind of an envoy trying to deal with this. We cannot allow this to get out of control.

And what happened under President Clinton was there was various things that went on, President Clinton met with the Pakistanis on cargo, and were trying to deal with it. We cannot just avoid this.

Mr. SHERMAN. My time has expired.

I recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Albright, it is a privilege to have you here. Regardless of any political differences anybody has here in the room, I think that your personal story is an inspiration to people, certainly in America and around the world, and we commend you for your continued engagement in world affairs.

With the rise of anti-Semitism at home and abroad, and you see it on campuses—and unfortunately, I think we have really witnessed it right here among some of our own colleagues in the halls of Congress.—what do you think Congress can do to highlight this resurgent evil? And what solutions or actions should we consider that we have not already taken?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I do think that it is something that we cannot kind of just not talk about and deal with, and I think people need to discuss what the results of it are and try to figure out how one deals with—and it is a hard issue in terms of freedom of speech, and also the boycott. I mean, I think that there are questions about how to deal with that and still allow freedom of speech.

I just think that we all have to speak out about the results of it. And I would be interested to know what kind of actions you all are recommending on it. Because some of it makes it hard, it is not something that one can legislate as much as one needs to keep talking about that we cannot do, what I said earlier, which is to identify with one group at the expense of another and make them the scapegoats. That is what happened.

Mr. PERRY. I think we need to, among other things, be careful about the parsing, which seems to be happening, where you can say that you are not for the Government of Israel, but you are for

the Jewish people. The Jewish people form the government of Israel. The State of Israel is formed by the Jewish people. And if you are maligning the government and the State of Israel at the same time, they are congruent, they are one and the same, they are the Jewish people. And I think that is the biggest thing we can do.

I want to move on to a little bit, looking at some of your statements that you read to us here this morning, particularly regarding the North Korean dictator, Kim Jong-un, and the scant dividends to date based on the President's actions. And I agree wholeheartedly with you that talking is much preferred to fighting. Fighting is the absolute last resort that we should seek. But at the same time, I think we need to give this administration space.

I do not like to see the President of the United States with a dictator anywhere. I think it does provide them some status that they would not normally have, but in the past, other Presidents have done it, and there has been little hue and cry from the other side that seems to revile this one. I am not looking through the world with rose-colored glasses. Kim Jong-un is a murderous dictator, but we have a circumstance that has been created because of the failures of previous administrations where we have a dictator with nuclear weapons. And you would know of anybody how complicated these issues are, and especially in that culture where a personal relationship, a personal relationship makes the difference in the negotiation as opposed to as much of the eaches.

And while we say that this President has not done enough from the first meeting, it was the first meeting, the beginning of the dialog. And I will remind everybody that in the past, under an administration that you served in, we offered security guarantees, fuel, food shipments, and help on building reactors. And, you know, North Korea, as you know, after they said that was the last missile test, lied directly to you and continued to test missiles and build nuclear enrichment facilities in secret.

So I just want to make the record clear here. And also, regarding comments on Syria, we appear to be pursuing several policies simultaneously, confusing allies and delighting our adversaries. I do not think—you know that is a very difficult situation, and this President has been put in an awful position of cleaning up a circumstance where our policy had kept Russia out of the Middle East for over 60 years, and the last administration gave them full entree and walked away, and now this President is trying to pick up the pieces on a horrific situation of a civil war which is supported by dictators in China and folks in Iran.

And, finally, I am very concerned about comments where we would say that America—there is an impression that our leaders share a disdain for democracy. And with the little time I have, this President has supported democracies in Venezuela, put pressure on China, pressure on Russia, pressure on Iran, supported the only democracy in the Middle East, Israel, tried to maintain a relationship with Turkey, bringing back Pastor Brunson, and supported the Ukrainian defense against Russia. This President is a supporter of democracy, and I reject wholeheartedly—that is an inflammatory comment that is very dangerous, I think, to suppose or to imply that the President of the United States does not support

democracy anywhere in the world, including the United States. But I appreciate your input.

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you.

Mr. CICILLINE. May I ask the witness be permitted to respond to what I think was a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will recognize her for a short time, yes.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Let me say I am troubled by the relationships with some very authoritarian leaders. I think that a lot has been done to raise Kim Jong-un's status. I agree with some of the positive steps that have happened, but I would also say that when the Clinton Administration left office, there were no long-range missiles, there was no more fissile material, and no nuclear weapons. And I think that it is very hard to deal with North Korea, because it is the trust but verify. And I do not know how many times they say they have destroyed Yongbyon. I think that we need to figure out what is really going on. And kind of having a love affair and some of the terminology is kind of difficult for people to understand.

I do think——

Mr. PERRY. Difficult for all of us to stomach, but once again, it is better than fighting. And I would say that——

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I definitely agree.

Mr. PERRY. I would say at the end of the last administration, most Americans saw the United States at the brink of war with North Korea, and a great concession by North Korea at this point is no testing, and we are not at the brink of war. While I find it—some of the rhetoric distasteful, that is——

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you.

Mr. CICILLINE. Could the witness be permitted to finish her answer? She was just interrupted. It is her time.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is actually the extended time of the gentleman. You will have—I am about to yield to you.

I do want to just comment on one thing the gentleman said, and that is, I have never met an Israeli who did not malign the Government of Israel. It is a national sport.

And with that, I am going to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island, that I am sure he will want to build on——

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here today and for your continued leadership and extraordinary service to our country. We could spend many hours, even days, discussing all of the shortcomings of the Trump administration's foreign policy, but since I only have 5 minutes, I would like to focus in particular on values, namely, democracy and human rights.

It is alarming how this administration seems to conduct foreign policy in a values-free vacuum. President Trump calls gross human rights abusers our allies, and treats our allies, including our closest NATO allies, like adversaries. As you said in your testimony, if we are not friends with our friends, to whom will we turn for help?

The administration's reckless approach and carelessness in damaging our alliances, in my view, is making America less safe. Congress, and in particular this committee, has a key oversight role to hold this administration to account and also to send a message to our allies about what America stands for.

And in particular, I would like your thoughts on what is happening in eastern Europe, in Poland and Hungary, where it seems democracy and rule of law are under increased threat. In your book, you refer to the erosion of democratic values and attacks on democratic institutions in Hungary. Unfortunately, as you know, Hungary is not an isolated case. We are also seeing warning signs of democratic backsliding in Poland.

So I would be anxious to hear your assessment of what is happening in central Europe and eastern Europe, what is the state of democracy in this region, and particularly, what influence the United States has and how we should be using it, and what we can do more to support democracy in civil society in this region, in particular.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I am very concerned about what is happening in eastern Europe. And it is interesting, and I have gone over in my mind, frankly, what we might have done wrong in terms of our euphoria after the end of the cold war. Thinking that many of those countries were ripe for democracy, and democracy, as we know, is much harder than we think.

And so—and believe it or not, Viktor Orban was everybody's favorite dissident. He came to the United States—and by the way, George Soros paid for his education in England—and I think he is an example of exacerbating some of the issues that the Hungarians had. I did a survey over all of Europe at the end of 1991, and I cannot remember all the statistics and the questions, but one I remember is: Do you believe a piece of your country is in the neighboring country? Eighty percent of Hungarians thought so.

And so Viktor Orban, who is a demagogue in many things, having invented a term called illiberal democracy, which is an oxymoron, has taken advantage of that anger in order to get support for policies that are completely undemocratic. And I think that that is a concept that makes it very difficult.

Poland, I also, as kind of the birthplace of a lot of democratic action, I think again there is—I find hypernationalism a very dangerous aspect as far as democracy is concerned. And I do hope that what we try to do is to go and explain without being domineering. I am going to Poland next week. I am giving a speech in honor of Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was my professor and my boss. Then I am going to the Czech Republic, and the Czechs treat me as some combination of a queen and an irritating older sister. I am going to give an irritating older sister speech since it is the anniversary of bringing them all into NATO. That NATO is not just a military alliance, it is a political alliance, and democratic values are a very important part of it. And I think we need to make it clear.

And what I am worried about, our increasing separations between eastern Europe and western Europe.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you. And I have just probably time for one more question. One of my criticisms of the Trump administration is that they seem to have little time for what have been real cornerstones of American foreign policy that you have written a lot about, democracy and human rights. And I wonder if you would just tell us a little bit about what role you think those values of democracy and rights play in our foreign policy. What effect will this administration's disregard for these values have on our stand-

ing and leadership in the world? And, in particular, the administration has failed to speak out in support of LGBT rights or to condemn atrocities committed against the LGBT community in Chechnya, is one example. What is the impact—do governments, when they fail to hear from the United States, behave in a different way?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I think that is a big impact. And one of the things that bothers me is, for instance, in Poland, there is no respect for the judiciary. There are those—I am concerned about what has happened in terms of this administration's respect for our judiciary. About the role of the press. The rule of law. A variety of things that we hold are essential to democracy, and literally the extent to which some of them can point to what is going on here, saying, well, if you guys do it, why cannot we.

So I believe that we do have a role to play as leaders, and I do think that we need to be very clear about what we believe in in terms of the rights of various groups and what our value system is, and we have been kind of burying that.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here. I represent Kansas' Second District, eastern Kansas, think farmers, ranchers, producers, and what can we do as diplomats and Congress Members to enhance access between our growers and international buyers?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. You know, I think this has been a very important part of American foreign policy for a long time with PL–480 that really started the farm programs. And I think that we need to make clear that our relationships with countries is based on a free trade aspect of this, and that we need to make clear how important our farming communities are, and to be as helpful as possible. I believe in that.

Mr. WATKINS. Thank you, ma'am. And in your testimony, you noted that this administration's approach to China, quote, could produce gains with signs of progress in recent days. Now, given that, what should be the next step, particularly with regards to China?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I do think that we have been worried about some of the things they have been doing in terms of our intellectual property and just generally in terms of how they operate. And I think that the trade talks, from what I can tell, have gone fairly deeply, and while they need to be continued, I think there is a question—the President postponed the time of raising the tariffs, and so I think we need to keep pursuing to have some kind of a fair system, but where what we do is to be able to protect our intellectual property. And I do know that they have said they were going to buy more agricultural products, soy beans, so I think that is a good idea.

Mr. WATKINS. Thank you, Madam Secretary. It is good to see you again.

I yield my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. BERA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I will reiterate my colleagues in thanking you, Madam Secretary, for your service. I would also recognize, and I think you would agree with this, the men and women of our foreign services, our diplomats, our civil servants, our aid workers around the world, the tremendous work that they do representing us, and really just want to acknowledge to them that this body appreciates what they do every day, and the NGO's that also project American soft power and presence around the world.

Secretary Albright, in your written testimony, you talked about that there was some concern about the foreign policy decision-making process, and I would second that. And I will use two examples, you know, recent examples, and also about a year ago. If you think about the decision to withdraw from Syria, I was in the region in December, met with our special envoy to ISIS, Brett McGurk, and talked to our commanders in the field, and they are prosecuting their mission very well.

Nobody seemed to have any idea that a public statement was going to be made by the administration. If I infer from Secretary Mattis' decisions, it did not appear that Secretary Mattis had been consulted. We know from testimony on the Senate side, General Votel had no idea and was not consulted on this. And it is of deep concern. Let's separate the actual decision, there is a deep concern amongst myself and I hope everyone on this committee, that there is not an interagency process that seems to be taking place as major policy decisions are being made.

I would say the same thing about a year ago when a decision to support the Saudis and the Emiratis on their blockade of Qatar. You heard mixed signals coming out of the administration, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense saying, no, we are not going to take sides; the President of the United States taking sides.

You know, from your time at State, what would the right interagency process look like, and where should we, from an oversight perspective, dive into this?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I have been fascinated at the decision-making process and participated in it. So it is one of my subjects that I spend a lot of time on. And since the 1947 National Security Act, there has been a process. Each President puts a somewhat different spin on it in terms of their own proclivities and how they like to do business. But the bottom line is the U.S. Government makes thousands of decisions a day. The harder the decision, it gets pushed up the line. And the hardest ones go to the National Security Council in order to be able to present a proposal to the President.

And the very important part is how those decisions are set up, prepared by an interagency process, and then having a meeting of the principals committee, which means the Cabinet members that the National Security Advisor runs. And the best meetings, the ones that I have witnessed or studied, are the National Security Advisor makes a point of finding out how different departments feel about it.

I kind of talk about it as breaking the eggs so that you really—and then the National Security Advisor would like to make an omelet out of them to give to the President. If you cannot make the omelet, then you go and meet with the President and go over the deci-

sions again and present your different views. That, from everything that I can tell, is not taking place. There are some questions as to whether—I mean, I do not know anything beyond what I read in the papers, but whether there have been principals meetings.

I think the Syria decision, and I am sorry that I could not answer before, I do not think we have done Syria right. I think there are many issues, and they go back to any number of aspects of it. But the part that was really ridiculous was having different members of the Cabinet say something different, so that we did not have any idea what the policy was, thereby making ourselves look completely inept. And the kinds of things—not just Secretary Mattis and various people—but, I mean, on any hour of the day you did not know what U.S. policy was, and that is the result of a nonexistent decisionmaking.

Mr. BERA. And that has to be of deep concern to us, and certainly deeper concern to our allies if they do not know what our policy is and how that policy is being discussed and made, you know. I have the privilege of being the subcommittee chair on Oversight and Investigations, and certainly one of the things that we want to do is take a deep dive and a deep look into how these decisions are made, and we do think there is a congressional role in this. And if we are all speaking with one voice in a bipartisan way, we may or may not agree with the policy, but if we actually understand the thought and decisions that went behind that policy, it does project our soft power and our commitment both to our allies, but to the rest of the world, in a much more positive way. So thank you for that comment, and we look forward to——

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Thank you.

I would like to thank Chairman Bera for his remarks. I certainly agree with that sentiment of having a bipartisan analysis of foreign policy decisions.

And, by the way, thank you, Madam Secretary, for your great service to our country over the course of many years. You would be hard-pressed to find any Member of Congress that does not have respect for all of your service to our country, so thank you.

Some of the observations with regards to an absence from the national scene or an odor of American absence of leadership, I do not want to misquote you, but some of the statements that you made today. We can have a difference of opinion on decisions that President Trump makes in some cases where the President might withdraw from the Paris climate accord. You can argue that that is taking a step back from American leadership, others are strongly in support of the decision. I think it is really important to note, which is part of the scope of today's hearing, that there are many decisions that were made that it was America stepping up and being more involved and showing more leadership.

And earlier you say the USMCA, as one area with regards to Canada and Mexico, where it was a tough negotiation, and there were improvements that were made to an agreement that was decades old, and it certainly was not easy in dealing with allies. I believe that withdrawing from the Iran nuclear deal was American leadership, and obviously, you would argue the opposite. But, you

know, I have strong opinions as to why we should have withdrawn from the Iran nuclear deal. Moving the embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, I would argue, was showing American leadership.

ISIS is almost completely wiped off the map in Iraq and Syria, which is fantastic. This is something that has been going on, an effort over the course of a few years. But that map, just a few years back, looked really bad as far as the amount of territory that they controlled. The decision to use the MOAB in Afghanistan. I was in Afghanistan right after that decision was made. It was one that helped American forces, coalition forces, and it raised morale amongst the troops that I was speaking with. Passing the Taylor Force Act through Congress and then getting signed by the President, because there is a pay-to-slay policy amongst the Palestinians to financially reward terrorism.

Congressman Cicilline brought up a great point with regards to the LGBT situation in Chechnya. That is a huge concern. But I think it is also important for us to acknowledge that it was just a week ago that there was an announcement made amongst the Trump administration led by Ambassador Grenell of Germany to start a global campaign toward decriminalizing LGBTQ all across the entire world, and I think that we should acknowledge that effort from a week ago and then decide—figure out how we can be helpful for that effort.

I believe the American involvement in Venezuela, the support for the Venezuelan people and recognizing Guaido, is the Trump administration showing more leadership, not less. In August 2017, with regards to North Korea, the U.N. Security Council voted unanimously to increase sanctions, and China and Russia ended up voting with us. And I credit Ambassador Haley and her team and the Trump administration for their efforts to get that vote, but obviously there is a lot of other dynamics and complications as it relates to North Korea. We are having this hearing while the President and his foreign policy team are in North Korea.

So while we are having a really important hearing where opportunities are going to be taken to share, it could be frustration or criticism with certain decisions the President made, because that is a congressional role with oversight, and it is important for us to do that.

I just wanted to use my brief time just to cover a few other topics that are going on that, I would argue, are important for American foreign policy, even if we might disagree with some of it. So I just think there was a few more topics to add to today's discussion.

And once again, thank you for your great service to our country, for being here today, and the United States, really. I was a couple years younger when you were serving as Secretary of State, an honor to meet you in person, but I think our country is better off that you have dedicated so much time in your life toward the United States and global foreign policy and so many great causes.

I yield back.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you very much. And if I just might say, I do think it is important to think about the unintended consequences of foreign policy decisions, and we all need to work on that more. I believe in executive legislative partnership on foreign

policy, and I believe in bipartisanship, and I proved that by being very good friends with Senator Jesse Helms.

Chairman ENGEL [presiding]. Thank you.

Mr. ESPAILLAT.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for your many years of service and your commitment to our Nation and democracy across the world. At this very same committee last hearing, we heard from Elliott Abrams. He sat right where you are sitting and provided testimony and answered questions regarding the administration's actions and intent toward Venezuela.

Despite his attempts at reassuring us, I am still particularly worried about his involvement in our efforts to support the people of Venezuela. This country has a long and dubious history of interfering militarily in Latin America, and Mr. Abrams himself played a particular role in that story.

President Trump has frequently appointed individuals who are the anthesis to their positions in making high-ranking positions across our government. Yet the appointment of an individual who was criminally charged for lying to Congress about his role in arm sales to fund a coup in Nicaragua seems to particularly be irresponsible, even for Mr. Trump.

Are you concerned that Mr. Abrams' past participation in Iran-Contra disqualifies him as an impartial arbiter, if you may, in this particular conflict in Venezuela?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I think that I would not have named him, but I do think that the President has the right to name the people that he wants.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. As a refugee yourself—and I have read about your particular story, a very compelling story, and one that I think should enlighten all of us during these troubling times. Do you mind sharing your view on how we are treating folks that are coming up to the border seeking asylum, many of them obviously running from violence, running from gangs, and natural disasters and the like?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. My short answer is it is un-American. That I really do believe that this country has had a generous policy. I do think every country has a right to make its immigration policy, and I wish that there would be a comprehensive bill to do with immigration.

And I have to tell this story. One of my favorite things in life is to give people naturalization certificates. And the first time I did it was July 4, 2000, at Monticello. I figured since I had Thomas Jefferson's job I could do that. And so I hear this man leaving, and say, can you believe it? I am a refugee and I just got my naturalization certificate from the Secretary of State. And I went up to him, and I said, can you believe that a refugee is Secretary of State?

I think our country is about welcoming people, and what is going on at the border is un-American, separating the children, having no process, absolutely appalling. And I do hope that you all address that.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Thank you. Let me go back to Mr. Abrams. Many in Venezuela, the folks that are fighting for democracy there, have been asking for arms there. Many feel they should be able to pro-

tect themselves in the fate and the likes of what the Maduro regime is perpetrating against them.

First of all, do you think that that is advisable? And are you concerned that Abrams is at the helm, and he already did something like this in the past, and he may again engage in this type of behavior?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I think that we do not need to add more arms there. I am not for—I am for assistance, I am for negotiation, I am for sanctions. I think we have to be very careful not to exacerbate the situation.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. And what about military intervention? I know that when you served as our Secretary of State, you were involved in some military actions in certain parts of the world. Do you feel that the crisis in Venezuela has reached a level where that could be a potential option?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think—I happen to agree that normally what is said is all options are on the table. But I do think at the times that I was involved in using force, which was in the Balkans, was really after a great deal of negotiation and attempts at various other solutions. I have not seen that. There have been—the way that we brought people to the table at Dayton, for instance, was with very strong sanctions and a number of different diplomatic efforts, and I do not think enough of that has happened at this point.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. And, finally, do you feel that the Maduro regime is a narco regime?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think that it has an awful lot in supporting corruption in a variety of different aspects in Venezuela. I think there is a genuine question about what happened in the elections, and I think that they certainly have had a lot to do with the drug trafficking and with corruption.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Thank you for your service, Madam Secretary. Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madeleine—Secretary Albright, thank you for being here, ma'am. I view this committee as the most important committee in Congress. And I say that because the right and strong foreign policy is good economics policy, it is good trade policy, and it is definitely strong national security. Therefore, welcome to the best committee in Congress.

When you look at the world today, it is in the largest flux that we have seen since World War II, there is a tectonic shift in world powers we have not seen since World War II. Different countries are jockeying for different positions, as we see with the rise of China in the South China Sea and around the way they are going after the ports in the strategic areas around the world.

Yet if we look over the past, and I cannot blame any administration, it is an accumulation of administrations over the last 30 or 40 years, that has let a country go from a very backward economy to one of the second strongest in the world. Yet some things have been left unchecked.

You know, when Xi Jinping came to the Rose Garden in 2015, with President Obama, said that the South China Seas, the land

that they were reclaiming, would never be militarized, yet at the same time, they are being militarized. Today, they are fully militarized. And then we see what is going on in the Middle East, over 70 million refugees, the largest number since World War II, and in our own hemisphere with Venezuela, over 3 million or pushing 3 million. And we are going to have an influx of refugees at our borders this country has never seen before.

Stating all that, and the flux—not the flux, but the assault against Western democracies with what China, Russia, Iran are offering, mainly China, socialism with Chinese characteristics. As far as I am concerned, it is still communism, it is in their name.

And then with Xi Jinping in 2017, the 17th Chinese Communist Party Congress said the era of China has arrived. No longer will we be made to swallow our interests around the world. It is time for China to take the world center stage.

Do you feel that is threatening and the right thing for a world leader to say?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. You have described a world, the diplomatic term for which is, it is a mess. And I do think that there are all those issues out there, and we keep harking back. And I think we need to look at what our various institutional structures are and the relationships.

I am very worried with the kind of pulling back of America from a number of roles that the Chinese are filling the vacuum. They are on the march in many different ways, and Xi Jinping is using nationalism as a way to motivate his people when they are having a number of different problems. But the issue, and this is what has to happen, is to have—to be able to have areas where we try to find some cooperation, and then find the areas where we have to compete and make very clear what our views are.

I am troubled, in reading the threats issue that the intelligence community put out, they state this very clearly, the Chinese problems, the Russian problems, and then areas where we need to look at regional stability. And the thing that I—I am very glad to be at this important committee, and I am very happy to continue whatever longer term discussions, because with all of you I think we have to look at what our policies are going to be that are relevant for this part of the time and not keep thinking——

Mr. YOHO. Can I cut you off there because that is where I kind of want to go? Knowing the change in the world that is going on and all the conflicts that are going on, with your expertise, you history, knowing politics back in the 1990's, knowing it today, and it has changed tremendously, what would you advise this committee to direct foreign policy, you know, to counter China and the BRI, we did the BUILD Act to counter that, and this committee passed that, it got signed into law.

What else would you recommend that this committee—because I want to set policies in place for 50 years down the road that an administration just cannot come in and change on a whim, that it will have to go through a committee of jurisdiction.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I do think that one has to look at what the institutional structures are that we are working with and our decision-making process, but then also look to see to what extent we need international organizations, how we operate with them. Is the

UN—does it need help without us cutting our funding? I think we have to take a very large picture in terms of the institutions. I would hope that you would actually ask members of the private sector and academia and people like me, former practitioners, to come and talk about what the various issues are and not get involved in policies that bring unintended consequences. We need some forward thinking together, and the private sector also has to be involved in it.

Mr. YOHO. One of your colleagues that got elected, Donna Shalala, was here in the nineties. She said—I asked her how things were going here, and she goes, this is completely different than when I was here. It is toxic. It is all politics, not policy. And I think that is a great warning.

Thank you.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Ms. Wild,

Ms. WILD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, it is an honor for me to be sitting on this committee and to be listening to your testimony. My late mother had the privilege of serving as a foreign service specialist under your leadership and was assigned to African affairs, and I am sure she would be thrilled to know that I am here today with you and that I was appointed vice chair of the Africa Subcommittee.

I share Chairwoman Bass' concerns that African countries are often ignored or overlooked in our foreign policy positions, but that is not the subject of my question to you today. Let me switch gears.

In August 2017, the Trump administration announced its intention to withdraw the United States from the Paris climate agreement which, of course, as you well know, was adopted in 2016 to create a structure for nations to pledge to voluntarily reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change. My primary concerns are these: One, it shows a clear disregard for the seriousness of climate change; but second, and within the province of this committee, it demonstrates a recklessness in backing out of an agreement that the United States made with our close allies.

I would like you, if you would, please, to discuss how the allies of the United States reacted to President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement. And also, what is the impact of us doing so with our allies in terms of our international standing and reputation for trustworthiness?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think it raises that very question, because so many agreements and diplomatic relationships are based on understanding and trust and living up to your word, frankly. I think both that and withdrawing from the JCPOA undermines what it is. Negotiations are negotiations, and people make compromises. And then if you walk away from them, why would they trust you on the next one?

I actually think both of them are difficult, but the climate change, when you think about it, was done in way that left an awful lot of choice for each sovereign State. It was not kind of an order about everything. It was a setting up of a system to talk about things.

I also know when we withdraw from agreements or are not there when treaties are being negotiated, we lose our position. You know, the international criminal—we may not agree with everybody, but issues when we are not there, we walked out of the land or did not pay attention to the landmine treaty or did not pay enough attention to the International Criminal Court. We have to be there, and I think that a lot of agreements like that are based on trust, and we have undermined our trust. We are the most powerful country in the world, and we are destroying the capability to deal with problems by walking away from issues that we have agreed to.

Ms. WILD. So we lose our place at the table.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Definitely.

Ms. WILD. Can you discuss which countries have not ratified the Paris climate agreement, and whether the United States historically has aligned with the priorities of those countries, if you know?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I cannot list them, but I do think that when we align ourselves that way, we are sending a message. They are not exactly the ones that we would like to have something to do with. What I do find fascinating, and I mentioned this earlier, is all of a sudden the Chinese are the leaders on this. And when we do not—when we are away from the table and we do not lead, somebody is going to step in.

Ms. WILD. Thank you very much. I yield back.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is so great to be with you, Madam Secretary, and I want to take this precious opportunity to ask you to think in broad and historical terms about the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the arc of history and what we have done as a country and what is going on in the world. I think you touched briefly on India and Pakistan earlier. They are fighting right now, and obviously, they both became nuclear weapons States in recent years. Now we have—you know, I am very sad that we withdrew from the Iran nuclear agreement, and I am very worried about Saudi Arabia trying to obtain nuclear weapons.

So I wanted to ask you broadly about that, but in the context of our own actions about our own nuclear weapons and those of Russia and China. You know, recently, the President withdrew from the intermediate nuclear weapons agreement with Russian because they were not complying, which they were not, but it is hard to understand how that is a constructive response. And I am very concerned that if we are stalled over a period of, really, many years of not getting anything done ourselves, and also, with these many other States trying to develop nuclear weapons, we are setting the stage for disaster.

So I wondered what your perspective on this situation is.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, it is really, for me, that kind of was a witness to the evolution of nuclear weapons but also the agreements that were made, I think we have come to a very sorry state. I think one of the general themes here has been, and I have supported that, is that one has to look at what agreements are and then bring them up to date in any number of ways because they do not always suit the exact situation, but withdrawing from them is a mistake.

And the New START Treaty is up for negotiation. And what is happening is the Russians are updating their nuclear weapons systems, doing all kinds of things that are of great concern to us. We are modernizing our nuclear arsenal, but I think that what it means is that we cannot withdraw from things. What we need to do is to update the negotiation on them. I would hope that we could commit ourselves to a New START Treaty or to negotiating on the basis of the New START Treaty.

And I think partially the way that the treaties have been set up, they are supposed to deal with when there is failure and cheating. Withdrawing from them does not exactly help, and it is giving an excuse to the Russians to go forward with things. We need arms control treaties. We also need people. There used to be kind of a priesthood of people that really understood all the nuclear—all the arms control things. Some of those people are no longer around, but we really do need to give a lot of emphasis to arms control agreements. And it goes back to the previous question in terms of trust and things like that, and I think we are undermining our own strength by not paying attention.

The other thing is nuclear proliferation is a multilateral problem, and we need to look at it from that perspective.

Mr. LEVIN. You know that when we sold nuclear technology to the United Arab Emirates, they agreed to sort of a gold standard of nonproliferation language in that situation, and I am concerned about the Trump administration possibly selling nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia without that kind of guarantee. How do we—I really appreciate your comments about our own nuclear weapons and agreements with others about that. How do we lead on these problems of increasing numbers of nuclear weapons States?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, we do have to have an agreement, the 1–2–3, to really—and the Saudis, as far as I know, there has been no movement on that.

Mr. LEVIN. That is right.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. And legally, we should not and cannot sell it to them. But I do think that we need to constantly keep looking at the nuclear nonproliferation regimes that are out there, and as I said, require a multilateral action. But I think we have to be very careful not to be those that help the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and that has a lot to do with what we are doing with North Korea and the stuff that they are selling to a variety of people. That is what people are concerned about is some sale from North Korea more to the Pakistanis or to the Saudis.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you so much. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. MALINOWSKI.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is wonderful to see you, Madam Secretary. I remember staffing you at these marathon sessions years ago, and now here I am with a chance to ask you some questions.

I want to start by saying that I really appreciate your commitment to bipartisanship and your effort to give credit even to an administration that you are largely critical of on some issues. I have tried to do the same thing; largely supportive of what they are try-

ing to do in Venezuela, for example. I think they, in some ways, are giving China more right than some previous administrations.

But I do want to come back to a question that has permeated our discussion today, and that is what is happening to our moral authority in the world. Does it help us in the struggle for democracy and against dictatorship around the world when our President is calling our free press the enemy of the people or questioning the credibility of our own democratic elections or attacking the integrity of our intelligence community and our law enforcement community?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think it is very damaging, because I think—having spent a lot of time talking to a variety of foreign leaders and them basically saying, you mean you want us to do this, but what are you doing and saying? Our moral authority makes a difference. I think that one of the issues—and I always like to refer back to my father. He believed that the U.S. needed a moral foreign policy. That is different than a moralistic foreign policy, which kind of dictates everybody what to do, but we do need to have our value system in place.

And the press, a free press is the basis of democracy. You cannot call them the enemy of the people because it gives Putin a chance to say the same thing. So I am very much concerned about what kind of a model or example we set.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. In the same vein, I could ask does it help us stand up to the Maduro regime, which has turned Venezuela into a socialist country by issuing emergency decrees in opposition to the elected Congress of that country when we are issuing emergency decrees of ourselves?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I have been troubled by that, because emergency decrees are sometimes used for the wrong purposes in order to exacerbate problems. I am very glad that the Congress voted against the emergency decree that President Trump put out.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Thank you. On to the Senate.

And I think that the bigger picture here, and we have not really brought this out thus far, is it is not North Korea, it is not Venezuela. These are individual crises. It is that we have two great powers, Russia and China, that are challenging the world order that we built and our moral authority to lead it. And it seems to me we are squandering some of our greatest advantages in that fight, our alliances with democratic countries that willing work with us. The example that we set at home, the consistency in the application of our principles around the world.

I was there with you in Munich and heard Vice President Pence's speech, and one part of it that really struck me was when he asserted at the very beginning that America is back as the leader of the world, and virtually nobody applauded. Can we be the leader of the world if nobody follows?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. No. I mean, and that is the part of the thing that is terrible, is I cannot—and you were there. I cannot repeat how proud I was to represent the United States. And I think that the fact that we have given up on a lot of our principles and that people question our trustworthiness or what our motives are, I think is weakening us. And the responsibility of any President of the United States is to worry about our national interests, but they are

being undermined by the way that we are treating our friends and allies.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. And would not you agree that President Putin's primary strategic goal with respect to the United States is to divide us from our allies and to break our moral authority?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. No question. And we forget that we are dealing with a KGB agent who knows exactly how to use propaganda, and he has now militarized information, and what he is doing is systematically undermining our friends and allies in central and eastern Europe. He developed another oxymoron term which is authoritarian capitalism, you know, or a liberal democracy. That is what he and Orban have in common. And I think he knows how to separate and undermine, and we have to push back on that because he—I have said this, he has played a weak hand very well, and we have played a strong hand poorly.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. BURCHETT.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, ma'am, for being here. By my accent, you probably think I am from New York——

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Definitely.

Mr. BURCHETT [continuing]. But I am actually from Tennessee. It is very cool for me sitting here talking to you. I was just thinking—I am cutting into my time, but I think it is important—that in my pin collection I have a Muskie for President pin. I believe you were involved with that.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Definitely.

Mr. BURCHETT. I was 4 years old when that was going on, so I just wanted you to know that.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I was a little older.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, ma'am. That is all right. That is all right. And your story is very American. I was thinking of my momma, and she flew an airplane during the war. And she was kind of a nontraditionalist. I wish she was alive to see me sitting up here, say hello to you.

But my question has to deal with China and dealing with their telecom giant. I believe it is pronounced Huawei.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Huawei.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK, thank you, ma'am. And as the carriers prepare to roll out the 5G wireless networks, officials have raised some concern that Beijing could use Huawei to spy on our various networks or even to disable them. It has been reported in a couple of instances. But this has led, of course, the Trump administration to press our allies to avoid using their equipment.

I was wondering what your take was on that. And do you see them as a national security threat?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I am very concerned by Huawei because they are very much a part of selling component parts that undermine the whole system. And I am very concerned about something generally that we are not thinking enough about a cyber approach and what technology could undermine, and I am very glad that we are pushing back on this. But it is a problem because our friends

and allies do have the same systems, and we have to figure out how to work with them on that.

And by the way, I do think we need to also begin to look at some rules of how cyber works. So, you know, we had a conversation about arms control. We also have to think about what the next threat, and a lot of this has to do with technology, and there need to be some rules about that. I am concerned about Huawei.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, ma'am. I am glad you said that. I do not represent it, but about 6,000 hardworking folks at Oak Ridge National Laboratory live in the district I represent, and I just this past weekend toured some of their—they have one of the worlds's largest computers, and I can assure you that cybersecurity is at the forefront of everything they were talking to me about.

The next question I have was about NATO. And I know you addressed that earlier. And I apologize, Mr. Chairman, if this questionhas been asked before. If it has, you just say, I have answered it already. Go on to something else. But NATO, you know, we—apparently, the other countries have been expected to pay the 2 percent in the past. They have not, really. A lot of them have. I think we paid maybe 50-plus percent of the NATO budget.

Do you think that the threshold this year—or do you think we are close to getting to that threshold with these other member countries?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think that this is an agreement that was made that they need to do it. I think a lot of people, however, do not understand what is being referred to. This isn't putting some money into a NATO pot.

Mr. BURCHETT. Right.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. It is what they need to spend out of their own defense budgets in order to be part of the system, and I do think we need to keep pushing at it. And I think that—but not by bullying. I think it is a matter of trying to keep pushing them as partners and then to really look at what the threats are. So I am all for it. I think that they need to do it. I do not think it is as close as I wish it were to be, and I think we need to raise it, but it is more the tone of how it came out and some understanding, and I think the American people need to understand what we are talking about and how NATO works.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, ma'am. It comes to mind a saying my mother used to say, and it skipped my mind right now, but it is something to do with it is a little easier to lure bees with honey than vinegar, so I can understand that. Thank you so much, ma'am.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you.

Mr. BURCHETT. And I appreciate your—it is a great story. And if any of the young folks are watching this, I think they ought to research this lady, your grandparents, and where you came from in Czechoslovakia. I mean, it is just a really cool story. So thank you so much.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. It is a good American story.

Mr. BURCHETT. That is what I said. I had it written—I wrote it in pencil up here.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you. Thank you so much.

Mr. BURCHETT. Typically American. Thank you so much, ma'am.

Chairman ENGEL. Mr. Burchett, I want you to know that I only called on you because I thought you were from New York.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, sir. Well, I know. We have had this conversation. My accent threw you off a couple of times. You asked me where I was from up there, and I have never—I hardly get to north Knoxville, much less New York City, But I plan on doing it 1 day, and I am going to hang out with you specifically.

Chairman ENGEL. Let me invite you.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, brother.

Chairman ENGEL. We would be pleased to have you. Thank you. Ms. OMAR.

Ms. OMAR. Thank you, Chair. Hopefully, I can join that invitation to visit New York as well.

Madam Secretary——

Chairman ENGEL. You are invited.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Secretary, it is such an honor to have you in this committee. And my apologies for having to run to another committee, but I am so glad we have this opportunity to chat.

Yesterday in my office, I met with some veterans who are part of Common Defense. They are veterans of wars we have had in Afghanistan and Iraq. They asked me some questions that were a little puzzling to me, and I did not really have answers for them. Those that I met who served in Afghanistan were not convinced that after 18 years of fighting, Afghanistan was better off for our having been there. And the ones that served in Iraq, they spoke of the trauma inflicted on communities there, as well as their own traumas and the ravages of war that they have been subjected to. In Libya, we talked about some of the stories. We are reading about migrants who being sold into slavery and the complete horror that is being faced by Libyans trying to flee their country as refugees.

What worries me as someone who survived war and understands the horrors of wars firsthand is that the planning of wars does not seem to genuinely consider the human toll it takes, and plans do not seem to be made for recovery, and our moral responsibility to the people of these countries does not seem to be taken seriously. So my question to you and something I wanted to explore with you, Madam Secretary, is about the decision to militarily intervene in a foreign country.

When it is made, how much weight is given to the dramatic toll that is going to be inflicted on the innocent civilians in that war? I do not just mean the civilian casualties. I also mean to the extent we weigh the long-term impact that we will have after we get there.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think that one of the hard parts is trying to decide what tool you use in order to deal with a particular problem, and force is usually the last tool to be considered. And I have to tell you, things that I never thought I would have to do in my lifetime, either at the U.N. or as Secretary of State, to raise my hand in order to say that we needed force somewhere. It is something that I did in the Balkans because I thought people were being ethnically cleansed not for anything they did, but what religion they were. And so I think it was the right thing to do.

Afghanistan was something that was the result of 9/11. The murderers came out of Afghanistan. I think the war kind of—the purpose of having troops there changed at a certain point. I do not think there was enough discussion about it. And I think that—I hope now that whatever agreements are made benefit the Afghan people and that it is done in a good way.

Libya was an interesting example because, in fact, there is a new concept about responsibility to protect, which, if you know, that the leader of a country is killing his own people or calls them cockroaches, whether the international community has some responsibility for it. But I think you raise a very important point, which is that it is not just the moment of the force but what you do, how long you are there, do you continue to discuss it, and the decision-making process to what extent are the other parts of our government involved in it and not just doing it through the Defense Department. So I think you raise a very, very important point.

Ms. OMAR. Thank you. For the remainder of my time, I wanted to speak about some of the other tools that you mentioned, the tool of using sanctions. You know, some scholars and practitioners of foreign policy have questioned whether sanctions are effective at changing the behaviors of certain governments. There is also a perception that sanctions are easily avoidable by the rich and the powerful, individuals that we target in using those sanctions.

So I wanted to ask you, do you believe that there is a risk in enacting sanctions because of the real and perceived harm done to the people of the country? Is it possible that the use of sanctions undercuts our national security by furthering anti-Americanism in the countries we target with sanctions?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I cannot wait to go back to my class and tell them the questions you asked, because I talked about sanctions as a tool on Monday in class, and part of the thing is that there are not enough tools. We are the most powerful country in the world, and there are not a lot of tools. And sanctions get chosen often as kind of the middle tool. More bite than diplomacy, less bite than force.

We have learned a lot about sanctions. We have learned that comprehensive sanctions, which we did in Iraq, hurt the people, and began to look more at targeted or smart sanctions. I think there are times they do work because what you are trying to do is change the behavior of a country. They need to be assessed at various times.

The question is when do you remove them? Who is really affected by them? But it goes back to another whole question, is, does the United States get involved when we see terrible things happening in a country? Do we have a responsible international role? And I do believe in the importance of American action, and the question is which tool you choose. But they need to be assessed. It needs to be discussed about how they work together, which ones do you use when.

But sanctions are often the tool of choice for obvious reasons, but I do think they need to be assessed in terms of whom who they really affect.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. ALLRED.

Ms. OMAR. Thank you for your question. Thank your for giving me the extra time. I really appreciate it. Thank you.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. ALLRED.

Mr. ALLRED. Hello, Madam Secretary. It is good to see you again. Thank you for being here today. I want to just say that I think that your story is the epitome of the American dream. And to anyone who is watching, who does not know your story, I would encourage them to learn about what brought you to the United States and the work that you have done here. And I want to thank you for a lifetime of service to our country.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you.

Mr. ALLRED. And, you know, I am increasingly concerned that future Madeleine Albrights might not see their future in the United States, that our light abroad is dimming.

And I represent an area that is deeply tied to our foreign relations and our foreign affairs. We are an area that has benefited from trade, and so when we pull back from trade or enact tariffs, it hurts my region. It hurts our economy. We are an area, and I have spoken with a lot of business leaders in my community who want the best and the brightest in the world to come to north Texas and to work in our businesses there, and they are deeply concerned at the decrease in foreign students coming to some of our universities. And Texas, of course, has some of the largest ports in the country, and in north Texas, we have one of the largest airports in DFW. So we are an international hub. And so what happens in our foreign affairs deeply affects my district and my State.

And I wanted to ask you, and I know you have worked on this and spoken about this, and maybe you have spoken about it today, and I might have missed it. But I wanted to ask you what we can do in Congress to better inform the American people about the effect of our foreign policy on our domestic tranquility.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I have to say it is the key point of all of this. We are such a large country and think that we are not affected by foreign policy. And one of the things that I have tried to do is make foreign policy less foreign in order to have people understand that our well-being depends on having international relations, in having a foreign policy. And so I do think that what is very important to do is to spend time explaining in everybody's district which is how are you benefited by trade or foreign policy, or if there is terrorism somewhere, to hope that it does not come to America, any number of different aspects of it.

And I have said—and I am happy to repeat this in front of everybody—I am very willing to go to people's districts to try to explain why foreign policy affects our domestic life, that in this day and age, every American is somehow affected by what happens abroad. And for us to build walls or put—or moats or whatever undermines what we need in the world, is to be able to connect with other people. And trade is good for America, and technology, development, and any number of things, but we need to explain it better.

I definitely—it is a vital part and most important for all of you. You are the ones that represent America, and so I think it is very important. I am happy to help in whatever way I can.

Mr. ALLRED. Well, thank you, Madam Secretary. You are welcome in Dallas any time. We would love to have you, especially with some of my high schools, to talk about the work that you have done and how important our foreign policy is to what we are doing on a day-to-day basis.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. And the young people make all the difference. By the way, in my book, I always say there is not a speech or a book that is written that does not quote Robert Frost. So he said, the older I am, the younger are my teachers. And I am learning from my students, but I am very happy to go and be helpful.

Mr. ALLRED. Yes. Well, thank you. And in my remaining time, I just want to address another theme that I think that has been discussed today, which is American withdrawal from international leadership. And I know you have maintained your connections. You were at the Munich conference recently, and I just want to ask, do you think that the damage that has been done is irreversible? And what concrete steps do you think Congress should be taking in these next 2 years to continue to repair some of those relationships and restore trust abroad?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. It is not irreversible, but it requires contact and experience, which is why I think having so many of you go to the Munich Security Conference as being very important. And I also hope that you all meet with your counterparts, parliamentarians from other countries. At the National Democratic Institute we are very interested in rule of law in the role of the legislative branches. And I just flat out invite you now to come with us on some of our election observing missions and to do a variety of things. They need to see what America really looks like and how you want to be helpful in this and that we need to have leadership.

So please, I think it is a very—codels. I was talking about that earlier. I think it is a very important part. There was a time that there were Members of Congress that were proud not to have passports. Please, you know. So I do think you guys need to get out there. So any time.

Mr. ALLRED. Thank you Madam Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman—or Madam Chair.

Ms. SPANBERGER [presiding]. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Trone.

Mr. TRONE. Madam Secretary, thank you again for your patience today. It has been a long day today.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. It is a lot of fun, I have to say.

Mr. TRONE. I have been really struck by your tremendous leadership with compassion, leadership with civility, and leadership and bipartisanship. And I will tell you, that is all in short supply here.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. TRONE. So thank you very, very much. We talked about, followup on Mr. Malinowski's point earlier, about America's reputation. We think about how President Trump in Venezuela has held them to standards, held Maduro and held his feet to the fire, but at the same time, to juxtapose that in the Philippines, in Russia, in Korea. We have had elections stolen. We have not held anybody to the fire of truth. And do you think that lack of consistency causes us irreparable harm to our reputation?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think it does, and it is very hard to follow. I mean, the hard part is to figure out what the strategy really is, and even though there is documents—I mean, what I found interesting is that the Trump administration put out its National Security Strategy very early. The question is to what extent is it being followed. And we do confuse people very much. And I think it goes to the points about trust, what our leadership role is, what our relationships are, and I do think consistency is something that would help.

Mr. TRONE. Yes. It really drives at competence at the end of the day.

Talk about Saudi Arabia a second. I have been concerned that—you mentioned earlier the bone saw. The situation with Khashoggi. We think about what has happened with Qatar. We think about the dissidents that have disappeared in Saudi Arabia and taken away. We think about the theft of probably $100 billion from other Saudis locked in the hotel. We think about the Prime Minister of Lebanon who has been kidnapped. And then we think about Yemen; over 100,000 folks are dead, probably 20-some million on the brink of starvation. We have a 33-year-old Crown Prince that is—you know, the country has been our ally, but we have a tremendous amount of arrogance, perhaps driven by age, perhaps driven by wealth beyond imagination.

What should we be doing about this? Should we just say, oh, it is OK, and let it go? Because once we do that, my concern is, for 50 years, your grandchildren and their grandchildren will have to deal with this.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think the hard part about State craft is trying to figure out how you say what is your value system, what you believe, everything, and at the same time, recognize that sometimes you have to have a relationship with a leadership that you disrespect or do not like or whatever. I think we need to make very clear that the actions that you have talked about are unacceptable, and at the same time, try to keep a relationship with Saudi Arabia. That is very hard. That does not mean selling arms to them, but trying to sort out how you can do both things, you know, kind of this, at the same time.

And basically, I do think that we need to keep calling out what happened on Khashoggi and what our intelligence communities have been saying and not deny that those kind of things are going on. But it is Franklin Roosevelt who established the relationship with Saudi Arabia. Never was simple. We need to figure out where we have to tell it like it is and, at the same time, maintain some relationship.

I have felt it is a mistake always to cutoff relations with a country or not have that conversation, because that is what diplomacy is about.

Mr. TRONE. I agree with you. I think we need to continue the conversations and be relenting in our open discussion of what was right and what was not right, but at the same time, I do not think we should just accept the fact that this behavior can go on unchecked.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. No. I agree. And I think kind of having normal, smiley discussions with the Crown Prince is not the way to go.

Mr. TRONE. Anything we can do to mitigate the damage to the America First policies?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I think by recognizing that we believe in partnership with others, but that is again—I do not mean to put everything on your shoulders, but I really do think that the role of Congress in this is key. And when you all can explain what we are really about, I think it makes a big difference. Your role in all national security policy and the kinds of things that people say. And I do think one of the aspects in terms of understanding that America, actually, we are great, and that our greatness has come from understanding partnerships and respecting our friends and allies.

Mr. TRONE. Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you.

Ms. SPANBERGER. The chair recognizes my friend from Pennsylvania, Representative Houlahan.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And thank you, Secretary Albright, for coming. It is a pleasure to see you again and a real privilege to have this conversation.

I have two separate questions that are fairly disparate, so I am hoping that I have enough time to get to both. The first one has to do with women and girls and particularly the fact in 2019, Fiscal Year 2019, we appropriated $10 million to fund the Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues, and apparently this position still remains open to this day. So I am wondering if you could be helpful in elevating what it is that this special envoy should do and why we should continue to fund this initiative given that it has not been filled.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, I have to say that when I became Secretary, I was the first Secretary to put women's issue central to American foreign policy, not just because I am a feminist, but because I know that when women are politically and economically empowered, societies are more stable. Then the whole position was created, which I think is very important. And frankly, you know, in most countries, more than half the population is female, and so we are undercutting our own national interests by undermining that.

I also do think—and by the way, what I am very proud that the National Democratic Institute does is support women candidates in—across the board in countries and trying to figure out how to be helpful when they are harassed in their countries, working with the United Nations on that. So I think that we need to see the issue from two ways. One is what makes it better for U.S. national interests, and then obviously the fact that I do think that the world is better off when women are equally empowered.

Ms. HOULAHAN. I could not agree with you more. And my second line of questioning has to do more with cyber and bio security and a little bit about what you talked about in your opening testimony regarding sort of the decimation of the State Department. I had the privilege of going to the Pentagon on Monday for almost a full day tour, and a very senior ranking member of the Secretary of Defense's office was asked about the state of the relationship between the Pentagon and the State Department, and he said it had never been better in his entire career. And he thought that there were no problems and no hiccups in their relationship.

And so I would love it if you could talk a little bit about the sort of line level and staff level state of affairs in the State Department, and also how it relates to cybersecurity and our ability to stay secure in that space.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I do think the importance of a relationship between State and Defense is essential. And one of the things that I have to say, Secretary Mattis said that if the State Department was not funded, he would have to get more ammunition and a real understanding of that relationship.

I do think that across the levels there are a lot of department discussions between State and Defense. I think the problem at the moment is that some of the people in the Defense Department do not have a counterpart in the State Department and that they end up then doing what State should be doing, Defense begins to do. And so I do think—and this goes back again to the funding of the State Department and having people there. I also do think that specifically on areas like cyber, which obviously have a lot of technical aspects to them, also have diplomatic parts in terms of negotiating with other countries about what is acceptable, what is not. The question about Huawei, for instance, or how the Russians are using their asymmetrical tools in countries and then the diplomatic part.

So we have those two departments for a reason, but one is operating—I have to say I am for a strong defense, but the difference in terms of $700 billion and something just under $60 billion is a little off base.

Ms. HOULAHAN. I very much appreciate your time. And I yield back the balance of my time to madam chair.

Ms. SPANBERGER. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the gentlelady from Virginia, and I am proud to call her madam chair.

And welcome, Secretary Albright. Great to see you again. I think I saw you a little over a week ago in Munich at the security conference. And I do not know about you, but I was really struck by sort of the evolution in reactions among our allies in Europe to the evolution of diplomatic and foreign policy here in the United States. I would say 2 years ago, there was anxiety, there was consternation. There were questions. There was the seeking of reassurance. This time, led by the Chancellor of Germany herself, Angela Merkel, I saw a sort of anger and defiance and resistance, frankly, to the abrogation of U.S. leadership and the evisceration of policies and treaties that were, in fact, initiated by and presided over by the United States.

I do not mean to put words in your mouth, but that was my observation. Big, big change in 2 years in terms of where our allies are vis—vis current United States foreign policy. And I think Mr. Pence, the Vice President of the United States, got a dose of that with the complete and utter silence in response to his speech, unlike Angela Merkel who criticized the United States specifically on JCPOA, on the Paris climate accord, on even naming a German auto manufacturer a threat to the national security, and she got a standing ovation.

Your observation.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. I have been to many of the meetings, and I was appalled at what was going on in terms of kind of a sense of, who are these people? What happened to America? And I was so glad that you all were there, because I think that it made really clear that we did care, but it was as a result of kind of an American approach to things, of bullying and name calling and not understanding what the role is.

I am not saying the Europeans are always easy to work with, but I do think that this was particularly an uncomfortable time, an embarrassment, if I might put it that way. I have seen some official releases of a transcript of the Vice President's speech, and you know how they often have in parentheses—it had parentheses, applause, and I thought where the—you know, who wrote that? So I do think that it was an embarrassing kind of time, and I do think it is an important convocation of people. And so the fact that you were there made a big difference, but your analysis of it totally matches mine.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank you, Madam Secretary. If I may, in my remaining time, I want to talk about refugees. One of the most disturbing aspects, among many, in the foreign policy of this administration is its hostility toward refugees. Here we are, you know, the Statue of Liberty. You come from a refugee family, Madam Secretary, as do millions of Americans, and yet we have gone from 100,000 level of refugees under the last year of the previous administration to a ceiling, a proposed ceiling of 30,000——

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY [continuing]. In this next fiscal year. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with limiting the number of refugees? And what are the consequences of doing that, from your point of view having served, of course, as Secretary of State?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Well, first of all, I think it is inhumane toward the people that want to come in and the many refugees that have been created, and so I think it is, frankly, un-American. We are a humane society. People want to be helpful to each other.

I think that the other part that makes it a problem, and we are not the only country, I think, that is being less than generous on this. It makes it very hard when America says you need to let in more people, and meanwhile, we are cutting our own numbers. So we are losing our authority on it.

I do think it is very important for there to be some comprehensive immigration legislation. I think it is a complicated issue, and as you know, there are distinctions between refugees and immigrants and a number of different aspects. And there are a lot of studies that have been done, I have been a part of a lot, and how technology can now help in identifying people, any number of things. And there is a commission—I will be very happy to send that report over.

But I am appalled, frankly. And I describe myself as a grateful American. And everything about the possibility of having come here as an 11-year-old and understanding democracy in America's role. So I do think we need to do something to really not have the Statue of Liberty weep.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And speaking of that, and then I will end, but I welcome your support. I have introduced a bill called the Lady

Liberty Act, picking up what you said, which, by the way, is H.R. 6909, and that would say, oh, no, no. The President gets to set the limit, as he does currently; however, that limit can never fall below 100,000.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And I welcome your input, if not your support, on trying to get that bill to the floor. I thank you.

And thank you, Madam Chairman.

Ms. ALBRIGHT. Thank you for doing that.

Ms. SPANBERGER. I will recognize myself for 5 minutes.

And, Secretary Albright, it is such an honor to have you here with us today. I thank you for your time, and I thank you for the opportunity to ask a few questions.

I am a former intelligence officer, and some of the greatest accomplishments of my life have been knowing that the information I was out collecting would inform our diplomats and our policymakers on issues that are complicated and difficult and nuanced. And last week—or last month, excuse me, following the intelligence chief's annual threat testimony, you said you were stunned by the President's immediate and vehement dismissal of their assessments and by his overall regular attacks on the integrity and the trade craft of American intelligence officers.

I am deeply concerned about what appears to be a growing disconnect between our political and our intelligence leaders, in particular, because I see that it undermines the ability of our lawmakers, of our diplomats, of American leadership to make informed, strong, quality decisions based on intelligence that was collected by people, by Americans who risked their lives to get it. And in light of this week's summit on North Korea, my question is, do you have an opinion of how we as Members of Congress can help ensure that the White House is receiving and considering the intelligence as part of the administration's policy formulation? And if that is not possible, as a former diplomat and as a teacher, do you have recommendations for what we as Members of Congress and as those with a platform within our own communities can do to ensure that the American population understands the value of intelligence in the way that it informs and the value of diplomacy in the way that it helps protect our communities and the way that it is a vital portion of our national security efforts?

Ms. ALBRIGHT. It is a key part of our national security efforts, and I had—well, first of all, what I truly miss not being in the government is the intelligence. And I would read the papers, and then I would come into my office, and there would be the State Department INR part, and then the intelligence person would come in and brief me, and read the PDB and all kinds of things, and I always thought, gosh, I wish I could spend hours all day doing this. But the greatest respect for the intelligence community. Leon Panetta at the time asked me to be on the CIA External Advisory Board, which I did with General Petraeus and John Brennan. I am no longer on that, but it was a way to understand what the intelligence community did.

And I think something that is very important in terms of all the work that is done on open source and all the information that is out there, and it is impossible for the government to operate with-

out having that kind of knowledge. And I think that what needs to happen is obviously the funding of the intelligence community, but also the respect for the intelligence community. And I think one of the things that the External Advisory Board was there to do, because that is what Panetta thought, was to try to explain it more to Americans. And I think that that needs to happen, is that it should not—not the product so much but the fact that it is important. How can you possibly make policy without both kinds of intelligence, frankly? But I think that it is very important.

And I think your coming here and being a Member of Congress is also a very important part in terms of being able to explain what it really does. So I will do my best to keep talking about the importance of intelligence.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Well, thank you, Madam Secretary, for your comments, for your insights, and your continued service to our country.

Thank you to the members of this committee. The hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:01 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128

Eliot L. Engel (D-NY), Chairman

February 27, 2019

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to be held in Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building (and available live on the Committee website at https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/):

DATE: Wednesday, February 27, 2019

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

SUBJECT: The Trump Administration's Foreign Policy: A Mid-Term Assessment

WITNESSES: The Honorable Madeleine K. Albright
(Former Secretary of State)

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 FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

Day *Wednesday* Date *02/27/19* Room *2172 RHOB*

Starting Time *10:11 a.m.* Ending Time *1:01 p.m.*

Recesses *0* (____to____) (____to____) (____to____) (____to____) (____to____) (____to____)

Presiding Member(s)
Chairman Eliot Engel, Rep. Brad Sherman, Rep. Abigail Spanberger

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session ☑
Executive (closed) Session ☐
Televised ☑

Electronically Recorded (taped) ☑
Stenographic Record ☑

TITLE OF HEARING:
The Trump Administration's Foreign Policy: A Mid-Term Assessment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
See attached.

NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
N/A

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.)*
SFR_Engel
QFR_Yoho

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____
or
TIME ADJOURNED *1:01 p.m.*

Full Committee Hearing Coordinator

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

PRESENT	*MEMBER*
X	Eliot L. Engel, NY
X	Brad Sherman, CA
X	Gregory W. Meeks, NY
X	Albio Sires, NJ
X	Gerald E. Connolly, VA
X	Theodore E. Deutch, FL
X	Karen Bass, CA
X	William Keating, MA
X	David Cicilline, RI
X	Ami Bera, CA
X	Joaquin Castro, TX
X	Dina Titus, NV
X	Adriano Espaillat, NY
X	Ted Lieu, CA
X	Susan Wild, PA
X	Dean Phillips, MN
X	Ilhan Omar, MN
X	Colin Allred, TX
X	Andy Levin, MI
X	Abigail Spanberger, VA
X	Chrissy Houlahan, PA
X	Tom Malinowski, NJ
X	David Trone, MD
	Jim Costa, CA
X	Juan Vargas, CA
X	Vicente Gonzalez, TX

PRESENT	*MEMBER*
X	Michael T. McCaul, TX
X	Christopher H. Smith, NJ
X	Steve Chabot, OH
X	Joe Wilson, SC
X	Scott Perry, PA
X	Ted Yoho, FL
X	Adam Kinzinger, IL
X	Lee Zeldin, NY
	James Sensenbrenner, Jr., WI
	Ann Wagner, MO
X	Brian J. Mast, FL
	Francis Rooney, FL
X	Brian K. Fitzpatrick, PA
X	John Curtis, UT
X	Ken Buck, CO
X	Ron Wright, TX
X	Guy Reschenthaler, PA
X	Tim Burchett, TN
X	Greg Pence, IN
X	Steve Watkins, KS
X	Michael Guest, MS

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

February 26, 2019

The Honorable Eliot Engel
Chairman
Foreign Affairs Committee
U.S. House of Representatives
2170 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Michael McCaul
Ranking Member
Foreign Affairs Committee
U.S. House of Representatives
2170 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington D 20515

Re: Amnesty International USA Statement for Mid-Term Assessment of the Trump Administration's Foreign Policy

On behalf of Amnesty International and our more than seven million members and supporters worldwide, we hereby submit this statement for the record. Amnesty International is an international human rights organization, founded in 1961 with national and regional offices in more than 70 countries.

The United States has played a critical role in the promotion and protection of human rights at the international level and in ensuring that the multilateral institutions mandated with working toward those goals deliver on their missions, that human right defenders hold human rights abusers accountable and that individuals enjoy their basic rights and dignity. Congress has and must continue to play a leading part in that effort, especially at this time when the U.S. has closed its doors to the most vulnerable.

This statement focuses on the Trump administration's record in the following four areas:

I. Protection of Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Displaced Peoples
II. Protecting Civil Society and Human Rights Defenders, Pressing Foreign Governments for Accountability on Human Rights
III. Opposing Discrimination against Vulnerable Populations and Stigmatized Groups
IV. Improving the Respect and Protection of Human Rights while Pursing National Security Interests

I. Protection of Refugees, Asylum Seekers, and Displaced Peoples

The world is witnessing the highest levels of displacement in history. 68.5 million people have fled their homes, escaping persecution, torture and violence. Among them are nearly 22.5 million refugees, over half of whom are children. They face desperate circumstances and are in dire need of shelter, medical treatment, food and other life-saving services.

Less than 1 percent of refugees will ever be given the opportunity to resettle in a third country. Most will either remain in the country to which they initially fled or return to their home country through voluntary repatriation. In their annual global resettlement needs assessment, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that close to 1.2 million refugees need access to resettlement – meaning they will likely never be able to return to their home country or be integrated in their host country.

The U.S. has long been the single largest donor of international humanitarian aid. Now more than ever, the U.S. must provide sustained funding for humanitarian aid to protect displaced populations and provide funding and support for the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP).

Recommendations: Congress should

- Sustain funding for humanitarian and refugee assistance in line with current appropriations. Additionally, funding and support for the USRAP should also support the admissions of at least 75,000 refugees in FY 2020.
- Support a refugee admission goal exceeding 75,000 in FY 2020
- Support robust funding for refugee resettlement in FY 2020
- Restore critically needed funding for the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)

II. Protecting Civil Society and Human Rights Defenders, Pressing Foreign Governments for Accountability on Human Rights

On October 2018, Jamal Khashoggi walked into the Saudi Arabian consulate in Istanbul Turkey and never came out. Khashoggi had been a critic of the Saudi government's abysmal human rights record. In the time since his murder, gruesome details of his dismemberment have become public and there is overwhelming evidence linking his murder to the highest levels of the Saudi government, yet no one has been held accountable, and the Trump administration has rejected the analysis of its own intelligence community and continued to do business as usual with the Saudi government.

Khashoggi is one of the thousands of Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) around the world who are routinely the target of judicial harassment, smear campaigns, intimidation, death threats, arbitrary detention, sexual violence, assault, torture, enforced disappearances, and even assassination by governments. Since the signing of the UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders in 1998, over 3,500 human rights defenders have been killed worldwide. In 2017, 312 human rights defenders were assassinated, and in 2018, 321 defenders in 27 countries were targeted and killed for their work.

Amnesty International has firsthand experience with this harassment. In recent years, the chair of the board of Amnesty International Turkey was jailed for 14 months and the executive director spent 4 months behind bars. Both still face trial on charges of allegedly being members of a terrorist organization. In 2018, the offices of Amnesty International India were raided by the India security forces, and Amnesty International Nigeria was the focus of days of protests paid for by the Nigerian military.

Amnesty International calls for the immediate unconditional release of all HRDs imprisoned solely for their peaceful human rights work. Amnesty further calls on government to investigate all murders of HRDs and to pursue the prosecution of those found responsible for those murders. We also call for the implementation of concrete measures to protect HRDs including the repeal of any legislation that criminalizes or restricts the work of HRDs.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Request the State Department o (DOS) to provide a report on the situation on HRDs, assessing the impact of U.S. funded programs to support HRDs as well as programs promoting human rights.
- Increase funding for DOS programs such as the Human Rights Defenders' Fund and Lifeline: The Embattled NGOs Assistance Fund.

Curbing Support for Human Rights Abusing Governments by the Trump Administration
President Trump's lauding of infamous human rights abusers like Rodrigo Duterte of the Philippines, Xi Jinping of China, and Kim Jong Un of North Korea undermines the credibility and ability of the United States to be a champion for human rights. It also increases the risk of other governments engaging in human rights abuses with the assumption that promoting respect for human rights is no longer a foreign policy priority for the United States

President Trump congratulated Duterte on what a "great job" he's doing on the drug war when Duterte has overseen the extrajudicial killings of thousands in the Philippines. Duterte himself has said that "his only sin is extrajudicial killings." President Trump called Kim Jong Un "very honorable" when there are approximately 120,000 North Korean political prisoners in gulags under Kim's dictatorial regime.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Communicate to the President the centrality and importance it holds for human rights as a U.S. foreign policy objective and Congress' expectation that administration will uphold and support human rights.
- Call upon the Trump administration to work with the UN to advance Human Rights through

Special Procedures Mechanisms
The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) is tasked with reporting on the human rights record of all UN member states. UN Special Procedures play a vital role in protecting human rights, with Special Rapporteurs and Working Groups experts. On January 4, 2018, the Guardian reported that the DOS has quietly ended its cooperation with these experts. The Trump Administration must commit to ensuring that the U.S. delegation collaborates and supports the work of the OHCHR and that of special procedures mandate holders, including in cases when they are investigating potential human rights violations in the United States.

U.S. Peacekeeping Funding/Contributions: The U.S. has long prided itself on serving as the largest financial contributor to U.N. peacekeeping efforts. Through this, the U.S. has

served as a lynchpin of stability and security in many troubled areas around the world. Recently, however, the administration has moved to cut U.S. funding to UN Peacekeeping. These actions have endangered countless civilian lives and have called into question the U.S. government's willingness to lead on human rights internationally. The Administration must recommit to supporting UN Peacekeeping efforts.

THE AMERICAS

Venezuela

The institutional crisis in Venezuela – fueled by deep political polarization and marked social deterioration in the country – has had a devastating impact on human rights. The government of Nicolas Maduro is engaging in a campaign of political repression and violating Venezuelans' political and socioeconomic rights. Over 90 percent of Venezuelans now live in poverty, and over three million have been forced to flee the country.

The crackdown on political dissent in the country continues to deteriorate. In January 2019, were numerous mass protests against the Maduro government, particularly in the working-class areas where pro-government armed groups are concentrated.

In 2019 Amnesty International concluded that the forces of the Maduro government engaged in a campaign of extrajudicial executions, arbitrary detention, and uses of excessive force. The team documented six extrajudicial executions at the hands of the Venezuelan Special Action Forces; two young men killed and one young man wounded by firearms deployed by the Bolivarian National Guard and the Bolivarian National Police; and the arbitrary detention of over 137 children and youth. All the targeted individuals had been linked to protests agitating for change and demanding access to basic goods, including food and medicine.

Recommendations: Congress should:

- Collaboratively, with other governments, call for an end to impunity by advocating for oversight by the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC), as well as preliminary investigation of these abuses by the International Criminal Court.
- Ensure that Venezuelans seeking international protection in the United States are granted unrestricted access to territory and protection from return.
- Ensure that the U.S. government's responses to the institutional crisis in Venezuela focus on the humanitarian needs and the rights of Venezuelans, and do not exacerbate their suffering. The petroleum sanctions imposed by the government in January 2019 have only caused greater harm to the most vulnerable Venezuelans, and threats of military intervention will only serve to further entrench and sow division in an already deeply polarized situation. Amnesty International recommends that Congress use its power to closely examine any measures taken (or threatened to be taken) by the U.S. government to ensure that they will not violate Venezuelans' human rights.

Nicaragua

Following reforms to the social security system in April 2018, Nicaraguans began engaging in widespread protests. In response, the regime of Daniel Ortega in power since 2007, brutally cracked down on protesters, resulting in hundreds of deaths and thousands of injuries. While the reforms were ultimately scuttled, the Nicaraguan people continued to take to the streets to demand an end to the Ortega government and to the impunity in the wake of the deadly response to the protests.

In June 2018 Amnesty International concluded that the Ortega government has adopted a strategy of indiscriminate repression, intending not only to stanch the protests but to punish those who participated and anyone who attempts to shine a light on the rampant corruption and rights abuses committed by the regime. The government has engaged in escalating attacks on the press, forcing over 60 journalists into exile. In December 2018 the government cancelled the legal registration of the Nicaraguan Centre for Human Rights, a domestic NGO dedicated to educating Nicaraguans about their human rights and providing reporting on Nicaragua's compliance with its human rights guarantees. In December 2018, the Interdisciplinary Group of Independent Experts (GIEI, by its Spanish acronym) concluded that the Ortega government had committed crimes against humanity in its crackdown on the 2018 protests; that same month, the Nicaraguan government kicked out GIEI as well as the Special Follow-up Mechanism for Nicaragua, in a move the Organization of American States criticized as "further plac[ing] Nicaragua in the terrain of authoritarianism." Since 2018, many Nicaraguans have been forced to seek protection elsewhere, including in the United States.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Conduct hearings on the situation in Nicaragua, particularly the crackdowns on free press and political protesters;
- Ensure that the administration extends protection to Nicaraguans fleeing political repression in the United States.

ASIA

Philippines

Congress must forcefully address the devastating human rights impact of the so-called war on drugs in the Philippines and the alarming lack of criticism and pressure for reform from the Trump administration. Since Rodrigo Duterte became president. Since June 2016, more than 7,000 people have reportedly been killed by police officers carrying out antidrug operations and by unknown armed persons, many of whom have links to the police. Each day leaves more people senselessly dead, fueled by the dehumanizing rhetoric of high-level government officials, including Duterte.

- **Recommendations:** Congress should
  Publicly and forcefully denounce the rampant human rights violations associated with the Philippines' "war on drugs," and call on the Trump administration to do the same. Strong statements from Congress and from the Administration would provide important support for the individuals and organizations combating the unlawful killings and underscore that their voices are being heard and that they have support around the world.

- Carefully review and restrict U.S. assistance that goes to the Philippine National Police (PNP). Take measures to ensure that no U.S. assistance supports human rights violations, including in the "war on drugs." Congress should link future assistance to clear progress in reforming the PNP and ending the impunity of police officers who commit or oversee unlawful killings. S.1055, also known as the Philippines Human Rights Accountability and Counternarcotics Act of 2017, introduced by Senators Cardin and Rubio in 2017, has promising provisions on the issue of security force assistance.
- Support the efforts led by Philippine HRDs and the Commission on Human Rights. With limited budgets, and in the face of harassment and threats, Philippine HRDs are documenting the horrors of the "drug war."
- Demand that the Trump Administration, in any future calls or meetings with the Duterte government, demand an end to the extrajudicial executions.

Myanmar

Since August 2017, over 700,000 Rohingyas have fled to neighboring Bangladesh to escape the brutality of the Myanmar military that include: mass murder, torture, rape and other forms of sexual violence, enforced disappearances and forced starvation.

In its September 2018 report of atrocities in the Northern Rakhine State, the DOS concluded that the campaign of violence against the Rohingya were "well-planned and coordinated." Amnesty International has documented a system of apartheid that restricts freedom of movement of the Rohingya, and denies adequate access to healthcare, education, work, and food. Increased humanitarian assistance is necessary and urgent for Rohingya refugees in overcrowded and unsustainable camps in Bangladesh.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Hold perpetrators of human rights violations against the Rohingya accountable.
- Engage the Trump administration to refer the situation in Myanmar to the International Criminal Court and support the established a mechanism that will collect and preserve evidence that can be used for a future criminal proceeding.

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

In Poland, the ruling Law and Justice party has launched a series of reforms aimed at undermining the independence of the country's judiciary. In Hungary, legislation supported by Viktor Orbán has severely constricted space for independent media and civil society. In Ukraine, government officials have responded to violent attacks by extremist groups against LGBTI activists, anti-corruption protestors, and ethnic minorities with apathy.

Trump administration officials have pointedly refused to raise these concerns at a senior level, instead abetting the region's authoritarian slide. President Trump has heaped high praise on the Polish government both in Warsaw and in Washington. Three decades after the collapse of the Berlin wall, we are witnessing the closure of political space in Central and Eastern Europe.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Conduct hearings on closing space for media, civil society, and activism in Europe.
- Ensure that Secretary Pompeo's recently announced effort to strengthen local media in Poland, Hungary and other regional countries translates into an effective, sustained, and well-funded program.

Russia

Allegations of improper contacts between President Trump and President Putin have dominated U.S. Media headlines. Yet behind the narrow media coverage, the Kremlin continues its assault on human rights.

In April 2017, a Russian newspaper reported that over 100 men believed to be gay had been abducted, tortured and, in at least several cases, murdered. Despite Members of Congress calling on them to do so, President Trump and then-Secretary of State Rex Tillerson failed to publicly condemn the purges for months. Russia's continued detention of activists and human rights defenders from occupied Crimea, including Oleh Sentsov and Emir Usein-Kuku, has been roundly condemned by human rights organizations around the world. The Kremlin has repeatedly cracked down on peaceful protestors by limiting their ability to assemble and detaining their leaders, including opposition activist Aleksei Navalny.

According to the limited statements made available to the public, President Trump failed to raise these pressing issues during his July 2018 meeting with Putin in Helsinki. President Trump's performance during the Helsinki summit was denounced by numerous prominent bipartisan voices, as well as the American public as a whole.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Request details on President Trump's preparation for the Helsinki summit and request clarity from senior administration officials about whether human rights were raised and, if not, why not.
- Request that Secretary Pompeo provide Congress with a report detailing what actions senior U.S. diplomats have taken to convey U.S. concerns to the Kremlin over the increasing harassment of Russian HRDs and what the administration plans to do going forward.

AFRICA

Cameroon

For the last 35 years under the leadership of President Paul Biya, the country's military has enjoyed absolute impunity as it has committed egregious human rights violations. These abuses worsened as the country began to be targeted by the armed group Boko Haram in 2013. Security forces arbitrarily detained persons suspected of being supporters or members of Boko Haram. They committed extrajudicial executions, torture, and destroyed villages and farmlands with impunity.

The security forces have implemented similarly brutal tactics in response to escalating unrest in the Anglophone regions of the country. Much more must be done to prevent more Cameroonians from

joining armed separatist's groups. Pressure for reform and respect for human rights in Cameron must come with equal force from highest levels of U.S. Government.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Press the administration to convene a meeting of key allies of and donors to Cameroon to discuss a joint diplomatic initiative to create an independent commission of inquiry into human rights violations by the Cameroon security forces and armed groups in Cameroon.
- Building on the recent decision of the administration to suspend some security assistance to the Cameroonian military based on human rights concerns, Congress should add its voice to the calls for reform by reintroducing and passing H.Res.1111, which calls on the Government of Cameroon, armed separatist groups, and all citizens to respect human rights and adopt nonviolent approaches to conflict resolution.

Ethiopia

In 2019 Ethiopia will have to make good on the promises of reform ushered in by the appointment Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed Ali at the beginning of April 2018. While the government has released over 10,000 political prisoners, much of the legislation that resulted in their incarceration remains in place. A number of banned opposition groups have returned to the country and have held events but sweeping repressive legislation is still the law and could be enforced at any given moment. At the same time impunity for human rights violations by the security forces before and during the last two states of emergency remains in place and will increasingly shape a difficult, transition period of negotiation between the country's stakeholders. Ethnically based violence is on the rise and the government is under increasing criticism both failing to protect people while also still targeting youth activists in mass arrests.

Recommendations: Congress should

Press the Trump administration to work with the Ethiopian government to enact key reforms including;

- Request a report from the DOS assessing the key human rights concerns in Ethiopia, progress made by the Abiy government and policy initiatives that U.S. can and should support.
- Work with the Departments of State and Justice to explore rule of law capacity building programs with the Ethiopian Judiciary.
- Pass S. Res. 168 encouraging key human rights reform in Ethiopia.

Nigeria

The Nigerian security forces have been linked to serious human rights violations in their counterinsurgency campaign against the armed group Boko Haram. Violations have included extrajudicial executions, torture, arbitrary arrest and detention and rape and have contributed to a culture of impunity and increasing levels of violence in states in the country's north east and middle belt regions. Security forces have also destroyed homes and livelihoods contributing to an internally displaced population (IDPs) of nearly two million people.

The Nigerian Government's failure to hold anyone accountable for the abuses, in some cases denying outright the allegations and in others cases justifying the activities of the military or

launching investigations whose findings are never released. The increasing levels of violence is driving a rise in the number of IDPs could also further destabilize the country.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Require a report from the DOS assessing the Buhari government's efforts to enforce accountability and reform.
- Place a freeze on planned military transfers to the Nigerian military until such a time that Congress is convinced that credible and transparent steps have been taken by the Nigerian government toward rebuilding professional, accountable security services in Nigeria.

III. Opposing Discrimination against Vulnerable Populations and Stigmatized Groups

Human Rights Documentation by the DOS

In 2018, there were glaring absences from the DOS' Human Rights Reports relating to reproductive rights. The reports stripped out sexual and reproductive rights, effectively erasing the human rights concerns of millions, and instead included only very narrow mentions of coerced abortion, involuntary sterilization or coercive population control methods. This "narrowing" has produced reports that are ideologically-driven interpretations of human rights that ignore key rights for women– to health, bodily integrity, and to control when they have children. Not only does this undermine the United States' stated commitment to human rights, it woefully misunderstands women's rights and the centrality of sexual and reproductive rights to ensuring equal rights for all. These glaring absences in the reports are a diminishment not only of women's rights, but of the integrity of the report itself and the State Department's commitment to human rights. It appears that this effort to erase the rights of millions of people around the world will continue in 2019, and Congress must oppose this.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Express its outrage over the omission of key human rights from the 2018 reports to Secretary Pompeo, schedule a hearing to review and discuss the 2019 reports and to take steps to ensure that that going forward the Human Rights reports include the full scope of human rights and not a selective, narrower, ideologically-driven subset of rights.

Ending the Deadly Global Gag Rule

The Global Gag Rule, also known as the Mexico City Policy, was reinstated by President Trump in 2017, and prohibits foreign NGOs that receive U.S. foreign aid from using their own money to inform the public or educate their government on the need to make safe abortion available, provide legal abortion services, or provide advice on where to get an abortion. The Global Gag rule means that NGOs that receive U.S. International aid for other reasons-- like maternal health, HIV prevention, or fighting malaria or Zika —must choose whether to lose critical U.S. funding or provide the services their patients need. Documentation has shown that the policy restricts a basic right to speech and the right to make informed health decisions, as well as harms the health and lives of poor women by making it more difficult to access family planning services. Additionally, it has also been found that the policy does not reduce abortion.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Permanently end the Global Gag Rule;
- Increase funding for international family planning and reproductive health (FP/RH) programs.

Stopping Gender-Based Violence

Every year, violence devastates the lives of millions of women and girls worldwide. Freedom from violence is a human right; yet, one out of every three women worldwide will be physically, sexually or otherwise abused during her lifetime—with rates reaching 70 percent in some countries. Violence against women and girls is a global epidemic and a human rights violation occurring daily, ranging from harmful practices such as rape, "honor killings," female genital cutting and human trafficking. Violence against women destabilizes countries, impedes economic progress and prevents women from contributing to their community.

The United States has as a critical role to play in reducing gender-based violence (GBV) globally. The International Violence Against Women Act (IVAWA) makes ending violence against women and girls a top U.S. diplomatic and foreign assistance priority. The bill creates a more effective and efficient strategy to combat GBV by streamlining the U.S. government's current efforts.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Pass the International Violence Against Women Act (IVAWA)
- Ensure robust funding to combat violence against women and girls globally through the Departments of State and USAID.

Protecting LGBTI Rights

In May 2018, Secretary of State Pompeo stated that the U.S. "firmly opposes criminalization, violence and serious acts of discrimination such as housing, employment and government services directed against LGBTI persons." He went on to say that the U.S. uses "public and private diplomacy to raise human rights concerns, provide emergency assistance to people at risk, and impose visa restrictions and economic sanctions against those who persecute them."

The U.S. government must continue its efforts to hold individuals who violate the human rights of LGBTI people to account, supporting LGBTI civil society as part of our broader democracy, rights and governance funding, and protecting LGBTI people seeking asylum.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Request a report from the Department of State providing an update on how the Department is enforcing the Equality Act with specific reference to the treatment of LGBTI person who have sought asylum in the United States in the last 24 months.

IV. Improving the Respect and Protection of Human Rights while Pursing National Security Interests

Use of Lethal Force

Since early 2017 the Trump administration has dramatically increased the use of lethal force, particularly using air strikes, both within and outside theaters of armed conflict. As a result of this policy there has been a sharp increase in the number of people killed by U.S. strikes in Afghanistan, Syria, Iraq, Somalia and Yemen. The Trump administration has provided little explanation of their purpose or information about their consequences or disclosed information necessary to allow independent assessment of whether those strikes complied with international law. The administration has also failed to demonstrate that its investigations of civilian casualties are sufficient to provide credible assessments of the number of civilian deaths and other harm these strikes have caused.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Press the administration for complete details on its use of lethal force to ascertain its compliance or lack of compliance with international humanitarian and human rights law;
- Request that the administration put in place a thorough and credible civilian casualty investigation and reporting process, and a fair process for providing compensation and assistance to victims.

US Arms Sales to Yemen and Saudi Arabia

In May 2017 President Trump announced the conclusion of a $110 billion arms deal with Saudi Arabia. While experts have since cast doubt on the accuracy of this advertised sum it is clear that the Trump administration sells substantial amounts of weapons to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, many of which are deployed in the Saudi-led coalition's war in Yemen. That war, waged with little concern for civilian lives and international law, has to date caused at least 10,000 civilian casualties. Save the Children estimated that 130 children were dying every day from malnutrition or cholera.

Amnesty International has documented how U.S. munitions sold to the coalition were used against civilians, often to shocking affect. In one case, a U.S.-manufactured Raytheon Paveway laser-guided bomb killed 16 civilians and injured 17 more. Media reports indicated that a bomb supplied by the U.S. was responsible for killing 40 children in August 2018. Concurrently, Amnesty International and others have documented that the Saudi-led coalition and their Yemeni allies have run a network of secret prisons in Southern Yemen where Yemenis are disappeared, tortured and sometimes killed.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Pass the Saudi Arabia Accountability and Yemen Act of 2019, which suspends the supply of weapons, munitions and related military equipment to Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and other parties to the conflict in Yemen.

- Ensure the Pentagon reports accurately on and responds appropriately to civilian casualties caused by U.S. military operations.

The Pentagon recently acknowledged, in response to a report by Amnesty International, that it had failed to report dozens of civilian casualties resulting from the US-led Coalition's assault on Raqqa, Syria in 2017. While this acknowledgement is welcome, it is not enough. The State Department should urge the Pentagon to comply with its international obligations to investigate all allegations of civilian casualties caused by U.S. lethal force where war crimes may have been committed, including the cases documented by Amnesty, to report publicly on the outcomes of those investigations, and to provide compensation and reparation for victims. The U.S. military has instead issued summary conclusions saying the laws of war were not violated, with no details of how any investigations were carried out. Meanwhile, it is clear from the findings of Amnesty's research that many more alleged civilian casualties from the U.S. assault on Raqqa have not been investigated or acknowledged. The State Department should work with the military to ensure that it establishes a reliable mechanism for receiving and evaluating claims of civilian casualties and civilian harm, and for providing compensation to victims.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Schedule hearings in to civilian casualties and other human rights abuses associated with the assault on Raqqa in 2017.
- Write to the State Department and the Pentagon to investigate all allegations of civilian casualties caused by U.S. lethal force where war crimes may have been committed and ask what actions have been undertaken to provide compensation and reparation for victims.

Guantanamo Bay

The continued detention of 40 men at Guantanamo Bay, most without charge or trial, is a human rights travesty and a clear violation of the U.S. obligations under international human rights law. Those who have been charged were charged in the Military Commission system at Guantanamo, which fails to meet even the minimum international fair trial standards. The judges are not independent, the government has denied defendants access to evidence, and it has repeatedly intruded on what are supposed to be confidential relationships between the defendants and their attorneys. Meanwhile, the Trump administration has made clear that it has no intention of transferring any detainees out of Guantanamo, including the five detainees who have already been cleared for release from the prison by all relevant U.S. national security agencies. This is clearly arbitrary detention in violation of international human rights law.

Toffiq al-Bihani, for example, is a 46-year old Yemeni detainee who has been in U.S. custody without charge or trial for more than 16 years. He is one of the detainees named by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence as having been tortured by the CIA in U.S. custody. He has never even been charged with a crime. Mr. Al-Bihani was slated for conditional transfer by the Obama administration in 2010, either to Yemen when the security situation improved, or to another country that would accept him. Saudi Arabia, where he was born and has extended family, had agreed to accept him. Yet the transfer never happened. His continued detention at Guantanamo, more than 16 years after he was turned over to the U.S. by Afghan authorities and eight years after he was cleared to leave, is unconscionable and a clear violation of international law.

Recommendations: Congress should

- Lift the current statutory restrictions on transferring Guantanamo detainees to the United States so as to allow those detainees accused of wrongdoing to be tried in the U.S. federal court system. Those not accused of crimes must be released.

Amnesty International USA would once again like to thank the Committee for holding the hearings. For more information, please contact Adotei Akwei (202) 509-8148 or aakwei@aiusa.org.

Sincerely,

Joanne Lin
National Director
Advocacy and Government Relations
Amnesty International USA

Adotei Akwei
Deputy Director
Advocacy and Government Relations
Amnesty International USA

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Questions for the Record from Rep. Ted Yoho
The Trump Administration's Foreign Policy: A Mid-Term Assessment
February 27, 2019

Question:

What are some tangible steps Congress can take to keep American foreign policy on track?

Answer:

Secretary Albright did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Acknowledging that you are a refugee yourself, do you agree that individuals who wish to enter the United States at the southern border should do so legally?

Answer:

Secretary Albright did not submit a response in time for printing.

○