

**PROTECTING U.S. CITIZENS ABROAD FROM
TERRORISM**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS
AND TERRORISM
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

MAY 2, 2002

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

81-762 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2002

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware, *Chairman*

PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland	JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts	CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin	GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota	BILL FRIST, Tennessee
BARBARA BOXER, California	LINCOLN D. CHAFEE, Rhode Island
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey	GEORGE ALLEN, Virginia
BILL NELSON, Florida	SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, West Virginia	MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming

ANTONY J. BLINKEN, *Staff Director*

PATRICIA A. MCNERNEY, *Republican Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS
AND TERRORISM

BARBARA BOXER, California, *Chairman*

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts	MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
BILL NELSON, Florida	BILL FRIST, Tennessee
JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., DELAWARE	JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas

CONTENTS

	Page
Andruch, Dianne M., Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State, Washington, DC	5
Prepared statement	8
Bergin, Peter E., Principal Deputy Assistant for Diplomatic Security and Director of the Diplomatic Security Service, Department of State, Washington, DC	12
Prepared statement	13
Ondeck, Thomas P., president, GlobalOptions, Inc., Washington, DC	28
Prepared statement	30
Penner, Hon. Vernon, vice president for Corporate International Services, Crisis Management Worldwide; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services, Annapolis, MD	26
Smyth, Frank, Washington Representative, The Committee to Protect Journalists, Washington, DC	22
Prepared statement	24
Spivack, Dr. Sheryl E., associate professor of Tourism Studies, George Washington University, Washington, DC	33
Prepared statement	35

PROTECTING U.S. CITIZENS ABROAD FROM TERRORISM

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 2002

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
OPERATIONS AND TERRORISM,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:16 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Barbara Boxer (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Present: Senators Boxer, Bill Nelson, and Enzi.

Senator BOXER. The International Operations and Terrorism Subcommittee will come to order. We believe that Senator Enzi is on his way and as soon as he arrives we will take his opening statement, but we have a time constraint, so we are going to move forward.

I am very pleased to be joined this morning by Senator Nelson, who has unfortunately an early commitment, but he cares about this issue, and he is going to make an opening statement. I want to thank Senator Enzi and his staff for their cooperation in putting this hearing together.

Following the September 11 terrorist attack on America that tragically claimed so many lives and the anthrax scare that remains unsolved to this day, the United States has placed a real focus on stopping terrorism on U.S. soil. We have done this by creating an Office of Homeland Security, tightening airport security, and devoting more resources and funding to ensure security here at home.

I believe all of that is terribly important. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I have worked hard on many of those issues that fall into the area of homeland defense. Yet, as Chair of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on International Operations and Terrorism and with my Ranking Member Senator Enzi, we recognize that, in addition to the new emphasis on homeland security, Congress has a responsibility and a duty to continue our oversight role in reviewing the threat that terrorism poses to U.S. citizens abroad.

Just in the past few months, our embassies have been threatened, our tourists kidnaped and killed, a journalist executed, and even in a church in Pakistan Americans were targeted and murdered.

In our hearing today we hope to accomplish a few goals. First, we hope to receive an overview of terrorist threats against U.S. citi-

zens living, working, and traveling abroad. Second, we hope to hear what the current procedures are for private citizens and organizations who seek to obtain U.S. Government assistance abroad in dealing with the terrorism threat. Third, we want to review the plans and procedures that are in place at the State Department to protect U.S. citizens abroad against terrorism, including coordination with other Federal agencies and efforts to encourage foreign governments to enact counterterrorism policies that lead to better protection of U.S. citizens and all people abroad. Fourth, I hope we will hear recommendations on improving the security of Americans abroad, especially in light of the September 11 attacks. We may want to look at legislation. We may not have to do that. But we hope that you will come forward with those ideas.

To help us learn more about this issue, we have invited two distinguished panels of witnesses to testify this morning. On the first panel we have two witnesses from the State Department. Mr. Peter Bergin is the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security and Director of the Diplomatic Security Service. Joining him is Ms. Dianne Andruch. Did I say that right?

Ms. ANDRUCH. Fine.

Senator BOXER. She is the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Overseas Citizens Services.

On the second panel we have four witnesses. First is Mr. Peter Smyth, the Washington representative for The Committee to Protect Journalists. Second is Ambassador Vernon Penner, a terrorism expert with Crisis Management Worldwide. Ambassador Penner also held the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services during the Reagan administration. Third is Mr. Thomas Ondeck, a tourism expert at GlobalOptions, Inc. Mr. Ondeck provides consulting services to businesses operating overseas. Fourth, our witness will be Dr. Sheryl Spivack, assistant professor of Tourism Studies at George Washington University.

Finally, I want to make it clear this hearing is not designed to persuade Americans against traveling abroad or studying in foreign countries or conducting business overseas or joining the Foreign Service. This hearing acknowledges that U.S. citizens will and should continue to go abroad in even greater numbers and I for one encourage all Americans to reach out beyond our borders. That is the way we make the difference in the world.

But I hope this hearing will lead the way for improvements in security against terrorism for these Americans and all people.

Senator Enzi, I am so glad to see you. I wonder if you would yield briefly because Senator Nelson has to leave us.

Senator ENZI. Sure.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so much.

Senator Nelson and then Senator Enzi.

Senator NELSON. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you, Senator Enzi.

I just wanted to come and lend my support to you and Senator Enzi in the conduct of this hearing, because of having just returned from 2½ weeks abroad with Senator Shelby. As we have gone from embassy to embassy and seeing the considerable threats that our diplomatic personnel endure, whether it is in a wonderful facility,

for example, in Islamabad, well-constructed, relatively new, set back in a diplomatic compound, and yet it was in that same diplomatic compound that the bomber, the suicide bomber, infiltrated into the church.

One of the most popular employees of our embassy was the lady that was killed with her child. A family of Floridians were in the church that day. We had to get to work to try to get them air-evac'ed out. They are going to live. It is the Wamble family. They are from the Tampa Bay area. But we are talking about long-time, big-time recovery, the son with brain injury, the mother with major injuries. Thank the good Lord, they are going to live. But again, it just brings it home, the personal aspect of Americans abroad.

Or I remember the embassy in Damascus, an embassy that is an old embassy, but an embassy that is right on the street. While Senator Shelby and I were there, there was a demonstration of 100,000 people and we thanked the President of Syria for the protection in our 2-hour meeting. We had a face-off on some other issues. We thanked him for his help as we go after al-Qaeda, but we certainly disagreed with his policy with regard to Hezbollah.

But right at the outset of the meeting, we said: Thank you, Mr. President, for protecting our diplomatic personnel. They had the riot police lined up shoulder to shoulder with shields out there, protecting not only the embassy but the Ambassador's residence, which by the way had been ransacked back in the late nineties, and the Ambassador's wife had to take refuge in a safe room in the top of the embassy residence.

So we have really got our hands full in the protection of our diplomatic people. Then I remember on the stop that we broke up the trip coming home from Turkey. By the way, we are building a new consulate in Istanbul, that will give us some more protection, because we have had bombs and rocket grenades shot at our embassy in Istanbul.

But breaking up the trip coming home in what is considered a relatively—and I make the point—secure country, Switzerland. We landed at a military base, we went to our embassy in Berne for the country team briefing. It is in a residential neighborhood. There is not a lot of protection there. We are hoping that we can acquire some facilities right next to the Ambassador's residence and then create an expanded perimeter.

But I bring up the point about Switzerland because when you are dealing with terrorists you never want to be surprised that you are surprised. There is nothing that says that they are not going—which we tried to share with the Swiss citizens and the Swiss Government as we were there: You better be prepared. Nothing says that you are immune from terrorist attack.

So I wanted to come and bring you these personal observations. My heart goes out to some of—and by the way, I was so impressed with our diplomatic personnel. My heart goes out to people like Wendy Chamberlain, the Ambassador to Pakistan, who after September 11—she is a single mom—she had to take her children back to the States, return to Islamabad.

Early this year she was so excited. I saw her here. She was so excited, she was getting her children to come back, and then the bombing of the church, not only the evacuation of all dependents,

but the reduction of the embassy staff down to just essential personnel.

So there is a great deal of personal disruption in family lives. I just wanted to come and give you my personal observations, Madam Chairman.

Senator BOXER. I want to thank you very much. I think you have added a lot to the hearing just because you were in the hot spots. We thank you for going there, for doing your work with Senator Shelby, and we will absolutely consider everything you have said as we go on with this hearing.

Senator Nelson.

Senator NELSON. By the way, I say that, I just said a few countries. We were in about six or eight countries, including Kabul, Afghanistan. Our embassy there is just something to believe. They are sleeping and eating in bunkers in the embassy compound and they still continue to try to de-mine the grounds of the embassy.

We had landed in helicopters from Bagram to the Kabul Airport and suddenly a guy is out there standing, putting up his hands, saying: Do not pass; we just found a mine; we are going to blow it up. And they blew it up right on the side of the road as we waited before we passed through.

So my hat is off to our embassy personnel overseas. Thank you for letting me share that.

Senator BOXER. Senator Nelson, I think I always thought it was rough here in the Senate, but it is a little rougher outside.

Senator ENZI, thank you so much.

Senator ENZI. Good morning. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I appreciate the comments that you have made and especially appreciate the comments you made about how we are not trying to discourage travel or education abroad. In fact, we do encourage that, because every trip that I have ever made has given me a much greater appreciation for what we have here in the United States.

I appreciate the comments about the embassies. Those are people who have volunteered their lives for their country, and we certainly hope we do not have to extract that big of a price. It is our responsibility to see that what they need, both the people in the embassies and the people in the military, what they need to do their job and to be safe are provided.

Of course, these things that we are talking about are not new. One of the first experiences that I had when I came to the Senate was hearing from a family in my home town of Gillette, Wyoming, who had a son in Pakistan doing an audit on his company and the entire team of auditors were wiped out in an assassination. It just does not seem like it can happen to somebody that you know.

But I do thank you for calling this hearing to look at the protection of U.S. citizens abroad, regardless of what they are doing there, in the uncertain terrorist environment that currently characterizes the world community. We do have a greater understanding now.

As we all know, there is a heightened sense of fear that terrorist acts will grow in number and intensity among our civilian population. Feelings of vulnerability have been increased, given the unprecedented attacks on our own soil last September. With that heightened awareness of threat and the increased sense of personal

vulnerability at home, when it comes to considering travel abroad Americans have been assessing the risks of doing so as never before.

U.S. citizens are increasingly prime targets for international terrorism. In 2000, approximately 47 percent of all terrorist incidents worldwide were directed against U.S. nationals or property, according to the State Department, and the vast majority of such attacks have occurred on foreign soil. The numbers of those who do decide to travel or live abroad are significant. Americans make approximately 60 million trips abroad each year and approximately 3.2 million Americans reside overseas. Notably, the U.S. business community overseas is a primary target of international terrorism in over 65 percent of such incidents.

Clearly, the U.S. Government has a role and a duty to its citizens, and I look forward to the first panel reporting on what the State Department has been doing. However, this is a growing and complicated phenomenon, requiring the best efforts of government and private sectors together.

Witnesses on the second panel will provide context on what is on the minds of travelers and business people and what measures they are considering for coping with personal safety threats and vulnerabilities when abroad.

I look forward to hearing from today's panelists and wish to thank them in advance for bringing to this subcommittee their expert views on matters that grip each and every one of us desiring to travel overseas in this post-9/11 world.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so much, Senator Enzi.

We are going to hold each speaker on the panel to 7 minutes because of time constraints. We want to make sure we have a chance to ask you questions. I hope that works out. We will put your full statement in the record, and why do we not start with you, Ms. Andruch, again Deputy Assistant Secretary for Overseas Citizens Services at the State Department.

STATEMENT OF DIANNE M. ANDRUCH, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR OVERSEAS CITIZENS SERVICES, BUREAU OF CONSULAR AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. ANDRUCH. Thank you very much and thank you also for the opportunity to testify this morning on behalf of the Bureau of Consular Affairs in the Department of State.

Senator BOXER. Could you pull that mike forward? I think people in the back cannot hear.

Ms. ANDRUCH. This is an especially important topic to us, the protection of U.S. citizens abroad, including embassy personnel, journalists, and private citizens, from terrorist threats. The Bureau of Consular Affairs is charged with exercising the Secretary of State's responsibility to provide consular protection and service to American citizens abroad. As the Senator already mentioned, approximately 3.2 million Americans reside abroad and Americans make more than 60 million trips outside the United States each year. There is no higher priority of the Department of State than the protection and welfare of American citizens.

U.S. citizens traveling, studying, and working abroad have always been on the front lines of America's struggles with terror, crime, and threats to safety. As consular officers, we have witnessed firsthand the dreadful consequences of terrorism against our fellow citizens abroad, for the past quarter century and more. Recent events, however, and the sacrifice and suffering of more American families, show once again that we must all be more vigilant as the war against American terrorism—America's fight against terror continues.

Since the tragedy of September 11, we have redoubled our efforts to protect U.S. citizens abroad. In our private-public partnership with Americans abroad, working with our colleagues in the Diplomatic Security Office and other government agencies, the Bureau of Consular Affairs is always exploring new ways to assist and protect American citizens. In my testimony today, I will discuss some of our efforts to assess the dangers confronting Americans abroad and to tailor our programs and services to the needs of our citizens.

Our Overseas Citizens Services Directorate, OCS, provides vital assistance to U.S. citizens abroad on a daily basis and especially during periods of crisis. One of our primary objectives is to give Americans easily accessible information alerting them to potentially dangerous situations. While unforeseen events can and do occur anywhere, we believe that safe, informed travel is best achieved by learning everything possible about conditions in that country before the travel begins.

The Department informs Americans of potential threats to their safety abroad through the three-tiered Consular Information Program. Consular information sheets, public announcements, and travel warnings are available on our Consular Affairs home page at travel.state.gov.

Senator BOXER. Say that one more time.

Ms. ANDRUCH. The Web page is travel.state.gov.

That Web site got over 118 million hits last year. Since September 11 we have issued two worldwide caution public announcements, two regional Middle East public announcements, and numerous country-specific public announcements and travel warnings to address terrorism and other threats.

I would like to take a moment to address briefly how threat material in this program is assessed. Security information contained in public announcements and travel warnings is based on information that is gathered from many sources, including our embassies and consulates abroad, U.S. intelligence agency open sources, and of course from other friendly governments.

The Bureau of Diplomatic Security determines if the threat information is specific, credible, and non-counterable. The Bureau of Consular Affairs coordinates the final text with the Department of State offices involved, embassies overseas, and other U.S. Government agencies.

In addition to the consular information program, American communities abroad are alerted to threats through what we call a warden system, or a network of providing information, which is designed and maintained by our embassies and consulates. These systems provide a quick mechanism for sharing information when there is imminent danger to the resident American community.

Following September 11, U.S. embassies and consulates used these systems intensively to disseminate messages relevant to the safety and security of Americans. In March of this year, we authorized posts to use their systems to distribute domestic threat advisories that were issued by the Attorney General or Governor Ridge here in the United States.

I would like to take this opportunity as well to let you know about changes in our critical consular services for Americans since September 11. One of our short-term goals is the creation of an on-line registration program for American travelers. This new system will create a central Internet site where Americans can register on-line with any embassy or consulate in the world. We plan to pilot test this new system early this summer.

In addition, we established a call center through which Americans without Internet access can get the latest information. Recognizing the need to improve our ability to track individual cases of Americans involved in crises overseas and report on the situation, the Bureau of Consular Affairs has worked with private sector information and technology firms to create a new crisis management software application. Again, in the summer of this year we will deploy this system to all our embassies and consulates abroad.

Another major change that the Bureau implemented since September 11 is a new overseas passport issuance program. On April 8 of this year, American citizens who require issuance of a U.S. passport while residing or traveling abroad will be issued the latest state-of-the-art passport. It incorporates a digitized image with other enhanced security features. The new passport—and I happen to have a copy here—has many features that make it one of the most secure travel documents produced anywhere in the world.

Issuing these more secure passports, putting these into circulation, instead of relying on the less sophisticated versions that have been issued by embassies and consulates abroad, will further help prevent the misuse of American passports by criminals, terrorists, and others.

In light of the events of September 11, it is more important than ever to reach out to congressional staff, business, and community leaders, schools, and other key stakeholders regarding our efforts to safeguard Americans overseas, protect our borders via vigorous visa adjudication processes, and also ensure the integrity of our U.S. passports. Since September 11 we have spoken to hundreds of key stakeholders all across the country. We partner with the Bureau of Security, Overseas Security Advisory Council, known as OSAC, and participate in their outreach activities with American business, security experts and other private organizations.

Our consular sections, working closely with the embassy regional security officer, also provide safety and security briefings for the local American community as needed.

Is that my timer?

Senator BOXER. Yes, and I will ask, I have your statement and we will put it in the record and we will get to some of what else you have to say.

Ms. ANDRUCH. OK, and I will be glad to take questions. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Andruch follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DIANNE ANDRUCH, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
STATE, OVERSEAS CITIZENS SERVICES, BUREAU OF CONSULAR AFFAIRS

Madame Chair and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the Bureau of Consular Affairs of the Department of State on the very important topic "protecting U.S. citizens abroad, including Embassy personnel, journalists, and private citizens, from terrorist threats."

The Bureau of Consular Affairs (CA) is charged with exercising the Secretary of State's responsibility to provide consular protection and services to United States citizens abroad. Approximately 3.2 million Americans reside abroad and Americans make more than 60 million trips outside the U.S. each year. There is no higher priority of the Department of State than the protection and welfare of Americans overseas.

U.S. citizens traveling, studying and working abroad have always been on the front lines of America's struggles with terror, crime and threats to safety. As consular officers, we have witnessed first hand the dreadful consequences of terrorism against our fellow citizens abroad for the past quarter century and more. Recent events, and the sacrifice and suffering of more American families, show once again that we must be all the more vigilant as America's fight against terror continues.

Since the tragedy of September 11th, we have redoubled our efforts to protect U.S. citizens abroad. In our private-public partnership with Americans abroad, working with our colleagues in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) and other government agencies, CA is always exploring new ways to assist and protect our citizens. In my testimony today, I will discuss some of our efforts to assess the dangers confronting Americans abroad and to tailor our programs and services to the real needs of our citizens.

Our Overseas Citizens Services Directorate (OCS) provides vital assistance to U.S. citizens abroad on a daily basis and during periods of crisis. We exercise this responsibility through a staff in Washington and our consular colleagues in our embassies and consulates throughout the world. Consular duty personnel are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week in Washington and overseas.

One of our primary objectives is to give Americans easily accessible information alerting them to potentially dangerous situations. While unforeseen events can occur anywhere, we believe that safe, informed travel is best achieved by learning everything possible about conditions in the country or region you are visiting.

The Department informs Americans of potential threats to their safety abroad through its three-tiered Consular Information Program. Consular Information Sheets, Public Announcements and Travel Warnings are available on our Consular Affairs home page at www.travel.state.gov, which received nearly 118 million inquiries last year. Our embassies and consulates also maintain their own Web sites to alert Americans in country to local developments. Since the bombings of our Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam in 1998, we have found it useful to issue Worldwide Caution Public Announcements, to alert Americans generally to the fact that terrorists have threatened action against Americans and American interests abroad.

Since September 11th, we have issued two World Wide Caution Public Announcements, two regional Middle East Public Announcements, and numerous country-specific Public Announcements and Travel Warnings that address terrorism, safety and security. Of the 29 current Travel Warnings, 9 are related to possible terrorist threats against American citizens: Israel, the West Bank and Gaza (4/02/02); Pakistan (3/22/02); Yemen (3/18/02); Afghanistan (2/28/02); Algeria (12/11/01); Indonesia (11/23/01); Tajikistan (9/26/01); Colombia (4/17/01); and Lebanon (8/28/00).

We also have Travel Warnings for Iran, Iraq and Libya, but these are to warn Americans that there is no U.S. diplomatic presence in these countries and that the governments are hostile to the United States.

Of the 19 current Public Announcements, 9 are related to possible terrorist threats against American citizens: Middle East Update (04/24/02); Peru (4/19/02); Philippines (4/18/02); Worldwide Caution (3/17/02); Turkmenistan (3/15/02); Colombia (2/22/02); Uzbekistan (1/8/02); Kyrgyz Republic (1/2/02); and Malaysia (12/5/01). In addition, we issued a Fact Sheet about chemical biological agents in October 2001. Copies of these documents have been made available to the Committee.

I would like to take a moment to discuss briefly how threat material in our Consular Information Program is assessed. The Aviation Security Improvement Act of 1990, passed in response to the 1988 Pan Am 103 tragedy, provided criteria (specific, credible, non-counterable) to be used in evaluating aviation threats. The Department adopted these criteria more generally in evaluating all threat information. The Act also established the tenets, adopted Government-wide as the "No Double

Standard” policy, for dissemination of threat information to the American public. In keeping with the “No Double Standard” policy, therefore, documents often inform private Americans of security measures adopted by a U.S. mission within a specific country, such as limits on in-country travel or that a post has gone to authorized departure status.

The security information contained in Public Announcements and Travel Warnings is based on threat information gathered from all sources, including our embassies and consulates, the U.S. intelligence community, open sources, and our allies. Very often, a post will specifically request a Public Announcement and provide suggested language. Once the Bureau of Diplomatic Security determines that the threat information is specific, credible, and non-counterable, the Bureau of Consular Affairs works closely with posts to develop appropriate language, and clears the announcement with posts and other interested offices within the Department.

In addition to the Consular Information Program, American communities abroad are alerted to threats through warden systems, which are designed and maintained by our embassies and consulates. This system provides a quick mechanism for sharing information when there is imminent danger to the American community. Because embassies now communicate with hundreds or even thousands of citizens, the traditional warden system has evolved into a combination of telephone, multi-fax, e-mail, high frequency radio, media and home page mechanisms. The best method of communication is determined on a country-specific basis within the context of local circumstances.

Following September 11th, U.S. embassies and consulates used their warden systems intensively to disseminate Worldwide Public Announcements, new Travel Warnings, and other messages relevant to the safety and security of Americans. In addition, we established a call center through which Americans without Internet access can receive updates to the Consular Information Program by telephone. In March 2002, we authorized posts to use their warden systems to distribute domestic threat advisories issued by the Attorney General or Homeland Security Agency without prior Department approval.

One of our short-term goals is the creation of an on-line registration program for American travelers. This new system will create a central Internet site where Americans can register on-line with any embassy or consulate in the world. We plan to pilot test the new system in early summer.

To respond to the concerns of Americans traveling or residing abroad, we hold many outreach briefings in the United States to key stakeholders in tourism, travel, education, and other organizations. In light of the events of September 11th, it is more important than ever to reach out to Congressional staff, business and community leaders, schools and other key stakeholders regarding our efforts to safeguard Americans overseas, protect our borders via vigorous visa adjudication processes, and ensure the integrity of U.S. passports.

Since September 11th we have spoken to hundreds of key stakeholders in Mobile, Ft. Worth, Dallas, Austin, El Paso, Palm Springs, Boise, Tulsa, Denver, Phoenix, Las Vegas, Boston, St. Louis, Orlando and the Washington, DC metropolitan area. We will continue our outreach efforts this spring and summer in San Antonio, Houston, Chicago, San Francisco, Nashville, Greensboro, NC, Miami, Stowe, VT, and Oklahoma City. We will resume our outreach sessions in the Fall with visits to additional cities around the country. Our Passport Agencies in the United States are also engaged in extensive outreach to the American community. We partner with DS’s Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC) and participate in their outreach activities with American business security experts and other private organizations. Our consular sections, working closely with the embassy Regional Security Officer, also provide safety and security briefings for the local American community overseas as needed.

When a large-scale or continuing crisis occurs, Overseas Citizen Services (OCS) frequently establishes a task force at the State Department to assist the American citizens involved overseas and to provide information to interested parties in the United States, most commonly family members and members of Congress. This group operates 24 hours a day until the crisis abates. Recognizing the need to improve its ability to track the individual cases of Americans involved in crises overseas and report on the situation, CA has worked with a private sector information technology firm to create a new crisis management software application. In mid 2002, we will deploy the system to all our embassies and consulates abroad.

Another major change implemented by CA since September 11th is our new overseas passport issuance program. Effective April 8, 2002, American citizens who require issuance of a U.S. passport while residing overseas will be issued the latest, state-of-the-art passport. It incorporates a digitized image with other enhanced security features. Because this technology is not available at U.S. embassies and con-

ulates, overseas passport issuance is being transferred to the National Passport Processing Center in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The new passport has many features that make it one of the most secure travel documents produced anywhere in the world. Issuing these more secure passports into circulation, instead of relying on the less-sophisticated versions issued by embassies and consulates, will help prevent the misuse of American passports by criminals, terrorists, and others. The Department is committed to ensuring that American citizens receive secure documents in a timely manner. U.S. embassies and consulates will continue to issue passports that are needed for urgent travel. However, such passports will be limited in validity, and cannot be extended. Bearers will be required to exchange their limited validity passports for full-validity digitized passports, at no additional cost, upon completion of their urgent travel.

Now I would like to turn my remarks to the assistance we have provided to actual American victims of terrorism. During the last year OCS has improved and expanded our assistance to American citizen victims of serious crime overseas, including victims of terrorism. As part of this program we are working more closely with victim assistance and compensation programs that serve as a resource to victims in the United States and we refer victims to specialized programs that can provide ongoing assistance when the families return to the U.S.

Consular officers in our embassies and consulates overseas and in Washington have provided extensive assistance to American citizens who have been victims of terrorist acts outside the United States. As consular officers our primary focus is the health and safety of Americans, not the investigation of the incident, but we coordinate our assistance with other agencies that have law enforcement responsibilities, including the FBI.

For example:

- Kidnapping in the Philippines

In the continuing case of a couple who were kidnapped by the Abu Sayyaf Group on May 27, 2001 in the Philippines, our consular officers in Washington and in Manila have maintained frequent and regular communication with the family in the United States, providing them with information updates and providing referrals for victim assistance as requested. An ongoing hostage taking is very traumatic, not only for the individuals who being held, but also for their families back home. Earlier this year we facilitated the travel of two family members to the Philippines where they received briefings and recorded personal appeals for the release of the hostages. We coordinated our efforts with victim assistance services; the Kansas state victim assistance agency supported their travel and we supported their stay in the Philippines. We will continue to maintain regular contact and provide assistance as needed.

The U.S. Government is currently assisting the Philippine Government in its efforts to fight the Abu Sayyaf and other terrorist groups by supplying training and equipment to the Philippine armed forces. U.S. Embassy officials in Manila remain in almost daily contact with high-level officials of the Philippine government, military and police. The U.S. has designated Abu Sayyaf as a Foreign Terrorist Organization and their assets have been blocked under U.S. law.

A Public Announcement for the Philippines citing kidnapping of U.S. citizens was in place when the American couple was taken hostage. The Philippines Public Announcement has since been updated on May 27, June 6, June 14, June 26, October 4, October 5, 2001 and April 18, 2002.

- Grenade Attack on Church in Islamabad

In the aftermath of the hand grenade attack on the church in Islamabad on March our Embassy staffs assistance was critical in responding to the immediate medical, physical and emotional needs of the victims, many of whom were members of our official community. Two Americans were killed in the attack and fourteen Americans and a Foreign Service National employee of the consular section of the Embassy were wounded.

Consular officers also assisted private U.S. citizens who were wounded in the attack. Consular officers from several overseas posts assisted in the medical evacuation of victims and provided continuing support while they convalesced in overseas medical facilities. We continue to assist the victims of this attack, linking them with services here in the U.S., including crime victim compensation and assistance programs that provide reimbursement for counseling and out of pocket medical expenses.

Following the attack, the Worldwide Caution was immediately revised on March 17. The March 17th revision notes the "growing possibility that as security is increased at official U.S. facilities, terrorists and their sympathizers will seek softer

targets.” The Pakistan Travel Warning was revised on March 18 when the Department subsequently authorized voluntary departure of non-emergency Embassy and Consulate personnel and family members in Pakistan. Additional information on threats resulted in the ordered departure on March 22 of non-emergency Embassy and Consulate personnel and family members in Pakistan, which was reflected in the March 22 Travel Warning for Pakistan.

- Israel and West Bank

With regard to events in Israel and the West Bank, most of the injured and killed Americans are residents of the area and our consular officers have been mobilized to visit them and assist as needed. In some cases the victims have been visitors to the area and we have worked with family and others to facilitate communication with home, medical treatment, and repatriation to the U.S. when they are able to travel. In a recent case we were able to link the victim to a state crime victim compensation program that is coordinating services to assist her in recovering from her serious injuries, including the loss of an eye. The Travel Warning for Israel and the West Bank of October 2000 was updated December 7, 2001 and April 2, 2002.

- Kidnapping and Murder of Daniel Pearl

Daniel Pearl, a journalist for the Wall Street Journal, was kidnapped in Karachi, Pakistan on January 23. The Consulate General in Karachi advised the Department of Mr. Pearl's death on February 21, following receipt of a videotape of his murder.

In the case of Daniel Pearl, we have coordinated our efforts with other Federal agencies to assist his widow and family, in matters such as obtaining information and assistance and compensation resources. The Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism (S/CT) discussed hostage strategy and negotiation with the parents of Daniel Pearl during key moments of the crisis. Since Mr. Pearl's last residence in the U.S. was California, we contacted the California Crime Victim Compensation Program, which in turn is working to provide assistance. Our consular officers in Paris have also provided direct outreach and support to Mrs. Pearl and we contacted the victim compensation authorities in France to facilitate additional assistance. As the trial commences our consular officers in Pakistan are in daily contact with family members providing information updates.

A Travel Warning for Pakistan has been in effect since August 10, 1999 when we first obtained information that suggested strongly that extremists based in Afghanistan were prepared to attack U.S. interests in Pakistan. As we continued to receive information regarding the safety and security of Americans in Pakistan, we subsequently updated the Travel Warning nine times: on May 14, 2001, September 17 (after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States and with the announcement of the voluntary departure of non-emergency Embassy and Consulate personnel and all family members in Pakistan), September 25, December 13, January 28, January 30, March 2, March 18 and March 22. The January 30 Travel Warning was the first reference to the kidnapping of an American journalist (Daniel Pearl), after we received information attributing his January 23 disappearance to a kidnapping. In addition, the Worldwide Caution Public Announcement was revised on February 1, 2002 to reflect reports that American citizens may be targeted for kidnapping or other terrorist actions.

- September 11th Attack and Overseas Victims and Family Members

In addition to providing assistance to Americans and their family members who are victims of terrorism overseas, we have also worked to disseminate information and provide assistance to the families of victims of the September 11th attack who live overseas, including foreign nationals. For example, working closely with the New York City Mayor's Office we developed a method whereby family members of victims of the World Trade Center attack could apply for an expedited death certificate from overseas, with the assistance of consular officers at our embassies and consulates abroad. We also disseminated information about resources for victims of the attack to our consular officers around the world so that they could provide this information to victims overseas and to foreign governments. Through our efforts, information about the Department of Justice victim assistance call center, the new September 11th Victim Compensation Fund, the American Red Cross travel and emotional assistance programs for overseas victims, and other information has been widely shared. Our Visa Office also worked to facilitate the review of visa applications from family members of victims of the attack so they could travel to the U.S.

Americans continue explore the world, to travel to often dangerous and interesting places and contribute to a better world. Our Passport Agencies issued 7.2 million passports last year. Applications are down just 7% this year. Terrorism has not deterred the determination of Americans to live in the world. There can be no excuse, no justification, and no rationalization for these acts of mass murder of inno-

cent people. We must continue to have a zero tolerance for those who would harm our citizens working or traveling abroad. While every such incident cannot be controlled, we are committed to both reducing the potential for and mitigating the effects of such acts. We believe this strategy will be effective.

The Department's efforts to protect Americans traveling abroad have been facilitated by our ongoing dialogue with Congress, and we look forward to working with you to seek opportunities for improvements in international travel information and services.

Madame Chair, this concludes my testimony. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Subcommittee today. I will be happy to answer questions that Members may have.

Senator BOXER. Thank you.

Mr. Bergin, welcome.

STATEMENT OF PETER E. BERGIN, PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY AND DIRECTOR OF THE DIPLOMATIC SECURITY SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. BERGIN. Good morning, Chairman Boxer and Senator Enzi. I am pleased to participate in this hearing on the important subject of protecting Americans abroad from terrorist threats. These are extraordinary times for all Americans. The threats facing our country and our citizens from elements around the world opposed to the United States of America and all we represent are more numerous and challenging than ever before.

Diplomatic Security receives more than 4,000 threats each year, a significant portion originating overseas. Our opponents are tough and smart and we need to be smarter than them to meet their challenge.

I appreciate the opportunity to highlight in this testimony three Diplomatic Security Service programs of national significance which play a major role in protecting our citizens overseas. First, Diplomatic Security operates the Rewards for Justice Program. Under this program the Secretary of State may offer rewards for information that prevents or favorably resolves acts of international terrorism against U.S. persons or property worldwide. The United States of America Patriot Act of 2001, which became law on October 26th, authorizes the Secretary to offer or pay rewards of greater than \$5 million if he or she determines that a greater amount is necessary to combat terrorism or to defend the United States against terrorist acts.

Secretary Powell has authorized a reward of up to \$25 million for information leading to the capture of Osama bin Laden and other key al-Qaeda leaders. The Rewards for Justice Program has been effective. It has saved lives and brought terrorists to justice. Since the mid-1980s the United States has paid over \$8 million to 22 people who have provided credible information that puts terrorists behind bars or prevented acts of international terrorism worldwide. The program played a significant role in the arrest of international terrorist Ramsey Yousef who was convicted of the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center.

The second Diplomatic Security program I would like to highlight for you is the Antiterrorism Assistance Program, or ATA. The ATA program is a significant line of defense for our country against terrorism overseas. Since 1983 it has provided training for more than

28,000 foreign law enforcement officials from just over 100 countries. And 3,000 foreign police will be trained just this year alone.

I would like to give you just one example of the effectiveness of the ATA's program. In November 1997, 58 tourists were killed in an ancient temple site in Luxor, Egypt, by an Egyptian terrorist group. U.S. tourists there at the time narrowly escaped being killed because they were able to hide from the terrorists, who were actually looking for Americans.

At the time there was no police communication and no meaningful emergency response plan or capability. In the immediate aftermath of this incident, ATA played a major role in training and equipping Egyptian police, who now have a security presence at every such tourist site and waterway in Egypt. Two-minute police response teams are in place and every district in Egypt has a crisis management plan that is regularly exercised. The tourist sites there have not had an attack on them in 4 years.

From my perspective, ATA provides security outside the walls of the embassy, with benefits for the entire American community.

The third important Diplomatic Security program to protect U.S. citizens and interests abroad is the Overseas Security Advisory Council, or OSAC. OSAC is a unique partnership between the private sector and the government to address security concerns of the U.S. private sector around the world. The Bureau of Diplomatic Security through OSAC provides security information to U.S. companies, nongovernmental organizations, religious groups, and other private entities so they can make informed decisions about how best to protect their people, their facilities, and their investments abroad.

We accomplish this in several ways. The Council, which is comprised of 30 representatives from the private sector, 4 from the U.S. Government, as well as 7 U.S. Government technical advisers, is the engine that drives OSAC.

OSAC also has threat analysts who are dedicated exclusively to the private sector and are the person to person focal point for the exchange of information. Our interactive Internet Web site, which averages 50,000 hits per week, provides information about the overseas security environment. We have 45 overseas country councils that provide local forums for the sharing of information, the bringing together of resident private sector representatives with the United States Embassy or Consulate.

OSAC is now in its 17th year and continues to provide critical information services to its 2,100 constituents.

Chairman Boxer, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you and the subcommittee today. We appreciate your committee's continued support. Without it, the Bureau of Diplomatic Security could not be effective. I would be now happy to answer any questions you might have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Bergin follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PETER E. BERGIN, PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY AND DIRECTOR OF THE DIPLOMATIC SECURITY SERVICE

I am pleased to participate in this hearing on the important subject of protecting our citizens overseas. The President and the Secretary of State have made clear, and the President's proposed budget reflects, that protection of U.S. Government

personnel serving abroad is a top priority. The Diplomatic Security Service has a major role in ensuring their protection. Having just heard from my colleague regarding her Bureau's efforts in protecting Americans working and traveling overseas, I would like to spend a little time discussing my Bureau's role.

As Director of the Diplomatic Security Service, I have a full appreciation for both successes and vulnerabilities in the overseas security arena. While the East Africa bombings are etched in our minds, the tragic events of September 11 serve to demonstrate our vulnerabilities here at home. Our resolve and response to the attacks should serve as a warning to our adversaries. However, there will continue to be those who are determined to exploit any void in our security or our collective will. Certainly our citizens abroad would then be considered potential targets.

While America was the target that day, there was every expectation that a U.S. interest abroad, either government or private, would also be targeted. Embassy by embassy security was assessed, enhancements incorporated and additional agents deployed to embassies considered most at risk. Inherent in the process was maximized communication within each embassy and coordination with the Department on a continual basis. DS focused primarily on the embassy community, but as my statement will address, we were also working with our colleagues in Consular Affairs to address the greater American presence security issues.

Regardless of the political climate, such as that which followed September 11, the protection of our citizens overseas is largely dependent on a system of safeguards, established relationships, intelligence sharing, communication, and dedication on the part of all those involved. This system also places responsibility on the traveler, employee, or dependent to take advantage of available information. The men and women of the Department take pride in their "protective" role, but it remains a collaborative effort, relying on multiple factors.

It is also important to understand that the goal of safety is met on a daily basis, not generally by remarkable efforts, but rather indirectly through a variety of seamless efforts, the results of which cannot easily be quantified. Those efforts, in the form of a variety of programs and liaison activities, provide a deterrent effect.

Regardless of our collective vigilance, there will continue to be threats made against American interests. We receive more than 4,000 threats each year, a significant portion originating overseas. They range from anonymous bomb threats and kidnapping plots to embassy attacks and assassinations. Life-safety issues don't permit us the luxury of choosing which to investigate. We dedicate our resources and coalesce the resources of other law enforcement and government agencies to acquire, assess, and use information received in a timely responsible manner.

As the Department's security and law enforcement component, DS has a broad mission, but its primary function is to provide a secure environment for the safe conduct of foreign affairs. The Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-399) directs DS to be responsible for the protection of personnel, facilities and information. That mission is divided into investigative and protective operations, each of which has links to significant life-safety issues. While it is impractical to list all programs, I would like to give a brief overview of a few of our programs that fall within today's focus.

We provide protection for the Secretary of State, for resident and visiting foreign dignitaries, and for foreign missions in the United States. Our investigative authority includes passport and visa fraud, clearly crimes that facilitate terrorist and other criminal attacks against our national interests, both overseas and domestically. Our Protective Intelligence Investigations Division (PII) is responsible for investigations involving terrorist threats and activities directed at personnel and facilities worldwide, that we are responsible for protecting. We also participate in 14 of the Joint Terrorist Task Forces (JTTF), with agents now being added to 5 more JTTFs. While located domestically, the task forces have become an integral part of America's response to terrorism overseas as well. The DS-JTTF role focuses on our ability to use our worldwide platform to further the JTTFs goals in an exigent manner.

In close cooperation with the FBI and other agencies, our counterintelligence program is designed to deter foreign intelligence efforts directed against our personnel and facilities worldwide. In addition, DS is the operational component for the Rewards for Justice Program, which has had a role in the capture of 22 persons responsible for planning or executing terrorist acts against Americans. Rewards are provided for information relating to an attack or the prevention of an attack.

In addition, the Antiterrorism Assistance (ATA) Program has proven to be a vital coalition building effort, paying security dividends for Americans. In cooperation with the Department's Office of Counterterrorism, which provides policy guidance, the ATA program provides America's first line of defense against terrorism overseas. Since first authorized by the Congress in 1983, ATA has provided training for 28,000 foreign law enforcement officials from more than 100 countries. It has built

productive relationships and provided a platform for exchanges of significant, timely information, a portion of which has relevance to the safety of Americans in that particular country or region. The ATA objectives include:

- Enhancing the antiterrorism skills of friendly countries by providing training and equipment to both deter and counter threats of terrorism.
- Strengthening the bilateral ties of the United States with friendly foreign governments by offering training assistance in areas of mutual concern.
- Increasing respect for human rights by sharing with civilian authorities modern, humane, and effective antiterrorism techniques.

The training of foreign officials is invaluable in efforts to provide protection for Americans overseas. By improving a country's ability to defend its territory against terrorism and other criminal activities, the ATA program improves protection and security for Americans living and traveling abroad.

The events of September 11 demonstrated the need to maximize training opportunities, particularly for those designated as frontline countries. It has resulted in Congressional approval of a significant ramping-up of the ATA program, both in terms of course offerings and numbers of participants. As an example, courses such as *Introduction to Cyber-Terrorism*, *First Responder*, and *Criminal Information Management Systems* are being integrated as course offerings. More than three thousand participants will be trained this year. Efforts to accommodate still additional training classes continue.

I would suggest that the Homeland Security initiative also benefits from ATA training. We can no longer protect our country from our borders alone. Rather, we must look to halt foreign terrorist activity, where it begins. The ability of foreign law enforcement to interdict terrorists and other criminals abroad, results in our shores and our families being made safer. That said, the more effective Homeland Security programs are in protecting against domestic attacks, the greater the potential that a "softer" more accessible American interest target overseas will be at least probed by our adversaries. That reality is a reason to remain vigilant and leverage every available resource from both the public and private sectors in addressing that environment as well.

To that end, a well-established and proven government-private sector partnership continues to be recognized for both its current value and its potential. The Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC) established in 1986, is an ever-evolving mechanism for the sharing of security expertise and information between the Department and the private sector. Its goal is to maintain close liaison between the U.S. government and U.S. businesses; thereby providing an excellent conduit for the exchange of security information with and among U.S. companies, non-governmental organizations, educational institutions and other private entities; so they can make informed decisions about how to best protect their people, facilities, investments and intellectual property overseas.

As the threat of terrorism to American interests increases, the value of the entire effort has taken on added significance. Organized criminal efforts against both our citizens and our businesses require a maximum effort to both prevent and mitigate the damage caused by the targeting of Americans. We understand the mission and we, together with our partners in Consular Affairs and the private sector, accept the challenge on a daily basis.

The safety of both government and non-government employees and dependents living abroad has direct linkage to the tenets of OSAC. The thousands of employees or representatives of U.S. international businesses or organizations abroad, U.S. citizens, and host or third country nationals, represent a source of information which may be pertinent to the security of the personnel and facilities of other U.S. partners. OSAC, which is proud of its more than 2100 member corporations and organizations, acts as the clearing house for the vetting and exchange of information among private sector entities.

The Council itself is composed of 30 private sector representatives from a very diverse group of businesses, such as financial, airlines, pharmaceuticals, consumables, high tech, as well as government representatives from the Departments of State, Commerce, Treasury, and the Agency for International Development. In addition, there are seven government Technical Advisors from: the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Security Agency, the National Counterintelligence Center, the U.S. Secret Service, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network and U.S. Customs. To be inclusive, the Maritime Security Council is also a Technical Advisor addressing maritime security issues affecting cruise lines and maritime travel.

In this remarkable coalition, with broad representation across the government and the private sector, security needs transcend parochial interests. The concept is

not ad-hoc, or convened by a particular threat or disaster, but rather a seasoned, tested organization of professionals, each of which serves from 2-4 years. To date more than 60 firms have served on the council at the invitation of the Secretary of State.

As importantly, the OSAC concept encourages the establishment of Country Councils, which provide a forum for concerns to be addressed at the local or regional level.

Currently there are OSAC Country Councils in 45 cities around the world. The composition of each includes host country, and U.S. or third country executives with security responsibilities for U.S. firms. The Embassy Regional Security Officer (RSO) and a private sector representative co-chair the council. Embassy support from the Ambassador, the Foreign Commercial Service, Consular American Citizen Services, and the economic or political sections adds to the sum.

What is also critical in the OSAC partnership is that every effort is made to leverage technology on our behalf. Our adversaries now have almost unlimited access to technology. We must also take full advantage. For example, the OSAC INTERNET site (<http://www.ds-osac.org>) focuses on security issues and contains press reporting from around the world, unclassified embassy reporting, information on overseas contacts. It also gives readers information on groups prone to violence, upcoming global events anniversary dates, information on cyber terrorism, a template for crisis planning and response, and other specialized topics. An average of 60 new entries are made each day. This Diplomatic Security managed site is user friendly, has a high speed search engine, an interactive component and receives about 30,000 hits per week.

Further, OSAC publishes and distributes material prepared by security practitioners in business and government to the private sector. Publications such as: Emergency Planning Guidelines for American Businesses Abroad, Security Guidelines for Families and Children, Protecting U.S. Business Information Overseas and A Practical Guide to Responding to a Biological or Chemical Threat are all available on the web site or in hard copy.

The daily operation of OSAC programs falls to the Research and Information Support Center (RISC). While candidly lean, it is most effective. RISC is staffed by six Security Specialists who are experts in their respective regions; and dedicated exclusively to the U.S. overseas private sector. This staff of analysts is the focal point for the exchange of information on security related incidents overseas between the Department of State and the private sector in the United States. The RISC is able to provide any enterprise incorporated in the United States doing business abroad with timely security-related information of an unclassified nature. The analysts average 200 consultations per month with U.S. private sector organizations.

Analysts search the world media every day and post relevant information on the OSAC web site of security or business interest to our constituency, including material they translate from foreign language dailies. They also review unclassified State Department cables from embassies around the world and abstract and post items of interest. They are looking not just at events but at the political, economic and social atmospherics which may impact U.S. business decisions. They take the next step with the information and distill the implications for U.S. organizations, companies, and their personnel and financial assets abroad. Their commitment and abilities, coupled with multiple support entities, has direct impact on Americans.

I previously mentioned that OSAC had proven its worth, but also had visions for the future. I would like to share just two examples. Each relates to this committee's interests in this hearing.

One current initiative is directed toward educational institutions. OSAC, joined by the Bureau of Consular Affairs, has formed the University Working Group to coordinate to develop safety programs and establish "best practices" guidelines to increase security awareness for students and faculty traveling and studying abroad. The University Working Group will share their results with colleges and universities throughout the country. The schools represented on the University Working Group are:

Pepperdine University, University of Louisville, Ohio State University, Arcadia University, University of Southern California and Michigan State University.

Another initiative underway involves training. OSAC has worked with the Department of State's Overseas Briefing Center to make available to the private sector a two-day program to prepare employees from the private sector to live and work overseas. It is very similar to the training that State Department and other USG employees receive, although it is being customized for a private sector audience. The course covers topics such as personal security, cross-cultural issues and security, specific tactics and trends and what the U.S. Embassy can and can't do for persons living or traveling abroad.

I have taken this opportunity to share with you just a few of the program areas that are intended to provide our citizens overseas with an increased level of safety. However, from a Diplomatic Security perspective, it would be shortsighted on my part, not to directly address the mission of the men and women who serve overseas as Regional Security Officers, engineers or technical security experts.

It is the RSO and their staff who remain the primary U.S. law enforcement point of contact at more than 250 Missions. They are the linchpins for security and law enforcement issues impacting the physical safety of U.S. citizens abroad. While we in DS hold each RSO to a high standard of performance, they continually evidence their willingness to place themselves in harms way for people whom they don't know, and probably will never see again.

As with most security operations, unless there is a tragic outcome, we will never read of the initiative shown by our personnel or others on an embassy roll. The efforts made by the RSO and others in the Daniel Pearl case, or recent rescues of Americans in Jerusalem, while known within the Department, received no direct media attention. I raise these issues, to assure the Committee that this Secretary, and the Department as a whole, takes the responsibility for Americans' safety as a solemn duty.

In spite of our dedication and resources, there will be circumstances and vulnerabilities, which result in attacks against Americans overseas. However, none will be the result of our indifference or lack of trying!

Mrs. Boxer, I thank you and the other Members of the committee for being given the opportunity to appear here. I would now be happy to answer any questions you or the other Members may have.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so very much, both of you.

I have just a couple of questions. It used to be that the soft targets of these terrorists were journalists, businessmen and students. I am wondering if you consider them soft targets. It seems to me there has been a big change. I wonder if either of you could comment on that.

Mr. BERGIN. I will take that first. After the 1998 attacks on our embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, the Department came to the Congress for support to harden embassies abroad. We have made significant headway in strengthening security at embassies around the world, and that is good because the transnational threat is one where one day it may be Suva in the Pacific rim and then the next day it could be Asuncion in South America.

So the view was that the threat was focused on the flagpole, either the embassy or in the case of the USS *Cole* or in Khobar Towers military personnel. In my view, Madam Chairman, the threat, there is a blur now, distinguishing between U.S. Government officials and American citizens. Generally from my perspective, the world is more unsafe today than it was prior to September 11.

Senator BOXER. Is what today? I am sorry?

Mr. BERGIN. Is more unsafe today than it was prior to September 11. That should give Americans reason for concern, but they should not be paranoid or live in fear, because there are practical, commonsense things that you can do to minimize the risks.

Senator BOXER. Do you want to say what those are, because I agree with you. I think these so-called soft targets are now just targets. So if you have some advice you could lay out here, it would be very helpful.

Mr. BERGIN. I think the No. 1 thing that we see in the 21st century is a proliferation of information. There is more information in open source about what is going on in Americans' communities, what is going on in the world. The key here is to be informed.

One of the things that I encourage, because I was a, we call them regional security officers. These are Diplomatic Security special

agents at embassies overseas. We have these country councils where the embassy security folks meet with the Americans in the community about security, and there is a regular exchange of information in these forums.

Senator BOXER. I understand. So that is absolutely so and Ms. Andruch pointed this out. So they get the information. But you said it is more dangerous now than it was pre-9/11, that the targets that used to be considered soft targets are more vulnerable. So besides getting the information? Because I have to say one thing about this information. A lot of the information you get is from the intelligence community. Well, I do not know—I am only speaking for myself, but a lot of these warnings that come to us, you do not know what to do. Last week it was do not go to the supermarket. They did not say that. They said supermarkets may be a target.

Last year, right after September 11 there were other such warnings, the bridges and so on and so forth. So what I am asking you is what can Americans do, obvious things that you have discovered that an American can do, a businessperson, a student, a tourist? They have all the information. Look, for example, I commend you on your information on the Philippines. I lost a constituent. He was beheaded by Abu Sayyaf, a tragic thing.

Right now you are telling people do not travel in that part of the Philippines. You are basically saying that, which I really appreciate. It is very specific. But I am just concerned that it is still vague in other situations.

So do you have, Ms. Andruch, do you have, specific advice, since Mr. Bergin has said it is more dangerous and there really are not so-called soft targets, it does not seem like, anymore.

Ms. ANDRUCH. I guess I would say, again not to beat a dead horse, but having as much information as possible. What we also urge is that Americans have—until this tragic event happened in the United States, we pretty much thought we were immune to the terrorist incidents. Now we know that that is not true and we have to pay a lot more attention to our personal security.

I think having the information, avoiding crowds, avoiding demonstrations, trying not to look so “American,” as we tend to do overseas. You know, I have had it happen when I have gone to a post overseas, a stranger coming from the embassy can pick me right out of that plane. I look, we look American. There is not a lot we can do about that except perhaps try to blend in a little bit more with the surroundings, and then check with the embassy and consulate once there just for information that might be specific to that particular area, to that particular time, that is not yet out available to the public.

Senator BOXER. Thank you.

Senator ENZI.

Senator ENZI. Thank you.

I want to followup just a little bit more on that. U.S. businesses that are operating overseas can pick up some of the same travel advisories. Is there a special way of warning them, and how are those warnings communicated, and does the business community feel that it is effective?

Ms. ANDRUCH. Do you want to start since that is kind of an OSAC thing?

Mr. BERGIN. Yes, Senator Enzi. We have a Web site, and it is ds-osac.org, where businessmen—we have 2,100 constituents who are American businesses or nongovernment organizations who log onto us on a regular basis seeking information about what is going on overseas. They can view that day up to the minute reporting from not only the American media, but foreign press, as to a situation in a particular country.

We have regular meetings with the business communities, three each year, to talk about security. In November there is an annual meeting where we bring up to a thousand American businesses into the State Department and we talk about the threat overview around the world. There has been very positive feedback about the effectiveness of OSAC as a tool to getting information out that they need to make business decisions.

Ms. ANDRUCH. If I could add just a bit there, we have a couple publications as well. One of them is from DS and it's entitled "Countering Terrorism: Security Suggestions for U.S. Business Representatives Abroad." Then we have other pamphlets for Americans traveling.

But to address your question about how we get that information out, in this network that every embassy and consular section has it uses whatever the best, whatever is possible in that country, given the infrastructure, to disseminate latest information as widely as possible. That is often by e-mail now. In some countries it may be a radio network or a phone tree, something as simple as that, to spread the word very widely.

There was an interesting article. I do not know if you have had a chance to see it. It was in the New York Times last week, and it was from a family who actually traveled to Rome shortly after we put out a public announcement where we had information that met our criteria that something in fact may happen over that Easter holiday. In fact he laughed about it and he said they went. They were going specifically to a place that they thought was safer because it would be less crowded and that was during the time we were suggesting they not go.

They took our advice to heart. They said they still had a wonderful time. It did not stop their vacation. They just altered their plans slightly. So I think that is a good thing, when we can get that out and let people sort of base their decisions on the latest information we have.

Senator ENZI. To shift gears just a little bit, Mr. Bergin, if American citizens abroad were to seek refuge in our embassy or a consulate due to terrorist activities, what is the policy on the diplomatic security that is offered? Is there a defined period of time? Is it different for officials than for non-officials, or does it even happen?

Mr. BERGIN. Well, I have never personally experienced a situation where Americans were seeking refuge in an embassy. I know that there have been circumstances where the political instability of a certain country requires an evacuation of noncombatants out of an area and we work very closely with the American community there. If the embassy is the place where you assemble to be evacuated, that is well and good. But there are other ways of handling that as well.

I would also add to what Ms. Andruch said. In order for us to get this information that is significant for Americans to make decisions, they really should register at the embassy, and American businesses should register with their Overseas Security Advisory Council, so that we can automatically e-mail or fax information to them in preparation for their travel.

But personally, sir, I have never experienced a situation where an American was seeking refuge in an embassy with respect to terrorism, but certainly we would not turn them away.

Senator ENZI. So is there a current written policy on that or are you just using common sense?

Mr. BERGIN. Sir, I do not believe that there is a current policy on this. I think this is a matter of common sense and good judgment, reacting to a certain crisis that comes up.

Senator ENZI. A final question for either of you: What is our current policy regarding negotiations to free Americans who might be victims of kidnaping in any of these areas?

Mr. BERGIN. The policy of the U.S. Government is that we make no concessions and we do not pay ransom. There is an element of the policy that is classified, that we would be prepared to discuss with you in closed session, but that is essentially the policy.

Ms. ANDRUCH. I have with me, if you would be interested in seeing it, it is actually an unclassified press statement that was made concerning that not too long ago, and I can leave that with you.

Senator ENZI. Thank you. I am aware a little bit of the policy that we have for our Foreign Service officers and the briefings that their families get to make them aware of what that policy is. But I was not sure what it was for other Americans who might be abroad. Thank you.

Senator BOXER. Thank you, Senator.

Just following up, I think I have that here. The policy is "the U.S. Government will make no concessions to individuals or groups holding official or private U.S. citizens hostage. The U.S. will use every appropriate resource to gain the safe return of American citizens who are held hostage. At the same time, it is the U.S. Government policy to deny hostage-takers the benefits of ransom, prisoner releases, policy changes, or other acts of concession."

Now, the issue that I have is the story that appeared in the Washington Times on April 11 that said that the U.S. Government facilitated the payment of \$300,000 through a third party in a bid to gain the release of two Americans held by the Philippine terrorist group Abu Sayyaf. The transaction was completed before Easter. It goes on to say the Pentagon opposed it, but the State Department was for it, and the Philippine Government denies any money had been paid. Richard Boucher refused to comment on the ransom report.

So can you shed any light on this at all, or would that be something we would have to do in executive session?

Mr. BERGIN. I am not aware of any payment, ma'am. We could get that up to you in a separate, closed session briefing. But I am not aware.

Senator BOXER. Do you have any information?

Ms. ANDRUCH. No, I would have to agree. Again, there has been so much and continues to be so much in the press, and much of

it is misinformation. So I would not be able to comment on that press article.

Senator BOXER. Well, we would like to have the information. If you can make it available to us, we would greatly appreciate it. We would ask for it. We would ask you to take that back to the highest levels. We just want to see a report that we could—so we have some information on whether there are any exceptions to this.

I wanted to end my questioning with a compliment. I see a really interesting document here, “Responding to a Biological or Chemical Threat, A Practical Guide.” This is terrific, and I wonder—it is what I like to see because it is very specific: warning signs of an attack or incident, such as droplets of oily film, unusual dead or dying animals, people dressed in warm weather with long sleeves, unexplained odors, unauthorized spraying in the area, victims displaying symptoms of nausea, and so on. It says what to do in case of an attack.

Is this something that our Office of Homeland Security made available to you? Are they doing a similar book for our people here?

Mr. BERGIN. Actually, ma’am, Diplomatic Security produced this publication about 2 years ago. We had a very modest program before the anthrax scare here. This was sent out to all embassies. We have trained diplomats and their families at 200 posts or so. It is in fact on our Internet site for all Americans.

Senator BOXER. Very good. I want to show this to Senator Enzi. If he agrees—this is a brochure—with me, then I think I would love to see it given out quite a bit more to our people, sent to our people, because I think it is very practical. It tells you what to do. It would be a little hard to do some of those things you talk about if you are just in a hotel room, because it says get away from air conditioning and so on.

But I think this is a terrific, very clearly written document. I wanted to thank you very much.

Senator ENZI. I would agree that it is an excellent document, and it is cited in Senator Frist’s new book on bioterrorism.

Senator BOXER. Maybe we can work to get this to Tom Ridge and maybe just have this available for our constituency, because I think it could save lives. It is well done.

Has it been updated since 2 years ago as well?

Mr. BERGIN. I do not believe so, ma’am. This was distilled from conversations with Defense Department specialists, medical specialists, a couple of years ago. It is contemporary.

Senator BOXER. Well, since September 11, I think it has tremendous meaning to us right here.

I want to thank you so very much. We will put your full statement in the record. You are welcome to stay if you want to hear the next panel. If you have other appointments, we will understand, but we will send you the record because we think that it would be good for you to hear what some of these folks have to say. So thank you very, very much.

Ms. ANDRUCH. Thank you.

Senator BOXER. We really appreciate your testimony.

Mr. BERGIN. Thank you for having us.

Senator BOXER. And any light you can shed on that ransom deal would be helpful.

Panel two, if you would please come forward to the witness table: Mr. Frank Smyth, Washington representative of the Committee to Protect Journalists; Ambassador Vernon Penner, former Ambassador, counterterrorism expert, vice president for Corporate International Services at Crisis Management Worldwide; Mr. Thomas Ondeck, president of GlobalOptions, Inc.; Dr. Sheryl E. Spivack, assistant professor of Tourism Studies at George Washington University.

We are very pleased, and we will call on you in the order in which I just re-introduced you, and we really look forward to hearing from you. Again, we are going to set the clock for 7 minutes and we will put your entire statement in the record. We simply want to have time to ask you questions.

Mr. Smyth, are you ready to open this?

Mr. SMYTH. Yes, I am.

Senator BOXER. Thank you. I want to welcome all of you. You have just been wonderful to cooperate with us and to come out here today.

STATEMENT OF FRANK SMYTH, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, THE COMMITTEE TO PROTECT JOURNALISTS, NEW YORK, NY

Mr. SMYTH. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Good morning. My name is Frank Smyth and I am the Washington representative of the Committee to Protect Journalists [CPJ].

CPJ is an independent nonprofit organization based in New York City that fights for the rights of journalists worldwide to report the news freely, without fear of reprisal. I would like to place in the record a copy of our recently published annual report, "Attacks on the Press in 2001,"¹ which contains more than 500 individual cases of attacks against journalists in more than 130 countries.

We are grateful for this opportunity to address this subcommittee. I have been asked to talk about what the U.S. Government can do to ensure the safety of U.S. journalists working overseas. This is of course an important issue and the recent abduction and murder of Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl in Pakistan dramatically illustrates the risks that U.S. journalists can confront.

Nevertheless, according to CPJ statistics the risk faced by U.S. reporters working abroad is fairly small compared to the risk faced by local reporters, particularly those covering corruption, human rights abuses, and military operations. These journalists are often targeted in direct reprisal for what they write or broadcast. During the past decade, our research shows that 399 journalists have been killed worldwide while carrying out their professional work. Only seven of them were U.S. reporters working overseas.

While I would like to briefly address the issue of the safety of U.S. journalists overseas, I plan to devote the bulk of my allotted time to discussing the larger threat to press freedom around the world, specifically CPJ's concern that the events of September 11

¹The report referred to can be accessed at the Web site of the Committee to Protect Journalists at <http://www.cpj.org>

and the subsequent U.S. military response have precipitated a global press freedom crisis.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and commend the U.S. Government for the role it has played and continues to play in working with Pakistani authorities to ensure that the killers of Daniel Pearl are brought to justice. However, we believe that this action is appropriate not because Mr. Pearl was a journalist, but because he was a U.S. citizen who was the victim of a crime. In fact, we are hard-pressed to think of any other action that the U.S. Government might take to protect U.S. journalists that would not do more harm than good.

U.S. journalists reporting from dangerous areas around the world, especially those places where the actions of the U.S. Government have stirred local anger, rely on their perceived neutrality to keep them safe. Thus, efforts by the U.S. Government to protect U.S. journalists overseas risk having the unintended effect of further endangering the journalists if those efforts create the impression that the journalists are somehow linked to the U.S. Government.

I want to highlight one action that CPJ believes the U.S. Government should never take: using an American journalist as a CIA agent. We call on the U.S. Government to reiterate its commitment to never recruit U.S. journalists as spies or government agents. We also call on the CIA and other government agencies to enforce a firm policy that it will never permit CIA agents to pose as U.S. journalists during undercover operations.

Furthermore, we would like to see this policy expanded to also bar the use of non-U.S. journalists as spies. The perception or even the rumor that a local journalist works with the CIA would obviously put him or her at considerable risk.

We have also been concerned that around the world repressive regimes have appropriated the rhetoric of the war on terrorism to justify the suppression of domestic criticism and curtail press freedom. In other instances, authoritarian governments appear to have taken advantage of the fact that the world's attention was elsewhere while they launched domestic crackdowns.

In Eritrea, for example, the government of President Isaias Aferwerki shut down the independent press and jailed 13 journalists in a crackdown that began shortly after September 11. In Nepal, the government in November branded as terrorists anyone who supports the country's Maoist rebels and imposed emergency regulations that have been used to harass and persecute journalists who report on rebel activities or who work for publications seen as sympathetic to the Maoist cause. Dozens of journalists have been detained since the declaration of the state of emergency.

Similarly, Chinese officials have characterized independence activists in the Muslim-majority region of Xinjiang as terrorists, targeting journalists and other intellectuals as part of a recently intensified crackdown on the separatist movement. In Malaysia, the Home Ministry has repeatedly blocked distribution of international publications, including Time and Newsweek, that published articles about the activities of Islamic militants within the country who may have links to the al-Qaeda terrorist network. In Kyrgyzstan, President Askar Akayev has used the threat of international ter-

rorism and the growing number of U.S. troops as excuses to curb political dissent and suppress the independent and opposition media.

And in Zimbabwe, Information Minister Jonathan Moyo has described the independent press as terrorists and specifically cited U.S. actions in justifying an independent media crackdown there. “We are watching events in the United States and Britain closely as pertaining to media freedom,” said Moyo last year, according to a local report. “These countries, especially the USA, have unashamedly limited press freedom since September 11 in the name of safeguarding the national interest. If the most celebrated democracies in the world will not allow their national interest to be tampered with, we will not allow it, too.”

This is clearly an opportunistic response by Mr. Moyo, who spearheaded the efforts to curtail the independent press in Zimbabwe long before September 11. Nevertheless, it is sad that Mr. Moyo is seeking to justify his government’s repressive measures by citing U.S. Government policy.

In fact, CPJ has criticized the U.S. Government in several cases for taking action that we believe sets a very poor precedent internationally. Specifically, CPJ expressed concern about efforts by the State Department to censor Voice of America broadcasts last year that included a telephone interview with the Taliban leader Mullah Mohamed Omar. Later Congress formally restricted the VOA from airing any such terrorist views.

The U.S. Government also tried to control broadcasts abroad. Last September Secretary of State Colin Powell asked the Emir of Qatar to use his influence to rein in Al-Jazeera, the Arabic language satellite station that is broadcast out of Qatar and financed by its government. Secretary Powell’s request was followed by a formal diplomatic *démarche* by the U.S. Embassy in Qatar.

In conclusion, while we believe that the U.S. Government should take no new specific actions to protect U.S. journalists working overseas because such action could do more harm than good, we believe there are actions that the U.S. Government should take to uphold and support press freedom around the world. Specifically, we believe that the U.S. Government should speak out against specific abuses and take active measures to ensure that the policy and rhetoric of the U.S. Government is never used to justify repressive actions against journalists anywhere.

CPJ thanks the subcommittee for this opportunity and I thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Smyth follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF FRANK SMYTH, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, COMMITTEE TO PROTECT JOURNALISTS

Good morning. My name is Frank Smyth, and I am the Washington Representative of the Committee to Protect Journalists. CPJ is an independent, non-profit organization based in New York City that fights for the rights of journalists worldwide to report the news freely, without fear of reprisal. I would like to place in the record a copy of our recently published annual report, *Attacks on the Press in 2001*, which contains more than 500 individual cases of attacks against journalists in more than 130 countries. We are grateful for this opportunity to address this subcommittee.

I’ve been asked to talk about what the United States government can do to ensure the safety of U.S. journalists working overseas. This is, of course, an important issue, and the recent abduction and murder of *Wall Street Journal* reporter Daniel

Pearl in Pakistan dramatically illustrates the risks that U.S. journalists confront. Nevertheless, according to CPJ's statistics, the risk faced by U.S. reporters working abroad is fairly small compared to the risk faced by local reporters, particularly those covering corruption, human rights abuses, and military operations. These journalists are often targeted in direct reprisal for what they write. During the past decade, our research shows that 399 journalists have been killed worldwide while carrying out their professional work. Only seven of them were U.S. reporters working overseas.

While I would like to briefly address the issue of the safety of U.S. journalists overseas, I plan to devote the bulk of my allotted time to discussing the larger threat to press freedom around the world, specifically CPJ's concern that the events of September 11 and the subsequent U.S. military response have precipitated a global press freedom crisis.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and commend the U.S. government for the role it has played, and continues to play, in working with Pakistani authorities to ensure that the killers of Daniel Pearl are brought to justice. However, we believe that this action is appropriate not because Daniel Pearl was a journalist but because he was a U.S. citizen who was the victim of a crime. In fact, we are hard pressed to think of any other action that the U.S. government might take to protect U.S. journalists that would not do more harm than good. U.S. journalists reporting from dangerous areas around the world—particularly those places where the actions of the U.S. government have stirred local anger—rely on their perceived neutrality to keep them safe. Thus, efforts by the U.S. government to protect U.S. journalists overseas risk having the unintended effect of further endangering the journalists, if those efforts create the impression that U.S. journalists are somehow linked to the U.S. government.

I want to highlight one action that CPJ believes the U.S. government should never take: Using an American journalist as a CIA agent. We call on the U.S. government to reiterate its commitment to never recruit U.S. journalists as spies or government agents. We also call on the CIA and other government agencies to enforce a firm policy: that it will never permit CIA agents to pose as U.S. journalists during undercover operations. Furthermore, we would like to see this policy expanded to bar the use of non-U.S. journalists as spies. The perception—or even the rumor—that a local journalist works with the CIA would obviously put him or her at considerable risk.

We have also been concerned that around the world, repressive regimes have appropriated the rhetoric of the war of terrorism to justify the suppression of domestic criticism and curtail press freedom. In other instances, authoritarian governments appear to have taken advantage of the fact that the world's attention was elsewhere to launch domestic crackdowns. In Eritrea, for example, the government of President Isaias Afewerki shut down the independent press and jailed 13 journalists in a crackdown that began shortly after September 11.

In Nepal, the government in November branded as “terrorists” anyone who supports the country's Maoist rebels and imposed emergency regulations that have been used to harass and persecute journalists who report on rebel activities or who work for publications seen as sympathetic to the Maoist cause. Dozens of journalists have been detained since the declaration of the state of emergency.

Similarly, Chinese officials have characterized independence activists in the Muslim-majority region of Xinjiang as “terrorists,” targeting journalists and other intellectuals as part of a recently intensified crackdown on the separatist movement.

In Malaysia, the Home Ministry has repeatedly blocked the distribution of international publications—including *Time* and *Newsweek*—that published articles about the activities of Islamic militants within the country who may have links to the al-Qaeda terrorist network.

In Kyrgyzstan, President Askar Akayev has used the threat of international terrorism and the growing number of U.S. troops as excuses to curb political dissent and suppress the independent and opposition media.

And in Zimbabwe, Information Minister Jonathan Moyo has described the independent press as “terrorists” and specifically cited U.S. actions in justifying an independent media crackdown there. “We are watching events in the United States and Britain closely as pertaining to media freedom,” said Moyo last year, according to a local report. “These countries, especially the U.S.A., have unashamedly limited press freedom since September 11 in the name of safeguarding the national interest. . . . If the most celebrated democracies in the world won't allow their national interests to be tampered with, we will not allow it too.”

This is clearly an opportunistic response by Mr. Moyo, who spearheaded the efforts to curtail the independent press in Zimbabwe long before September 11. Nevertheless, it is sad that Mr. Moyo is seeking to justify his government's repressive

measures by citing U.S. government policy. In fact, CPJ has criticized the U.S. government in several cases for taking action that we believe sets a very poor precedent internationally. Specifically, CPJ expressed concern about efforts by the State Department to censor a Voice of America broadcast last year that included a telephone interview with the Taliban leader, Mullah Mohammed Omar. Later, Congress formally restricted the VOA from airing any such "terrorist" views.

The U.S. government also tried to control broadcasts abroad. Last October, Secretary of State Colin Powell asked the Emir of Qatar to use his influence to rein in Al-Jazeera, the Arabic-language satellite station that is broadcast out of Qatar and financed by its government. Secretary Powell's request was followed by a formal diplomatic démarche by the U.S. embassy in Qatar.

In conclusion, while we believe that the U.S. government should take no new specific actions to protect U.S. journalists working overseas (because such action could do more harm than good), we believe there are actions that the U.S. government should take to uphold and support press freedom around the world. Specifically, we believe that the U.S. government should speak out against specific abuses and take active measures to ensure that the policy and rhetoric of the U.S. government is never used to justify repressive actions against journalists anywhere.

CPJ is grateful for this opportunity to address this important matter.

Senator BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. Smyth.

Ambassador Penner, counterterrorism expert and vice president for Corporate International Services, former Ambassador. Welcome, Ambassador.

STATEMENT OF HON. VERNON PENNER, VICE PRESIDENT FOR CORPORATE INTERNATIONAL SERVICES, CRISIS MANAGEMENT WORLDWIDE, AND FORMER DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR OVERSEAS CITIZENS SERVICES, ANAPOLIS, MD

Ambassador PENNER. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Let me begin by thanking the Chair for this opportunity to speak on a subject to which I have dedicated a significant portion of my career as a Federal servant, Foreign Service officer, and most recently in private business. I hope that my experience in consular affairs and currently as a senior member of a risk consultancy organization will be useful to the important work of this subcommittee.

Now, there are three things I would like to stress in my oral testimony. First, that while Americans have always been at risk abroad from terrorism in the last decades of the 20th century, that risk is greater since the events of 9/11.

Second, but even with the greater risk, that does not mean the roof is collapsing or that the world as we know it is so much different or that we should stop traveling or working abroad. I welcome your words when you talk about continuing to encourage travel. I believe we can work together to meet that greater risk by a combination of better intelligence and information, more proactive countermeasures and unrelenting awareness.

Third, in my personal view in this process there is only so much the U.S. Government can and should do. Security is and must be viewed as a shared responsibility, involving a number of partners: the individual American, the employer if he or she is working abroad, the host country, and the U.S. Government.

Now, about the first point, I do not think that much needs to be said. We are all in agreement that there is a greater risk to U.S. citizens abroad since 9/11. That needs no further elaboration.

On the second point, and that concerns better information, proactive countermeasures, and awareness, let me offer these observations. I begin with the conviction that the State Department takes its responsibilities very seriously for the protection and welfare of American citizens abroad. When I was the Deputy Assistant Secretary we used to call our OCS branch the branch for four D's, the D division. It stood for the detained, the disappeared, the distressed, and the deceased. And already 20 years ago, we had categories numbering in the thousands. How many attributable to terrorism? A relatively small number, but with a very high profile because of the political significance.

Now today, we see those numbers differently and the potential for much greater casualties, personal property, and major acts of terrorism in ways we never imagined possible.

We have heard from the State Department representatives, the Bureau of Consular Affairs, the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. I can only applaud them but they have to do more. There must be a greater outreach to the traveling public and expatriate communities. I think other means of contact should be used, in drawing together groups and organizations like the American Chamber of Commerce, the U.S. Council for International Business, the National Foreign Trade Council.

I believe there should be a greater participation by embassies abroad in the activities of their local American communities. I believe wider use of travel advisories should be done and specifically point to what you yourself raised, Madam Chairman, and that is possible trigger points or emergency responses that citizens themselves should take.

There should also be an increased emphasis on holding host countries responsible for the protection of U.S. citizens and our expatriate public.

Finally, I recommend that we use in a greater means, if possible, our own constituent posts, the consulates and consulate generals. This is where the real outreach to America occurs. I note in passing that there are fewer consulate and consulate generals today than since the end of the War of 1812.

In providing all of these things, I think the State Department is under considerable limitations. One limitation is resources. It is interesting that in my last decades of work I cannot remember a year when State Department received the money it requested. Of the seven different posts I was assigned to in Europe, three have now closed.

I attended very recently at my company's, my private company's, expense one of these excellent OSAC courses. This course had 60 participants in attendance, people ranging from Boeing, Pepperdine College, the Lutheran Welfare League, outstanding participation. Unfortunately, OSAC said that because of funding they could not repeat the program more than five times this current year. I find that unacceptable.

Another limitation is attitude. To be honest, consular work is not considered the most career-enhancing in the State Department. Neither is diplomatic security. I think we need a top to bottom commitment to the concept that our success or failure in foreign

policy is not just measured in terms like American interests, but in terms like American lives.

I think this is a job for professionals. Here we have another limitation. I think too many well-meaning and highly qualified people, for whatever political reasons, have gotten themselves in protection and welfare, in consular work. My own position in the State Department was filled by a political appointee. I guarantee you that every career ambassador abroad has done consular work. That is not, of course, the case with the political appointees, who of course get a bit of consular training.

But ultimately the State Department can only do so much. This is where I think we should now open and look at the shared responsibility factor. The first line of responsibility for Americans in country x is that country's own security and law enforcement personnel. Americans themselves must now take it upon themselves to be aware of the risks.

Finally, as something that just occurred to me, I would like to table some recommendations that my own organization has pulled together, a professional organization, and suggest that as a consular officer in the past I often passed on to constituents, American citizens, lists of lawyers, lists of doctors for their use. There should be no reason why Diplomatic Security should not pass on a list of professional security organizations when the case so warrants it.

Thank you very much.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so very much for your very specific advice to us.

Mr. Ondeck, president of GlobalOptions.

**STATEMENT OF THOMAS P. ONDECK, PRESIDENT,
GLOBALOPTIONS, INC., WASHINGTON, DC**

Mr. ONDECK. Thank you, Madam Chairman, for the opportunity to provide testimony to you today on this important topic. Our company is a private risk management and business intelligence company headquartered here in Washington. So we approach things in this area from a private sector background rather than a public sector background.

Now, as we talked about earlier in the hearing, more Americans than ever are traveling to dangerous places overseas. We have some tourist agencies who now use the whiff of danger to attract U.S. travelers. For example, the Web site of one tourist agency promotes travel to Bogota by describing this city as "dangerous but delightful." And indeed it is. Last year nearly 3,000 people were kidnaped in Colombia, more than any other country in the world. Colombia's murder rate is 13 times higher than the United States. It is home to narcotraffickers, terrorists, guerrillas, paramilitary groups—a lot of dangerous people. The State Department warns U.S. citizens not to travel to Colombia. Yet still, American tourists travel there.

U.S. business travelers do not avoid hot spots, either. International travel is an indispensable part of modern corporate life and for many business people working in foreign high-risk areas just comes with the territory. That is particularly true, of course, for journalists, who by the very nature of their jobs are often at risk. Getting a story and getting it right usually requires investiga-

tive work and it often means traveling in dangerous areas and talking with dangerous people.

All these dangers are further magnified by our Nation's war on terrorism. The terrorists are now on the defensive, but they are far from finished. They are looking to hit back and American travelers are tempting targets.

Now, in light of this threat, what can we do to better protect Americans traveling overseas? First, governmental action. The government activities described by the first panel are very important. However, they cannot of themselves be expected to protect every American overseas. The State Department issues individual country travel warnings, but many Americans still choose to travel to dangerous countries.

U.S. consulates offer advice and assistance, but it has been almost 100 years since the U.S. Consul in Tangiers summoned an American battle fleet to threaten bombardment if a kidnaped American was not released. The U.S. military provides protection for journalists in coordinated pools operating in war zones, but journalists are competitive. They seek to get a scoop and to get the story that no one else has, and sometimes that ends with tragic results. Last year 37 journalists were killed, including 9 covering the war in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

A related problem is the kidnaping of Americans abroad. The U.S. Government's policy is not and, in our opinion, should not be to negotiate with kidnapers of American travelers, because to do so would only engender more kidnapings. Sixteen years ago, after Associated Press reporter Terry Anderson was kidnaped in Beirut, he noted that his captors could not hope to bargain with the U.S. Government. As Anderson stated, "There was nothing that the American Government can or will give them."

Now, beyond that, we get to the issue of private actions that American travelers can take to better safeguard their security. For top executive travelers, private security firms such as ours, offer executive protection professionals, or bodyguards. We offer specialized courses in security awareness, terrorism awareness, and self-defense.

Then for the average traveler, there are a variety of books, such as this book offered by our company. This is entitled "Protect Yourself in an Uncertain World." It provides numerous specific suggestions. We agree with you, Madam Chairman, that it is specific, concrete recommendations and suggestions that are necessary to protect Americans when traveling.

Some of the precautions that we recommend specifically—there are numerous suggestions in the book—but some of the ones that we recommend in particular are: First, you do not have to be rich to be a target. Terrorists want to make a political point and for that, any American will do. Second, do not advertise your nationality. Blend in, wear clothes that blend in. Third, curb your vanity. Expensive clothes and jewelry always draw attention. Fourth, if possible do not travel by yourself. There is safety in numbers. If possible, hire a car and a driver rather than relying on taxis. Sixth, stay away from tourist-oriented bars and nightclubs. By going there you are making it easier for the bad guys to find you, and alcohol and safety do not mix. Finally, stay alert, always stay alert.

Remember, you are not in Kansas anymore and if something does not seem right walk away fast.

Madam Chairman, thank you very much for letting me testify.
[The prepared statement of Mr. Ondeck follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THOMAS P. ONDECK, PRESIDENT, GLOBALOPTIONS, INC.

Madam Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Terrorism, thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on protecting Americans traveling abroad, and the risks and difficulties of protecting journalists.

GlobalOptions is a risk management and business intelligence company. We provide a variety of security services for businesses and executives. Our staff of professionals include former intelligence and law enforcement officers, veterans of America's elite military units, and legal and crisis communications specialists. We also offer courses in security awareness, terrorism awareness, managing terrorist crime scenes, executive protection, self-defense, avoiding workplace violence, evasive/aggressive driving techniques, and firearms safety and marksmanship.

More Americans are traveling internationally to places that are increasingly dangerous and participating in activities that are more hazardous than ever before. Additionally, travel abroad is more risky as a result of our nation's war on terrorism. Warnings have been issued that extremist groups may be planning attacks against Americans and facilities abroad. As a result, providing protection is becoming an ever more difficult challenge for the U.S. government.

Some 27 million Americans journeyed overseas in 2000. While the most popular destination remains Europe, Americans increasingly are exploring more remote and potentially dangerous locations. Travel to Africa in 2000 expanded by more than 12 percent. Americans going to East Asia and the Pacific jumped by 15 percent—the fastest growth anywhere.

Americans are not content to just bask in the sun on a sandy beach or relax in a luxury hotel. By increasing numbers, travelers are seeking adventure and the "smell of danger." Adventure packages from travel agencies offer everything from mountain climbing to hang gliding, dog sledding, and sea kayaking. Special trips are even available for tornado chasing. If you want to trek to the top of Mt. Everest, venture into the depths of the Amazon rain forest, or blast off to space (Mark Shuttleworth from South Africa became the second space tourist when rocketed to space last week.), there is a travel agency that will make your dreams come true.

Tourism agencies seek to attract travelers regardless of the danger. A website on Bogota, for example, promotes the city as "dangerous but delightful." Last year, nearly 3,000 people were kidnapped in Colombia, more than any other country in the world. Its murder rate is 13 times higher than the U.S. The country is home to narco-traffickers, guerrillas, paramilitary groups and other criminal elements. Bombings are also common. The U.S. State Department has warned U.S. citizens against traveling to Colombia. Still, Americans, placing their lives in jeopardy, continue to journey to Colombia, enticed by its miles of virgin coastline, warm and charming people, and exotic wildlife.

Travel warnings for more than two-dozen countries have been issued by the U.S. State Department. Many Americans will heed these warnings, but not all. There will always be adventurers who are drawn to places filled with danger and intrigue.

U.S. businesses cannot be expected to avoid hot spots either. Travel is an indispensable and unavoidable part of modern corporate life. For many companies, working in high-risk areas comes with the territory. As an example, untapped oil reserves are mainly located in remote, violent areas in developing countries. While the U.S. government can provide diplomatic support, protecting Americans in these hazardous areas is an immense challenge.

There was a time when the world was less complicated and America's supremacy protected citizens abroad. In May of 1904, the U.S. State Department received a cable announcing a "most serious situation." A "band of natives" had kidnapped Ion Perdicaris, an American citizen, while he was in his country house in Tangier. The American Consul General, Samuel Gummere, requested that a man-of-war be sent at once. President Theodore Roosevelt had just dispatched 16 warships to the Mediterranean on a "goodwill cruise" and he ordered a contingent of four big battleships and three cruisers to steam to the Moroccan port to rescue Perdicaris.

If Perdicaris was murdered, Roosevelt warned the U.S. would demand the life of the murderer. The United States threatened to land Marines and seize customs. The show of military force led to the release of Perdicaris, who commented: "Thank Heaven. It is that flag . . . and that Preside . . . who have had me dug out from amongst the kabyles! That flag and no other!"

Given the vast number of Americans journeying abroad and the world's political problems, it is no longer possible for the U.S. government to provide this level of security. Still, the State Department and consulate offices offer a wealth of information to inform travelers about hazardous places and provide assistance when there is a problem. But it would be wrong to suggest that the government can somehow protect every American from every peril.

It is the fact that so many people are traveling today and the understandable limitations of government to provide assistance that has led to the establishment of risk management companies, such as GlobalOptions, and medical evacuation services like MedJet, which will dispatch a jet to fly members home if they are hospitalized abroad.

Because government is necessarily limited in what it can do to protect Americans, it is important for international travelers to take the initiative and learn how to best protect themselves. The need to take precautions is especially warranted given America's war on terrorism. In March, the State Department issued a worldwide alert. U.S. citizens face an increased risk of attack from terrorists while abroad and may be targeted for kidnapping. Additionally, consulate offices may be temporarily closed or suspend services. In light of the heightened threat, following are some general precautions for travelers:

- *Be alert.* Keep your mind focused on potential danger signals and not personal items. The key to good personal security is constant vigilance. An attack most often occurs when you let your guard down.
- *Evaluate the necessity of your trip.* In areas beset by terrorism or political instability, determine if your task can be accomplished by telephone or some other method.
- *Learn as much as possible about each country you plan to visit,* including the history, religion, government, and language. Knowing the foreign phrases for such words as "help" and "police" can save your life in a crisis.
- *Don't advertise your nationality.* Try to wear clothes that blend in with the native population.
- *Avoid known tourist haunts.* If there is a threat of terrorism, avoid cafes, nightclubs and other tourist spots that might be targeted because they attract Americans.
- *Keep a low profile.* Prominent persons should avoid announcing their visits in advance. News articles and photos increase your risk, since they alert criminals and terrorists to your presence. Never allow your travel itinerary to be published. Consider booking reservations using an alias or using the name of your traveling companion.
- *Don't dress in expensive clothes and jewelry that will draw unnecessary attention.* Especially leave religious jewelry at home.
- *Choose an airline carefully.* The safest airlines tend to be from places that are not part of political blocs or embroiled in local conflicts, such as Sweden, Switzerland, and Singapore.
- *Book a flight on a large aircraft if possible.* It takes more manpower and effort for terrorists to seize a large jetliner. Lone hijackers or small groups are more likely to target smaller planes.
- *Check where a flight originates and stops en route.* Flying the most direct route minimizes the time you spend sitting in a vulnerable terminal.
- *Avoid countries with permissive attitudes toward terrorism.* Airport security is the final line of defense, not the first. Some countries, such as Greece, have failed to take effective measures to combat terrorism and remain a dangerous transit point.
- *Beware of taxis.* Do not take the first taxi that approaches when you walk out of a hotel. A number of Americans have been kidnapped in this fashion. Don't be afraid to turn down a ride if a cab appears unsafe or the driver acts strange.
- *File a trip plan with someone you trust.* Brief the person on what to do if there are any problems and check in with this person frequently.
- *Stay away from unattended bags.* They could contain a bomb. Avoid trash bins, telephone booths and other enclosures that could contain an explosive.
- *Hit the ground when hearing shooting or an explosion.* Pull your arms over your head for more protection.

Kidnapping for ransom or for political reasons, once a rare crime, has increased dramatically in recent times. In some developing countries, such as Colombia, kidnappings have reached epidemic proportions. Below are a few suggestions to help victims avoid and/or survive a kidnapping ordeal.

- *It can happen to you.* Time and again, kidnap victims explain they didn't take security precautions because they thought they could never be a potential target.
- *Vary your routine.* For Americans living abroad, take different routes to work, mix-up your routine so your activities are difficult to predict.
- *You don't have to be rich to be kidnapped.* Since most officials and corporate executives have some security, kidnappers often target mid-level personnel who are readily accessible and do not take elaborate security precautions.
- *If you resist, you may be killed.* Most kidnapped victims are released in exchange for a ransom or other consideration. Kidnappers want victims alive, not dead. But you increase the likelihood that you will be killed or injured if you resist forcefully.
- *Don't shoot off your mouth.* Do not brag that your company or family may have plans for securing your release in the event you are kidnapped.
- *Don't assume you can reason with terrorists to win them over.* Avoid political discussions for you may only antagonize your captors. Try to be a good listener.
- *Don't offer advice.* Should your captors accept your suggestion and it fails, you will likely be blamed.
- *Generally, don't try to escape.* Your best chance of freedom and survival lies in your exchange for ransom or your rescue. If you fail, you will likely be subjected to harsh punishment.

PROTECTING JOURNALISTS

Foreign correspondents, by the very nature of their jobs, are at risk. Getting a story—and getting the story right—usually requires investigative work. And that means traveling through, or to, potentially dangerous areas and talking with questionable people. While some of the above recommendations can reduce the chance a journalist working in a hostile land may be attacked or kidnapped, it is impossible to eliminate all risk.

The abduction and murder of *Wall Street Journal* reporter Daniel Pearl is tragic, but not surprising considering where he was working—Karachi, Pakistan—and the people he was associating with—an Islamic militant leader.

Reporters must weigh the risks when working on a story. They do not have the luxury of conducting a security assessment or having bodyguards for protection. On January 23, the day Pearl was kidnapped, he met with an official at the U.S. Consulate to assess the danger of meeting with Sheikh Mubarak Ali Gilani, an Islamic extremist. The U.S. official advised Pearl against the meeting. But later that day, when Pearl received a call from a contact, he decided to go ahead with the meeting and soon thereafter was kidnapped.

Sixteen years ago, Associated Press reporter Terry Anderson was taken hostage in Beirut. He points out that few reporters have been kidnapped. Anderson believes the reason is that it discredits the kidnapper's cause. "All they're going to get is bad publicity," Anderson offers. The abductors cannot hope to bargain with the government for the life of a journalist. "There is nothing that the American government can or will give them," Anderson states.

From a security point of view, there are limitations in what government can do to protect journalists. Reporters are highly competitive and seek to get something that no one else has. To get a scoop, they rush to dangerous parts of the world, often arriving before U.S. troops. They file reports from the pathway of a hurricane. With satellite cell phones and laptop computers, journalists can report and file stories from nearly anywhere. This means they are no longer dependent on government resources to send stories to their editors, as they were in the past.

Reporters do not take unnecessary risks just for the thrill of it. They take risks, as Anderson explains, "because it is important." Pearl was investigating a story potentially linked to the accused shoe-bomber Robert Reid.

Pearl is one of nine journalists killed in the Afghanistan region the past year. Four died in an ambush, one during a burglary, and the other three in combat situations. Throughout the world, 37 journalists were killed in 2001.

In conclusion, let me stress that traveling to other lands can clearly be dangerous. But by taking security precautions the risks are manageable. No American should hesitate to see and experience different countries and cultures. No corporations should, out of fear, reject the need to open markets and expand operations abroad.

The chance of an ordinary American being killed or injured in a terrorist attack or being taken hostage is slim. The risks are higher for diplomats, members of the military, and corporate executives in selected parts of the world, and as such increased security measures are necessary.

This concludes my testimony. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so much for that very practical advice.

Dr. Spivack. I am going to remind everyone again, you are assistant professor of Tourism Studies at George Washington University. We understand that you are George Washington's expert on data concerning safety of U.S. citizens and tourists abroad.

STATEMENT OF SHERYL ELLIOTT SPIVACK, PH.D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF TOURISM STUDIES, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, DC

Dr. SPIVACK. Thank you. One minor, minor little correction. That is Associate Professor.

Senator BOXER. Associate, sorry.

Dr. SPIVACK. I am also the Director of the Tourism Policy Forum, an international think tank at the university. This operates under the International Institute of Tourism Studies.

I certainly thank you for giving me the opportunity to present testimony on factors related to the protection of U.S. citizens while they are traveling abroad. I have for the last 15 years conducted research and published articles on the health, safety, and security, security issues related to the growth of international tourism.

International tourist arrivals in 2001 decreased by 1.3 percent to 688 million. This was the first time in 50 years of recordkeeping by the World Tourism Organization that any significant decrease was measured. Since World War II nothing appeared able to flatten world travel growth, including wars, conflicts, and world recessions. Though specific acts of terrorism against tourists in a region would adversely affect travel to that region, they would not affect overall world travel growth. In essence, people simply traveled elsewhere and to regions they perceived as being safe.

In 2001, two factors combined to produce the first decline in recorded history on international arrivals: the global economic slowdown which began at the end of 2000 and the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11. Nevertheless, recovery is underway and the World Tourism Organization predicts the third and fourth quarters of 2002 to regain to pre-crisis levels. The rebound of travel after the September 11 attack thus took approximately 7 months.

What this suggests is that the demand and thirst for travel is hard to dampen. In fact, travel appears to be a fundamental right. The ability to move freely around the world, to unite with family and friends, to understand other cultures and to conduct business across continents, and in sum to enlarge on one's perspective of the world.

After all, the sine qua non of Western understanding has always been and always will be, the more we know the more we understand. Travel allows Americans and all peoples of the world to do just that. It is for that reason that tourism has often been suggested as the most accessible, if not vital, force for peace.

In addressing the Tourism Policy Forum's international assembly in Washington, DC, 1990, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, president of the George Washington University, stated: "In a world of this kind,

travel and tourism, seen from the view of what is good for the present and the future of planet Earth, is an absolute necessity, the most truly consequential industry of all if we're to have even a running good chance of achieving workable world peace."

At the same time, this growing travel phenomenon raises some pragmatic issues. International travel does impose certain health and safety risks, the scope of which is just beginning to be recognized by policymakers, industry, and the traveling public. Concerns related to health, security, and legal liability are very much at the forefront of the minds of all stakeholder groups. International conflicts and wars, growing levels of crime and terrorism, are real factors that will continue to influence the development of tourism and the movement of people to areas and away from others.

Fortunately, understanding the conditions, factors, and trends that comprise the American traveling spirit is fundamental to creating the policies and partnerships necessary to successfully safeguard the promises travel offers. I suggest these trends to be examined:

Trend No. 1: The travel experience changes. Americans are traveling in record number to remote destinations throughout the world in search of high adventure and often high-risk travel. Today's traveler is very different from the traveler of the early sixties, whose motivation was often oriented to status and prestige, and the product offered, superficial discovery.

The traveler of the 1960's who visited 12 countries in 10 days has been replaced by the traveler who demands authenticity of experience, greater physical involvement, risk-taking and adventure. Growth has exploded for adventure excursions, hiking up Mount McKinley, packing the jungles of Ecuador, cutting a path through the overgrown forests of Brazil. For soft adventure experiences, tourists are flocking to view glaciers from bush planes, scuba-ing through underwater parklands, and rounding up cattle on ranches.

The old notion of a vacation being a relief from labor has been replaced by a much more physically, intellectually, and socially dynamic one. Yet, while travelers are seeking greater physical adventure, risk-taking and authentic experiences, they are nevertheless demanding to be assured of safety in all phases of travel, from transport and recreation to food services and accommodations.

Protecting the interests of all these travelers in the most remote of destinations around the world is a challenge for all stakeholder groups, the destinations, the industry, and the tourists themselves.

Trend No. 2: The travel market diversifies. Several new markets of travelers have emerged as a result of changes that have occurred within political and social spectrums. One observed trend is a market focus that has shifted from a broadcasting to a narrowcasting of consumers. Special population groups which have heretofore been overlooked are emerging in this decade as major new markets. One such special population is the physically disabled or physically challenged. Another group that has emerged with the much-touted demographic shift of the aging of the population is the senior traveler.

In addition, the marketplace has become much more complex, with the number of individuals who now elect non-package tours and also the number of travelers who travel alone. Unfortunately,

that is increasing. Last year 31 percent of all American international travelers traveling for leisure traveled alone.

Trend No. 3: Travel services multiply. With the growth of international travel, so has grown the multiplicity of businesses and services to take the travail out of travel. One particularly interesting service to form are those companies that have established a niche in the insurance business by providing medical information assistance programs for travelers. Essentially, these services sell an information network program to insurance companies, who add the special coverage as an added benefit to existing health policies. The assistance provided includes locating competent doctors, arranging for medical attention, providing language and translation assistance, monitoring medical progress, and arranging for emergency evacuation if medically necessary.

I do have—I understand that is my time limit. I do have some other comments and perhaps considerations as we look at how we might work together in terms of partnerships between government, nongovernmental organizations, universities, industry, and tourists in making certain that we do everything possible to make travel an experience that is safe and secure.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Spivack follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SHERYL ELLIOTT SPIVACK, PH.D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR,
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

I thank you for allowing me to present testimony on factors related to the protection of U.S. citizens while they are traveling abroad. I am a professor at the George Washington University, School of Business & Public Management, and for over the last 15 years I have conducted research and published articles on health, safety, and security issues related to the growth of international tourism.

International tourist arrivals in 2001 decreased by 1.3% to 688 million. This was the first time in fifty years of record keeping by the World Tourism Organization (WTO) that any significant decrease was measured. Since World War II, nothing appeared able to flatten world travel growth including wars, conflicts or world recessions. Though specific acts of terrorism against tourists in a region would adversely affect travel to that region, they would not affect overall world travel growth. In essence, people simply traveled elsewhere and to regions they perceived as being safe. In 2001, two factors combined to produce the first decline in recorded history on international arrivals: the global economic slowdown, which began at the end of 2000, and the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11. Nevertheless, recovery is underway, and the World Tourism Organization predicts the third and fourth quarters of 2002 to regain to pre-crisis levels. The rebound of travel after the September 11th attack thus took approximately seven months.

What this suggests is that the demand and thirst for travel is hard to dampen. In fact, travel appears to be a fundamental human right; the ability to move freely around the world, to reunite with family and friends, to understand other cultures, to conduct business across continents, and in sum, to enlarge one's perspective of the world.

The sine qua non of the western world has always been and will always be the more we know the more we understand. Travel allows Americans and all people of world to do just that. It is for this reason that tourism has been often suggested as the most accessible if not vital force for peace. In addressing the Tourism Policy Forum's International Assembly in Washington, DC, 1990, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, President of The George Washington University stated, "In a world of this kind, travel and tourism . . . seen from the view of what's good for the present and future of Planet Earth . . . is an absolute necessity . . . the most truly consequential industry of all if we're to have even a running good chance of achieving workable world peace."

At the same time, this growing travel phenomenon raises some pragmatic issues. International travel does impose certain health and safety risks, the scope of which is just beginning to be recognized by policymakers, industry and the traveling public. Concerns related to health, security and legal liability are very much at the fore-

front of the minds of all stakeholder groups. International conflicts and wars, growing levels of crime and terrorism are very real factors that will continue to influence the development of tourism and the movement of people to certain areas and away from others.

Understanding the conditions, factors and trends that comprise the American traveling spirit is fundamental to creating the policies and partnerships necessary to successfully safeguard the promises travel offers.

Trend #1—The Travel Experience Changes

Americans are traveling in record number to remote destinations throughout the world in search of high adventure and, often high-risk travel. Today's traveler is very different from the traveler of the early 1960's, whose motivation was often oriented to status and prestige, and the product offered—superficial discovery. The traveler of the 1960's who visited twelve countries in ten days has been replaced by a traveler who demands authenticity of experience, greater physical involvement, risk-taking and adventure. Growth has exploded for adventure excursions—hiking up Mt. McKinley, hacking the jungles of Ecuador, or cutting a path through the overgrown forests of Brazil. For soft adventure experiences tourists are flocking to view glaciers from bush planes, “SCUBAing” through underwater parklands, and rounding up cattle on western ranches. The old notion of a vacation being a relief from labor has been replaced by a much more physically, intellectually and socially dynamic one. Yet, while travelers are seeking greater physical adventure, risk-taking, and authentic experiences, they are nevertheless demanding to be assured of safety in all phases of their travel—from transport and recreation to food service and accommodation. Protecting the interests of all of these travelers in the most remote of destinations around the world is a challenge for all stakeholder groups: the destinations, the industry, and the tourist themselves.

Trend #2—The Travel Market Diversifies

Several new markets of travelers have emerged as result of changes that have occurred within political and social spectrums. One observed trend is a market focus that has shifted from a broad-casting to a narrow-casting of consumers. Special population groups, which have, heretofore, been overlooked, are emerging in this decade as major new markets. One such special population group is the physically disabled. Another group that has emerged with the much touted demographic shift of the aging of the population is senior travelers. In addition, the marketplace has become much more complex with the number of individuals who now elect non-package tours and also the number of travelers who travel alone. Last year, 39% of all American international travelers traveling for leisure, traveled alone.

Trend #3—Travel Services Multiply

With the growth of international travel, so have grown a multiplicity of business and services to take the “travail” out of travel. One particularly interesting service to form are those companies that have established an niche in the insurance business by providing medical information assistance program for travelers. Essentially these services sell an information network program to insurance companies who add the special coverage as an additional benefit to existing health policies. The assistance provided includes locating competent doctors and arranging for prompt medical attention, providing language and translation assistance, monitoring medical progress and arranging for emergency evacuation if medically necessary.

Trend #4—Travel Information Amplifies

The diversification of the travel experience and the travel market, coupled with advances in telecommunications technologies, has resulted in greater consumer information demands on the travel industry and inbound and outbound countries. As an indicator, the U.S. State Department's Travel Advisory website is one of the most popular visited government websites. Clearly the Internet has had significant impact on planning and delivery of travel services. Bill Gates predicted that the Internet would have most impact in the areas of health, education, travel and entertainment. The fact that travel now generates the most revenue in business to consumer e-sales is indicative of this trend.

These trends suggest that desire for international travel is not going to abate, nor is the need to address the safety and security needs of a diversifying market of U.S. travelers. Addressing the complexities of safety and security for individuals traveling abroad will depend on an international understanding between all countries that benefit from the large growing tourism industry. Clearly, it should be understood that:

- The rights, safety and health of travelers is both an obligation and market opportunity for government and businesses alike. Governments and industry must maintain the highest level of standards in developing and directing policies that respond to health and safety considerations of all user markets.
- Governmental and non-governmental agencies on the national and international level must work with the tourism industry to create a better exchange in the collection of timely and accurate data. In the same measure, adequate educational programs must be developed, utilizing current technology to alert travelers of the safety conditions and situations that could be potentially harmful or threatening. Travel advisories must go beyond State Department advisories, and provide realtime information that will contribute to the health concerns of the traveling public.
- Countries which depend on tourism for supporting its economic structures and development must diligently safeguard its product, assuring that products will be delivered in the fullest consideration of the health, safety and well being of both travelers and residents. Governments who wish tourism to be a beneficial industry in their country cannot have only regard for tourist dollars but must have equal regard for the protection, health, safety and well-being of their visiting guests.

I thank the members of the committee for giving me the opportunity to appear before this committee.

Senator BOXER. Thank you, and we will put all your statements in the record.

It is sort of an interesting Catch 22, Senator Enzi, that is emerging here. On the one hand, if you travel in groups of Americans that is a problem. If you travel alone it is a problem. So clearly it is a challenge, but we are going to figure it out.

I was very taken, Mr. Smyth, with your testimony, especially dealing with the CIA issue because as I look over it, we are trying to be positive here. What can we do to make journalists safer? Clearly, you do not want the heavy hand of government protecting you to the point where you have no credibility in covering a story abroad. I totally understand that.

But you did raise the question of the CIA possibly using journalists or posing as journalists. Now, I am not familiar with the guidelines. Has there been a statement from the CIA on their policy regarding this issue?

Mr. SMYTH. As I understand, the CIA is prohibited at the moment and has been since the 1970's from using journalists as undercover operatives or from posing, having agents pose as undercover operatives. However, as I understand, it is possible that that policy could be waived by Executive order. The debate came up again, I believe, in 1996. There was some discussion about the possibility of waiving those restrictions. Fortunately, that debate ended without any changes.

But we would like to see a blanket affirmation that that is not the case and will not be the case in the future.

Senator BOXER. With no exceptions?

Mr. SMYTH. Right, with no exceptions.

Senator BOXER. Well, I am very interested in this. I have not discussed it really with Senator Enzi, but what I plan to do as a result of your testimony is to get a briefing from Director Tenet on this point, because I think if we look back at the Daniel Pearl situation that issue was raised. Of course, immediate denials. But I would like to talk with him about it. I want to thank you for that.

Now, my understanding is that you in fact were detained for 18 days during the gulf war?

Mr. SMYTH. That is right, I was detained for 18 days in Iraq.

Senator BOXER. During the gulf war by Iraq.

Mr. SMYTH. After the gulf war, and I was captured during the uprisings after the gulf war against Saddam, that is correct.

Senator BOXER. You were covering Iraq post-gulf war?

Mr. SMYTH. Right, I was covering the Kurdish rebels in northern Iraq, and I myself was accused of being a CIA agent.

Senator BOXER. You were? Who was it who detained you?

Mr. SMYTH. We were captured by Iraqi Army special forces and then transferred to Iraqi military intelligence agents, and then transferred to an Iraqi prison until our release by Iraqi Ministry of Information officials.

Senator BOXER. How many of you were there?

Mr. SMYTH. There were four of us, three journalists and an armed guerrilla guide. Gad Gross, a journalist, and our armed guide, Battei Abdullah Rahman, were captured and executed; and myself and a French photographer were captured an hour later and we survived and were both held for 18 days together.

Senator BOXER. Can you attribute something that happened there to your safe release, if you had to think why?

Mr. SMYTH. I think the U.S. Government raised my case in particular in military to military contacts, I was told later. I think that was useful to some degree, but I also think that also helped convince some Iraqi military intelligence officers that, since the U.S. Government was concerned about me, that perhaps I was what they were claiming.

I think what really was instrumental in my release was the ad hoc campaign that was mobilized by my journalistic colleagues, including CPJ, for whom I did not work at the time, to mobilize a campaign, including appeals made on CNN, I think that were instrumental.

Senator BOXER. Well, it did not work for Danny Pearl.

Mr. SMYTH. No, it did not, unfortunately.

Senator BOXER. I just have one more question. I want to thank all of you because this has been really good.

Ambassador Penner, we did not have a written statement from you. You wrote it from the heart and you just delivered it. You had mentioned some specific things you think the State Department could do more of, could do better of, and you were a little critical. Is it possible for you to get that in a letter to me and to Senator Enzi so we can take a look at your specific proposals?

Ambassador PENNER. I will do my best.

Senator BOXER. Because if we agree with you and then we can team up, maybe we can see if we can do better over there.

I want to thank you again and ask my colleague if he has questions.

Senator ENZI. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Yes, I have a couple.

Again, I do want to thank all of you for your testimony. It has been helpful. I am anxious to get a copy of the book and read it.

Mr. Ambassador, on your comments, one of the things that I have been working on since I got here was to have a State Department liaison office with the Senate on the Hill. When we are doing travel abroad most of it is arranged by the military liaisons, who

all do have offices here on the Hill and work with us frequently and have the added benefit when they are traveling with us of being able to mention a few things that the military needs. And coincidentally, when we are in a foreign country and visiting there, we usually get to see the military installations that are of importance in that country.

We spend a few minutes with the embassy, who are also having security difficulties and special needs that would help the country. So I am hoping that we can find a small cubbyhole where we can put people up here. I think that would both enhance our security and the security of the embassies.

It has also been my hope that when we meet with people from foreign countries, which people on this committee particularly do, that that liaison office could then arrange for us to have an interpreter, one from our side. The other side brings interpreters, but I have always wondered whether they were actually saying what I said.

I just was in Russia on a trip and worked with them on some cooperation items and I had three interpreters with me who were from the University of Georgia, and was surprised to find the number of times that the interpreter from the other side and the interpreter from our side were arguing over definitions. For instance, their word for "security" and their word for "safety" is the same word, but they are two absolutely different things and could make a difference to embassies and particularly to security agreements that we are having.

I appreciate your comments, too, about the political appointees. I roomed with the same person for 3 years during college who became a career ambassador or a career Foreign Service officer. So when I travel in these other countries I kind of look at the people that I meet and try and determine whether they are political appointees or career folks, and there is a difference, not a vast difference in some instances, but there is a difference in the information that is conveyed to us.

I do have some questions for all of the members of the panel, but since we are running out of time, if we can have the record open, I will submit those. But I do want to ask Dr. Spivack a question. I appreciate her coming today. I am a graduate of the George Washington University, so I appreciate the accumulation of expertise that has been put there.

I have been working on terrorism insurance for buildings and it occurred to me that probably the travel industry also has some needs on the insurance side. I think some people insure to make sure that if their trip gets canceled they can be reimbursed and that sort of thing. Can you give us just a little update on what some of the travel insurance needs are, how they have been affected since September 11? Is there a problem with that?

Dr. SPIVACK. Well, there has been for a number of years travel assistance programs available for travelers. The particular organizations that have made a lot of use of these are organizations such as universities, the World Bank, the IMF, that have a large number of employees abroad at any one point in time. So they negotiate, they are almost like blanket riders to policies that create an

information network, travel assistance network for travelers when they are traveling abroad or living abroad.

Essentially what it is is a number of preferred providers throughout the world that can bring immediate attention. All you have to do is be able to get into an 800 number or to a telephone number and you are connected to multiple providers worldwide, receiving anything from language assistance, if you are detained by the police assistance is given in those situations, if you need psychiatric counseling.

It is a fairly large, extensive array of services that these travel assistance programs provide.

Senator ENZI. Has that gotten more difficult since September 11 to get? Have the rates gone up? Are you aware of any changes?

Dr. SPIVACK. I am not aware of any rates going up. There are pretty standard procedures with universities and large organizations, as I said, who have many people abroad at any one given time. There are certain credit companies that, if you purchase your airline ticket through a credit company, you automatically get that travel insurance.

Again, these programs have been around for many years. I think people are more aware of them. I think September 11 did bring that attention to the minds of people to look at all kinds of assistance programs that might make their travels more safe or give them the perception of safety.

Senator ENZI. Thank you, and I appreciate your testimony. If we can leave the record open, I will have a list of questions.

Senator BOXER. We will leave the record open.

Senator ENZI. Thank you.

Senator BOXER. Let me just again thank you all. In addition to this CIA question which I am going to pursue, another interesting point was made about the responsibility of the host country. I am not sure if it was Mr. Ondeck or it was Ambassador Penner. In a world where Americans are really, with our trade agreements—and we have one on the floor right now—really helping the people of the world because we have a very open trade policy—unfortunately, unlike many of them, we do get out there and buy their products. I mean, they owe us something to help us.

One of the things they could do is to make sure that when Americans travel abroad, whether it is business people who are in fact there on a business trip—and I would love to have a copy of your book so I can show colleagues on the committee what is being done in the private sector about this, because I do worry about the availability. You know, it is easy to say we have this on our Web site, but I am taken with the suggestion that there be more outreach and that there is not enough outreach.

Ambassador PENNER. Madam Chairman, let me give you one specific example. Any ambassador going and serving abroad gets a fairly detailed list of instructions, a kind of a letter of introduction. I would be hard-pressed—I have not seen one recently. Certainly when I went out as ambassador, there was virtually no mention of consular affairs or protection and welfare in my letter of instructions.

Now, I realize this goes back 15 years. Nonetheless, I am convinced there has yet to be a commitment from all sides of the State

Department that consular affairs is as important as it is. I would suggest that the drafter of those letters of instructions come from the regional bureaus.

I am struck by Senator Enzi's comment that he is sort of crafted by the military people who prepare his own trips. I agree with you completely and I support that State Department career people should be involved. Similarly, consular officers, professionals, should be involved as well in the process, and that may be something to pursue.

I only note in passing that there has never been an Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs who has been a career consular officer. I do not want to disparage the outstanding people that have been there, and I have served there myself, but I feel that we have reached the stage, and I think all our colleagues agree, the threat is so much greater that we have to engender a professionalism into what we are going to be doing about these things.

Senator BOXER. I so appreciate it. The reason I wanted to hold this hearing now, not following some horrible incident, and we did not do it right after Danny Pearl, this is a good time to come forward with these ideas. So I would like to issue a challenge to all four of you. It would be very helpful to me to just sit down on one piece of paper and say, these are the four things I think the committee ought to pursue, five things or two things or one thing.

I think I know from your testimony, but I would like to even get it down in a more precise way. What I will do when I receive that is discuss that with Senator Enzi. If he and I can team up in certain of these proposals, I know we will. And because we do not team up that often, I think we will get—on other issues of a domestic nature—when we do team up on this, I think we would have some clout.

So we are very thankful to you all for coming here today, and we look forward to this followup I hope that you will be able to do for us. In the mean time, I am going to start the followup on my own.

We stand adjourned, and again thank you so much.

[Whereupon, at 11:42 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

