

**THE RECONSTRUCTION OF AFGHANISTAN:  
AN UPDATE**

---

---

**HEARING**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**  
**UNITED STATES SENATE**  
ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

—————  
FEBRUARY 12, 2003  
—————

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

87-575 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2003

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://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

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana, *Chairman*

CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska	JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware
LINCOLN CHAFEE, Rhode Island	PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland
GEORGE ALLEN, Virginia	CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas	JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming	RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio	BARBARA BOXER, California
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee	BILL NELSON, Florida
NORM COLEMAN, Minnesota	JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, West Virginia
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire	JON S. CORZINE, New Jersey

KENNETH A. MYERS, JR., *Staff Director*  
ANTONY J. BLINKEN, *Democratic Staff Director*

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Biden, Hon. Joseph R., Jr., U.S. Senator from Delaware, prepared statement .	10
Hagel, Hon. Chuck, U.S. Senator from Nebraska, prepared statement .....	24
Johnson, Hon. David T., Coordinator for Afghanistan Assistance, Department of State, Washington, DC .....	4
Prepared statement .....	7
Lugar, Hon. Richard G., U.S. Senator from Indiana, opening statement .....	3
Rodman, Hon. Peter W., Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense, Washington, DC .....	12
Prepared statement .....	14
Shahryar, Hon. Ishaq, Afghanistan Ambassador to the United States of Amer- ica .....	44
Prepared statement .....	48



## THE RECONSTRUCTION OF AFGHANISTAN: AN UPDATE

---

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2003

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:34 a.m. in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Richard G. Lugar (chairman of the committee), presiding.

Present: Senators Lugar, Hagel, Chafee, Coleman, Biden, Sarbanes, Feingold, and Corzine.

The CHAIRMAN. This meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee is called to order. Today the committee meets to review the United States' policy toward Afghanistan and our ongoing efforts to assist that country in recovering from the damage incurred under the rule of the Taliban and former tenants, such as Osama bin Laden and the al-Qaeda.

In the months ahead the United States will be focusing increased attention on threats posed by Iraq and North Korea, but we cannot abandon our commitments or lose sight of our goals in Afghanistan. The international community will take notice of our staying power in Afghanistan. If we are able to help Afghanistan transition into a secure democracy, we will bolster our ability to attract allies in the war against terrorism.

Our commitment to Afghanistan is also a demonstration of how we will approach post-conflict Iraq, the subject of our hearing yesterday. American credibility is on the line in these situations and we must understand that failure to follow through could have extremely negative consequences in the war on terror.

While military experts have been saying for some time that the war against the Taliban and the al-Qaeda is winding down, American troops remain in harm's way. Estimates suggest that as many as 1,000 al-Qaeda fighters remain active inside Afghanistan. Most recently, allied forces took action at Spin Boldak in eastern Afghanistan, and just 2 weeks ago four American Marines were killed when their Blackhawk helicopter crashed 7 miles from the Bagram Air Base. To date 47 American service members have lost their lives since operations in Afghanistan began last fall.

In addition to ongoing military operations, the United States is leading the way in the reconstruction and revitalization of Afghanistan. More than 2 million refugees have returned, crops are being planted, mines are being cleared, children are returning to school, and women are emerging as a critical force in the future of Afghan-

istan. We should be proud of all that has been accomplished thus far under very difficult circumstances.

Early on, President Bush announced that the United States would, and I quote, “not just simply leave after a military objective has been achieved.” But in response to the President’s commitment, the United States in fact provided more than \$500 million in humanitarian reconstruction assistance to Afghanistan in fiscal year 2002, and I am hopeful the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act which Congress passed last year will accelerate the already substantial progress being made in the country.

Despite this progress, the challenges ahead are daunting. While humanitarian aid and emergency assistance has been generous, the recent fighting in the south and the continued control of warlords in various locales demonstrate the fragility of the situation. The United States is taking the lead in training a new Afghan National Army [ANA], but this is a slow process.

In the meantime, security in Afghanistan depends upon U.S. military power and the International Security Assistance Force, [ISAF]. The ISAF was created by the Bonn Agreement and has reached its agreed strength of 4,900 troops. But the need to expand the ISAF and issues surrounding its leadership and force levels continue to be topics of debate.

I agree with those who suggest that ISAF must expand its area of operations beyond the capital. The need to maintain security, distribute aid, and establish the credibility of the interim government exists throughout the country, not just in Kabul, the capital.

Furthermore, the challenge of finding nations willing and able to lead the ISAF is becoming increasingly difficult. The United Kingdom and Turkey have previously led the force and Germany and the Netherlands recently took command. But efforts to identify a followup leader have thus far been unsuccessful.

Late last year, the Defense Department announced plans to establish eight joint regional teams, composed of U.S. combat and civil affairs officers, in order to provide security for reconstruction efforts and to help extend the Afghan Government’s reach into the countryside. This is an important initiative, but it cannot fully compensate for the value of an expanded ISAF.

The issue of counternarcotics is closely linked with the overall security situation in Afghanistan. Experts report that as much as \$1 billion in heroin is being shipped out of the country each year. A large portion of these profits are lining the pockets of some of the same warlords who are threatening the stability of the Karzai government. The United States must formulate a long-term plan to address the threats associated with narcotrafficking. I am hopeful the administration will submit to Congress a plan of action to address these threats.

With this in mind, I look forward to hearing from our witnesses, not only on the successes achieved to date, but the administration’s future plans and policies for Afghanistan, specifically those to be achieved through the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act.

Before turning to Senator Biden—and I will do so when the Senator appears—he has had a train delay and will be with us shortly for his opening statement—I want to welcome today’s witnesses. We are pleased to have them. We will call first upon David John-

son, the State Department's Coordinator for Afghanistan; and then we will hear from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Peter Rodman, on the United States' policies and plans.

We are especially pleased that the Afghanistan Ambassador to the United States of America will join us to provide an Afghan perspective in the second panel.

Finally, let me point out that this hearing represents the first in a series designed to investigate reconstruction efforts and the ongoing security challenges in Afghanistan. Upon the Senate's return from recess, the committee will host a meeting with Chairman Hamid Karzai. Dr. Karzai has provided important leadership to Afghanistan at a critical time in its history. It will be a great privilege to have him with us for that meeting.

We look forward to the witnesses this morning and I call now upon our first witness, the Honorable David Johnson, for his report. Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Senator Lugar follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR

Today the Committee meets to review U.S. policy toward Afghanistan and our ongoing efforts to assist that country in recovering from the damage incurred under the rule of the Taliban, and from former tenants such as Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda.

In the months ahead, the United States will be focusing increased attention on threats posed by Iraq and North Korea, but we cannot abandon our commitments or lose sight of our goals in Afghanistan. The international community will take notice of our staying power in Afghanistan. *If we are able to help Afghanistan transition into a secure democracy, we will bolster our ability to attract allies in the war against terrorism. Our commitment to Afghanistan is also a demonstration of how we will approach post-conflict Iraq. American credibility is on the line in these situations, and we must understand that failure to follow through could have extremely negative consequences on the war on terror.*

While military experts have been saying for some months that the war against the Taliban and al-Qaeda is winding down, American troops remain in harm's way. Estimates suggest that as many as 1,000 al-Qaeda fighters remain active inside Afghanistan. Most recently, allied forces took action at Spin Buldak, in eastern Afghanistan; and just two weeks ago, four American Marines were killed when their Blackhawk helicopter crashed seven miles from Bagram airbase. To date, 47 American service members have lost their lives since operations in Afghanistan began last fall.

In addition to on-going military operations, the United States is leading the way in the reconstruction and revitalization of Afghanistan. More than two million refugees have already returned; crops are being planted; mines are being cleared; children are returning to school; and women are emerging as a critical force in the future of Afghanistan. We should be proud of what has been accomplished thus far under very difficult circumstances.

Early on, President Bush announced that the United States would "not just simply leave after a military objective has been achieved." In response to the President's commitment, the United States provided more than \$500 million in humanitarian and reconstruction assistance to Afghanistan in fiscal year 2002. I am hopeful that the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act, which Congress passed last year, will accelerate the already substantial progress being made in Afghanistan.

Despite this progress, the challenges ahead are daunting. While humanitarian aid and emergency assistance have been generous, the recent fighting in the south and the continued control of warlords in various locales demonstrate the fragility of the situation in Afghanistan.

The United States is taking the lead in training a new Afghan National Army. But this is a slow process. In the meantime, security in Afghanistan depends upon U.S. military power and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF).

The ISAF was created by the Bonn Agreement and has reached its agreed strength of 4,900 troops. But the need to expand the ISAF, and issues surrounding its leadership and force levels continue to be topics of debate. *I agree with those who*

*suggest that the ISAF must expand its area of operations beyond the capital. The need to maintain security, distribute aid, and establish the credibility of the interim government exists throughout the country, not just in Kabul.* Furthermore, the challenge of finding nations willing and able to lead the ISAF is becoming increasingly difficult. The United Kingdom and Turkey have previously led the Force, and Germany and the Netherlands recently took co-command. But efforts to identify a follow-up leader have thus far been unsuccessful.

Late last year, the Defense Department announced plans to establish eight "Joint Regional Teams," composed of U.S. combat and civil affairs officers, in order to provide security for reconstruction efforts and to help extend the Afghan government's reach into the countryside. *This is an important initiative, but it cannot fully compensate for the value of an expanded ISAF.*

The issue of counter-narcotics is closely linked with the overall security situation in Afghanistan. Experts report that as much as \$1 billion in heroin is being shipped out of the country each year. A large portion of these profits are lining the pockets of some of the same warlords who are threatening the stability of the Karzai government. The United States must formulate a long-term plan to address the threats associated with narco-trafficking. I am hopeful that the administration will submit to Congress a plan of action to address these threats.

With this in mind, I look forward to hearing from our witnesses—not only on the successes achieved to date but on the administration's future plans and policies for Afghanistan, specifically those to be achieved through the Afghan Freedom Support Act.

Before turning to Senator Biden for his opening statement, I would like to welcome today's witnesses. First we will hear from David Johnson, the State Department's Coordinator for Afghanistan, and then from Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Peter Rodman, on U.S. policies and plans. We are especially pleased that Afghanistan's Ambassador to the United States, Ishaq Shahryar, will join us to provide an Afghan perspective.

Finally, let me point out that this hearing represents the first in a series designed to investigate reconstruction efforts and the ongoing security challenges in Afghanistan. Upon the Senate's return from recess, the committee will host a meeting with Chairman Hamid Karzai. Dr. Karzai has provided important leadership to Afghanistan at a critical time in its history. We look forward to receiving him and listening to his recommendations.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID T. JOHNSON, COORDINATOR FOR AFGHANISTAN ASSISTANCE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC**

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to testify today before your committee.

Mr. Chairman, 17 months ago Afghanistan was mired in more than 2 decades of conflict. Its people were living under the brutally repressive Taliban regime, suffering human rights abuses on a dramatic scale. Afghan women were oppressed, girls were denied an education, religious minorities were persecuted, and citizens had virtually no rights. For most people, it was almost a reign of terror. Humanitarian problems were immense and there was no prospect for a productive economy. Afghanistan was a haven for drug producers and drug traffickers. Tragically for the United States and its citizens, Afghanistan was also a parasitic host for al-Qaeda.

Today, Mr. Chairman, the Taliban is history. Its surviving terrorist elements have been forced into hiding. Afghans relish their new-found freedom. June's emergency Loya Jirga created a representative government with broad popular support. Afghanistan's first peaceful transition of power in decades occurred with the handoff from the previous Afghan interim authority to the current transitional government headed by President Karzai.

The quick and generous response of the international community last year to the plight of Afghans helped to avert a major humani-



tarian disaster. Now, though humanitarian assistance remains a necessary part of international aid to Afghanistan, we are placing a greater emphasis on reconstruction. Major infrastructure projects are getting under way, in addition to innumerable small-scale projects across the country.

The United States, together with Saudi Arabia and Japan, is rebuilding the key segment of the “ring road” which links Kabul to Kandahar to Herat. Together with improvements in communications, an opening of transportation routes can help tie the country together economically as well as politically. Already goods and services are available to a degree previously unimaginable to most Afghans, and the seeds of a developing market economy have now been planted.

In other positive developments, an independent media has begun to take root, a small disarmament program has begun in the north, and schools have reopened across Afghanistan. More than a million girls have enrolled in schools and women are reentering universities.

President Karzai issued an important decree in December outlining the size and character of a civilian-controlled Afghan National Army and the United States and France are training the core of that military force. Similarly, Germany has taken initial steps to train a national police force.

Afghanistan is clearly moving in the right direction. This is no small accomplishment and the people of Afghanistan deserve great credit for this achievement.

Despite my upbeat assessment, there is clearly an underlying fragility. Taliban and al-Qaeda remnants remain in Afghanistan. They continue their attempts to disrupt the efforts of the Afghan Government and the international community, using disinformation, intimidation and violence. Poppy production increased this past year. The central government’s institutions are growing in strength, but the challenges of training, equipping, housing, and paying government employees, including law enforcement and military personnel, are indeed daunting.

While we must continue to rely in some areas on local leaders to provide security and stability, in the longer term we have to help Afghans create national institutions with national sources of support, rather than relying indefinitely on regional leaders with independent militias. Only by doing this will we draw the center and the regions together.

To create a viable central government and establish the basis for a stable democracy and developing market economy, it is critical that the Bonn Agreement be fully implemented. Most of the commissions called for in the Bonn Accords—the judicial, human rights, and civil service commissions—have been established and a constitutional drafting committee is now in place.

But the challenges ahead are considerable. The timetable for holding national elections in June 2004 is ambitious. The process of drafting and securing popular support for the country’s constitution will be difficult. There are profound social, religious, and political crosscurrents which must be addressed in this document.

The constitution must offer the fundamental framework for a society and a judicial system based on respect for human rights and

the rule of law. While it does not have to settle all of these issues, it must set the terms of their debate, create a government based on the consent of the governed, and provide for the basic rights of citizens required by international standards, including freedom of conscience.

To achieve these objectives, the United States will continue to work with Afghanistan as well as with other donors to help rebuild and reform Afghanistan's judicial system. This is an enormously complicated task. Lawyers and judges must be trained, laws rewritten, courts and prisons must be rehabilitated. In an underdeveloped country that began marching backward in the 1970s, the to-do list is indeed a very long one.

Moreover, for the rule of law to prevail Afghanistan must have an effective, professional police force. Germany has taken responsibility as the lead nation to work with the Afghan Government to create such a force. But the road ahead will not be easy nor fast. The estimated 75,000 police in Afghanistan have no strong central authority and the various police forces in the country's 32 provinces operate with considerable autonomy. Corruption in many areas is rife. Although the initial focus of training will be to get the police in Kabul up to speed, we also need to train and equip police in other parts of the country.

Ultimately, Mr. Chairman, Afghanistan must be able to provide for its own internal and external security if it is to be fully established as a strong and stable nation State. The United States recognizes the need to build an Afghan National Army and to do it right. We and the French have been careful and deliberate in training the first five battalions of this army. It will take time to build an effective military force and there are challenges that must be confronted and overcome. We must also link the building of an army to a broader effort to disarm, demobilize, and reintegrate Afghan veterans.

Despite these challenges, we are determined to succeed. Afghanistan's long-term stability demands a national military force that is multi-ethnic, disciplined, subordinate to civilian authority, adequately armed and equipped, and sustainable.

In Kabul, the International Security Assistance Force retains the critical task of keeping the capital and its environs stable and secure. The British and Turkish forces have led ISAF well in the past year and the United States will support the German and Dutch co-lead of ISAF which began formally on February 10, just 2 days ago. We believe ISAF will need to maintain its presence in Kabul at least through the Afghan elections in June 2004, at which point the Afghan National Army should be able to begin to pick up increasing responsibility for security in the capital and beyond. That is the point at which we can reexamine this issue.

With respect to security in the provinces, Operation Enduring Freedom continues. U.S. and other coalition forces remain at work hunting Taliban and al-Qaeda remnants and dealing with other threats to peace and security. We are also establishing, in concert with the central government, Provincial Reconstruction Teams throughout Afghanistan. The first team was deployed in Gardez in late December, a second deployed to Bamiyan in January, and a third will be established in Kunduz before the end of this month.

Sites for future teams include Mazar-e-Sharif, Herat, Malwan, Jalalabad, and Kandahar.

The composition of these teams will vary by location depending on local reconstruction and security requirements, but generally the teams will consist of civil affairs specialists, engineers, medical personnel, linguists, and U.S. regular and special forces, as well as U.S. diplomats and assistance personnel. Afghanistan national army personnel and personnel from our coalition partners will also participate in some of these teams.

The presence of these teams should enhance security where they operate, permitting Afghan Government authorities, international organizations, representatives of donor nations, and NGOs to go about the crucial business of reconstruction in a more secure and stable environment.

There is obviously much to do, but we are committed to the future of Afghanistan and our investment in terms of lives and national treasure has already been considerable. The President has repeatedly reaffirmed his intention for the United States to remain engaged for the long haul. To do that, we must continue to work with you in the Congress. We need your support, your ideas, and your engagement. They are an integral part of our government's effort to support Afghanistan.

I am delighted to be here today and I will do my best to address your questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Johnson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID T. JOHNSON, COORDINATOR FOR AFGHANISTAN ASSISTANCE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify today before the Committee. As I will outline in my remarks, we have many reasons to be upbeat about developments in Afghanistan.

Some seventeen months ago, Afghanistan was a country still mired in more than two decades of conflict. The vast majority of its people were living under the brutally repressive Taliban regime and suffering human rights abuses on a dramatic scale. Afghan women were oppressed, girls were denied an education, religious minorities were persecuted, and the common citizen had absolutely no democratic rights whatsoever. The humanitarian problems besetting the country were immense, and there was no prospect for economic recovery. Afghanistan was a haven for drug producers and traffickers. Tragically for this nation and the scores of others that lost citizens on September 11, Afghanistan was also a haven for international terrorists.

Today, the Taliban regime is history. Surviving terrorist elements have been forced into hiding, their networks and plans disrupted. Afghans are relishing a newfound freedom. The Emergency Loya Jirga in June of last year succeeded in creating a representative government with broad support from the population. The first peaceful transition of power in Afghanistan in 23 years occurred with the handoff from the previous Afghanistan Interim Authority to the current Transitional Government headed by President Karzai. President Karzai and his government are actively pursuing implementation of the Bonn Agreement and creating the various commissions needed to draft a constitution and create a democracy in which human rights—including the rights of women and ethnic and religious minorities—are protected.

The quick and generous response of the international community to the plight of Afghans in the immediate post-conflict period helped avert a major humanitarian disaster caused in part by drought and the unexpectedly large number of returning refugees. Now, though humanitarian assistance will remain a necessary part of international aid to Afghanistan for the foreseeable future, a greater emphasis is being placed on reconstruction activities. Major infrastructure projects are underway in addition to innumerable small-scale projects across the country. The United States—together with Saudi Arabia and Japan—is contributing to a major project to rebuild a segment of the “ring road” linking Kabul to Kandahar and Herat. To-

gether with improvements in communications, an opening of transportation routes will help tie the country together both economically and politically. Reconstruction is a long-term commitment, one that the U.S. and international community have made. It will require significant resources over the coming years. We and the other donor nations need to begin planning for these resources now. The results of this effort are clear: Already, goods and services are available to a degree previously unimaginable to most Afghans, and the seeds of a developing market economy have been planted.

In other positive developments, an independent media is taking root, a small but useful disarmament program has begun in the northern part of the country, and schools have reopened across Afghanistan. Over a million girls have enrolled in school, and women are entering universities. President Karzai issued an important decree in December outlining the size and character of a civilian-controlled Afghan National Army, and the United States and France are engaged in training the core of that military force. Similarly, Germany has taken initial steps to train a rational police force. Both of these training efforts emphasize human rights as an integral part of the conduct of the military and police. Almost across the board, things are moving in the right direction for Afghanistan. This is no small accomplishment, especially for a poor country emerging from decades of conflict, and the people of Afghanistan deserve great credit for coming together to make it happen.

Despite this upbeat assessment, we must be forthright in assessing the underlying fragility of many of these accomplishments. Former Taliban and Al-Qaeda remnants remain in Afghanistan and the region, and they will continue to try to disrupt the aims of the Afghan government and the international community using disinformation, intimidation and violence. Poppy production increased this past year and we must continue to combat that scourge. The central government's institutions are growing in strength but the challenges of training, equipping, housing, and paying government employees—including law enforcement and military personnel—are daunting. While we must continue to rely to some degree on local leaders and their fighters to provide security and stability in many parts of the country, in the longer term Afghanistan's history strongly suggests that the existence of regional leaders with independent militias and outside financial sources will undermine the goal of creating a stable and effective central government. We are working with Karzai to draw the center and the regions together.

Ultimately, Afghanistan must be able to provide for its own internal and external security if it is to be fully established as a strong and stable nation state. The United States recognizes the critical value of building an Afghan National Army (ANA) and building it right, and we and the French have been careful and deliberate in the training of the first five battalions of the ANA. It will take time to build an effective military force, and there are challenges that must be confronted and overcome. Recruitment will remain problematic—even if ANA salaries are increased—because the pool of potential recruits we must deal with remains largely uneducated and riven by ethnic divisions and old loyalties. We must also somehow link recruitment efforts to the broader process of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) of Afghan fighters, recruiting into the ANA or providing other employment to those demobilized as appropriate. Despite these challenges, we must persevere. Afghanistan's long term stability demands a national military force that is multi-ethnic, disciplined, subordinate to civilian authority, adequately armed, equipped and maintained, and sustainable.

In Kabul, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) retains the critical task of keeping the capital and its environs secure. British and Turkish forces have led ISAF well in the past year, and the U.S. Government will support the German and Dutch co-lead of ISAF, which began formally on February 10—just two days ago. We believe ISAF will need to maintain a presence in Kabul at least through the Afghan elections in June 2004, at which point we hope the ANA will have picked up increasing responsibility for security in the capital and elsewhere.

We will therefore need to work within the United Nations to see ISAF's mandate extended past December 2003—the end of its current authorization. In response to calls from some quarters that ISAF be expanded to other parts of the country, it should be noted that the United States does not oppose the expansion of ISAF. It would be a significant challenge, however, to expand its operations to cover a country the size of Afghanistan, and no country has volunteered for this task.

In terms of security in the provinces, Operation Enduring Freedom goes on and U.S. and coalition forces remain at work hunting Taliban and Al-Qaeda remnants and dealing with other threats to peace and security. We are also establishing in close concert with the central government "Provincial Reconstruction Teams" throughout Afghanistan. The first PRT was deployed in Gardez in late December. A Second team deployed to Bamiyan in January, and a third will set up in Kunduz

this month. Proposed sites for future PRTs include Mazar-i Sharif, Herat, Parwan, Jalalabad and Kandahar. The composition of individual PRTs will vary by location depending on local reconstruction and security requirements, but generally the teams will consist of civil affairs specialists, engineers, medical personnel, linguists, and U.S. regular and Special Forces. Afghan National Army personnel and personnel from our coalition partners may also participate in some capacity. We hope that the presence of these teams will enhance security in the areas in which they operate, permitting Afghan government authorities, international organizations, representatives of donor nations, and NGOs to go about the crucial business of reconstruction in a more secure environment.

To create a viable central government and establish the basis for a stable democracy and developing market economy, it is critical that the Bonn Agreement continue to be implemented. The Judicial, Human Rights and Civil Service Commissions called for in the Bonn Accords have been established, and a Constitutional Drafting Committee is at work and expects to have a draft constitution by early March. The challenges ahead are considerable, however. The timetable for holding national elections in June 2004 is ambitious. The process of drafting the new constitution and obtaining public buy-in for it will also prove a complicated task. There are profound social, religious, and political currents that somehow must be satisfied in the final document. The constitution must offer the fundamental framework for a society and a judicial system based on respect for human rights and the rule of law.

In that vein, the United States will continue to work with Afghanistan, Italy and others in the international community to help rebuild Afghanistan's judicial system. This is an enormously complicated task. Lawyers and judges must be trained, laws rewritten, courts and prisons rehabilitated—the list of things to do is long. In addition, in order for the rule of law to prevail, Afghanistan must have the security provided by an effective and professional police force. Germany is the lead nation in working with the Afghan government to create such a force, but the road ahead will not be easy or fast. The estimated 75,000 police in Afghanistan have no strong central authority, and the various police forces in the country's 32 provinces operate with considerable autonomy. Corruption is rife in many areas. Although the initial focus of training will be to get the police in Kabul up to speed, the need to train and equip police in other parts of the country is obvious. Active international engagement on this issue will remain vital for the foreseeable future.

Narcotics production and trafficking pose a critical threat to security in Afghanistan. We and our international partners see narcotics as a crosscutting issue for all reconstruction and developmental assistance. The 2002 estimate for opium poppy cultivation shows an increase of approximately 30,000 hectares in Afghanistan and we expect another large crop this year. Weak institutions, corrupt officials, impoverished farmers, and strong warlords and drug traffickers hobble implementation of the Afghan government's opium ban. Insecurity in many poppy-growing areas hinders NGOs from full implementation and monitoring of development programs. U.S. counter-narcotics support for the UK lead on this issue and the Afghan government focuses on alternative livelihood programs, building up Afghan law enforcement capacity, and running a vigorous public affairs campaign against drugs. With our G-8 partners, we are encouraging neighboring countries to strengthen interdiction capabilities and increase crossborder cooperation to stop the regional drug trade. These strategies will develop over the long term in tandem with progress in overall security and reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan.

We appreciate the strong support of Congress for our commitment to Afghanistan. The Afghanistan Freedom Support Act has helped reinforce the message that the United States will not walk away from this war-torn country. We plan to put its provisions to good use, by providing assistance to the Afghan National Army through drawdown. I thank the Committee for its key role in the enactment of this legislation last year.

There is obviously still much to do in Afghanistan. We have made a necessary commitment to the future of that country, and our investment—in terms of lives and rational treasure—has already been considerable. The Bush Administration has repeatedly stated its resolve to remain engaged in Afghanistan. Regardless of the other challenges that our nation may have to face, our commitment to Afghanistan will hold strong. To confront our challenges effectively, we must continue to work with Congress, and I am delighted to be here today as part of that process.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Johnson.

At this point I want to recognize the distinguished ranking member of our committee for his opening statement.

Senator BIDEN. I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. I would ask unanimous consent that my statement be placed in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be published in full.

Senator BIDEN. And I apologize for being late.

Just 2 months ago, the President signed the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, and Senator Hagel and Senator Lugar and I cosponsored that. It was pushed forward by this committee, and we finally got it passed. But the act authorizes \$3.3 billion for reconstruction and security of Afghanistan over and above the funds the President might see fit to allocate from other sources. In recognition of the fact that Afghanistan recovery is a long-term effort and in recognition of America's continued commitment, the sum was structured as a 4-year authorization.

The President's budget proposes funding for Afghanistan for fiscal 2004 that remains approximately the same level as it did in 2002 and 2003. But none of this will make much of a difference without security, and security is jeopardized, in my view, by the administration's decision not to seek an expansion of the U.N.-mandated peacekeeping force.

We are already seeing Afghanistan drop off the radar screen, not with our witness, but in the country at large and the world at large. What level of commitment will the administration display once Afghanistan winds up behind Iraq and North Korea and whatever comes next?

So Mr. Chairman, I think we have to remember why you and Senator Hagel and I and our colleagues on the committee decided to pass this Afghanistan Freedom Support Act in the first place. I can sum it up in three words: warlords, drugs, and terrorism. We have made precious little progress in any of the three. We did it to prevent future Afghans from becoming a replay of the past and we did it for the sake of the people of Afghanistan.

But we also did it for the sake of our own national security, and I am anxious to hear from our second witness. We are able to talk about—I am going to tell Mr. Johnson others now, I am going to want to know—I want to know precisely what warlords are in charge, what areas do you have little or no impact? Tell me who our greatest problems are, the names of them? Is it Ismail Khan? Is he cooperating with Iran, which he is. What is going on with regard to Tajikistan's involvement in the north?

These are things I am very anxious to hear about, not just generic assertions about our long-term commitment. And I look forward to hearing that.

As I said, I ask unanimous consent my entire statement be placed in the record. I thank you for your indulgence.

[The prepared statement of Senator Biden follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you on calling this important and timely hearing. With war clouds gathering over Iraq and an unacknowledged crisis looming in North Korea, public attention has shifted from our unfinished business in Afghanistan.

At this time last year, I had just returned from a visit to Kabul. Every day I spent in that city, I was asked the same question over and over: Will America help to rebuild Afghanistan, or will we just declare victory and go home?

There was tremendous good will toward the United States, but also a great deal of suspicion. The Afghans I met were grateful to us for ousting the Taliban, but worried about our long-term commitment.

The people of Afghanistan have long memories: After helping drive the Soviets out of the country in 1989, the United States quickly lost interest in the war's untidy aftermath. Nation-building was slow, frustrating, and, above all, expensive. So, as my hosts in Kabul reminded me, we quickly left the Afghans to fend for themselves.

In some parts of this administration, "nation-building" is a dirty phrase. But the alternative to nation-building is chaos—a chaos that churns out bloodthirsty warlords, drug-traffickers, and terrorists. We've seen it happen in Afghanistan before—and we're watching it happen in Afghanistan today.

Warlords, drugs, and terrorists. The connection is as clear as a bell: Terrorists use drug profits to buy safe haven from warlords. That pretty much defined the state of Afghanistan throughout the 1990s—and, sadly enough, it looks like it may define Afghanistan for the foreseeable future.

As President Bush said in another context, "This looks like a rerun of a bad movie, and I'm not interested in watching it." Well, we've already seen the coming attractions, and the feature is loaded on the next reel.

*Warlords:* Instead of accepting our NATO allies' offer to help share the burden of peacekeeping in Afghanistan, we have placed responsibility for security on the unsteady shoulders of Afghanistan's warlords. We call them "regional commanders" now, but many observers would have less savory names for them. We pay them millions of dollars, and we don't demand much in exchange.

Let's remember that it was the brutal anarchy of the warlords that caused the people of Afghanistan to welcome the Taliban's rise to power. In the mid-1990s, even the rough justice meted out by the Taliban was regarded by some in Afghanistan as preferable to the utter chaos that preceded it.

Today, many of the very same warlords ousted from power are back in their old lairs. And, as relief workers, journalists, and human rights advocates tell us, they're up to their bloody old tricks. Murder, rape, theft and torture—they're instruments of policy now. And the central government, with few resources of its own, is powerless to do much about it.

*Drugs:* One sector of the Afghan economy has chalked up an astounding recovery from the devastation of the Taliban era. According to UN figures released last week, Afghanistan has now regained its status as the world's largest source of opium.

In 2002, the report stated, Afghanistan produced 3,400 tons of the drug—that's more than 18 times the amount produced during the last year of Taliban rule.

The value of this harvest to growers and traffickers was \$2.5 billion—more than double the entire amount of aid given to Afghanistan by all nations combined for 2002.

*Terrorists:* We've seen what happens when warlords and drug-traffickers take over a country—they soon make their nation a haven for terrorists. This happened under the Taliban, and it is happening in Afghanistan once again.

One year ago, we were hunting high and low for a fellow named Osama bin Laden. One year later, we're still hunting for him—along with his top deputy, and Taliban leader Mullah Umar. One year later, it seems Bin Laden is very much alive, most likely hidden somewhere in or near Afghanistan.

In November, our intelligence agencies and the White House confirmed the likely authenticity of an audiotape made by Bin Laden. He was gloating about attacks on Western targets in Indonesia and Kenya, and promising future terrorist assaults. Just yesterday another Bin Laden audiotape, not yet definitively authenticated, was described by Secretary Powell and aired on CNN.

One year ago, we were hoping to roll up al-Qaeda and its allies like an old rug. One year later, we're in an Orange Alert—the second-highest threat level, only reached twice since 9/11—due to continuing al-Qaeda activities.

Mr. Chairman, these facts make one thing very clear: We have a great deal of work left to do in Afghanistan.

Just two months ago, the President signed the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002. I am very proud of the fact that this landmark piece of legislation, sponsored by Senator Hagel and cosponsored by me and Senator Lugar, was pushed forward by this committee during the period of my chairmanship. Your own leadership on this issue, Mr. Chairman, was crucial in winning passage for the vitally important Act.

The Act authorized a total of \$3.3 billion for the reconstruction and security of Afghanistan—over and above whatever funds the President might see fit to allocate from other sources.

In recognition of the fact that Afghanistan's recovery is a long-term effort, and in recognition of America's continuing commitment, this sum was structured as a 4-year authorization.

The President's budget proposes funding for Afghanistan for fiscal year 2004 that remains at approximately the same level as funding for fiscal years 2002 and 2003. But none of this will make much of a difference without security—and security is jeopardized by the Administration's decision not to seek an expansion of the UN-mandated peacekeeping force.

We're already seeing Afghanistan drop from the radar screen—what level of commitment will the administration display once Afghanistan has to line up behind Iraq, North Korea, and whatever comes next?

And, Mr. Chairman, let's remember why you, Senator Hagel and I (along with our colleagues on this committee) decided to pass the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act in the first place. I can sum it up in three words: *warlords, drugs, terrorism*.

We did it to prevent Afghanistan's future from becoming a replay of its past.

We did it for the sake of the people of Afghanistan, but we also did it for the sake of our own national security.

Mr. Chairman, we have several distinguished witnesses before us today. I look forward to their testimony—and to finishing the job that we've started in Afghanistan.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Biden.

I want to recognize now our second witness, Peter Rodman, a good friend of our committee, a frequent testifier, whose timely testimony today is important to us. Please proceed.

**STATEMENT OF HON. PETER W. RODMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, WASHINGTON, DC**

Mr. RODMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to apologize for being late myself. As you know, I had another commitment. I am hosting the Defense Minister of Colombia for a working group. But I was able to fulfill that obligation and come here, and I thank you for your courtesy and your indulgence.

I have just had a chance to see a copy of the chairman's opening statement and I certainly agree with the statement about the necessity to follow through. If we fail to follow through as a country on what we have begun and undertaken in Afghanistan, then that will impact not only the war on terrorism, but American credibility generally.

But the commitment of the administration is to do precisely that, and it is a unified commitment of the Department of Defense, the Department of State and every other agency that is engaged there.

I have submitted a formal statement which you have for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be published in full in the record.

Mr. RODMAN. I thank you for that, and if I may I would like to make a few general remarks.

Our fundamental goal as we define it is to help the Afghans build their institutions. It is not for us to do it for them. It is for us to do what we can do, what we need to do, to help them create conditions for the political and economic construction that is going on.

For the Department of Defense, the most important dimension of course is the security dimension, and this includes not only helping buildup the army. This is a means, not an end. It is a means, as I said, to help them provide security and an environment in which this political and economic task of construction can go forward.



Our assessment, however, is that most of the country is basically stable. Our assessment is that 75 to 80 percent of the violent incidents occur in about 20 percent of the country, and that 20 percent is to an increasing degree al-Qaeda and Taliban elements attempting to regroup and American and coalition forces going after them. Most of the country seems by our assessment to be generally stable. Moreover, there is a structure of stability, which was the accomplishment of the Bonn process, an equilibrium among the different political forces in the country, learning the habits of getting along with each other, while we help build the central institutions and help strengthen the central government over a period of time.

As Ambassador Johnson has mentioned, 2 million refugees have returned and—2 million—and that is not a phenomenon that suggests the country is inhospitable to people getting on with starting their lives up again. There are thousands of humanitarian projects under way, some of which the Department of Defense is contributing to, others of course USAID, and of course the international community.

The other thing I want to point to is what David referred to, what we call the Provincial Reconstruction Teams. We think this is a very flexible and creative instrument for addressing the security problems that remain in most of the country, and we think it is responsive to the needs that were perceived by those who are arguing for ISAF expansion. These Provincial Reconstruction Teams are a more robust version of small teams we had around the country in liaison with the different regional leaders. But these teams will have military forces as well as other agencies, to provide a sense of security, to facilitate the efforts of all those involved in the humanitarian and economic reconstruction effort.

These teams we think are a flexible instrument for, as I said, providing a sense of reassurance, exerting our influence in the different regions on behalf of the unity of the country. It, by the way, will help in the training of the ANA because Afghan National Army units will accompany some of these teams where they go.

President Karzai has received this idea very enthusiastically and I think Ambassador Brahimi as well. So this is an American initiative which responds to what we see as the need. These teams will go all over the country where needed and the teams will be adapted to the circumstances that they find. In some cases there will be a minimal security problem and most of the team will be doing the humanitarian work. In other areas, where needed, the military element will be robust enough to provide the sense of security that is needed.

Let me stop there, however, Mr. Chairman, and I am happy to contribute to this discussion. But I do want to emphasize that the administration is united and I think with the Congress in doing the job and staying as long as needed to do the job. We did not come this far to walk away from it. We think the problems are manageable. We think this country, Afghanistan, has come a tremendously long way in one year's time, and it is certainly our commitment to stay and do the job as is necessary.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Rodman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. PETER W. RODMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF  
DEFENSE FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

POST-CONFLICT AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I thank you for the opportunity to discuss with you the Administration's planning and policy with respect to Afghanistan.

President Bush summed it up best in his State of the Union Address: "In Afghanistan, we helped liberate an oppressed people. And we will continue helping them secure their country, rebuild their society, and educate all their children—boys and girls."

The Department of Defense is committed to this goal in Afghanistan. We cannot permit Afghanistan to become again a safe-haven for global terrorism, and we will not. The best assurance of that is to help the Afghan people and their government lay the foundation for lasting peace and stability.

The Afghan people have suffered enormously over the last 25 years. Their sacrifices have been great, and the United States is committed to helping them raise themselves from the ashes of war and destruction—not only to assure them a better future, but so that Afghanistan can be a model to others of peace, moderation, and well-being in the region and in the Muslim world.

Before the fall of the Taliban, Afghanistan was ruled by tyrants and terrorists, and impoverished by them. Whatever the problems that remain, there cannot be any doubt that Afghanistan is a story of accomplishment and progress:

Over 3 million schoolchildren, many of them young girls, are filling the classrooms of Afghanistan.

Schools, hospitals, clinics, and wells are being rebuilt by Afghans, with U.S. and international assistance.

Over two million Afghan refugees have returned to their native land from neighboring countries and abroad. They are voting, with their feet, their confidence in their country.

Our military Civil Affairs teams are making a difference in the lives of many Afghan villagers across the country.

Afghanistan will also adopt a new constitution by the end of the year with elections to follow in June 2004.

The United States will do its part, in this international effort, to help provide Afghans with the resources and support they require. We are confident that the overwhelming majority of Afghans welcome and support our presence in their country as a force for liberation, security, and progress.

In the dimension of security—the Defense Department's special concern—there are certainly challenges that remain. I will discuss them in a moment. But a structure of stability has been built in Afghanistan, and a strong basis for national unity. Our job is to support our Afghan friends as they strengthen their national institutions.

This is a point I want to stress: Afghanistan belongs to the Afghans. We do not aspire to "own" it or run it. We want to help Afghans achieve their goals for peace, freedom, and security. We want to help them create the conditions that will enable them soon to take complete charge of their own affairs as rightful members of the international community, sharing the same rights citizens of so many freedom-loving countries enjoy. We do not want to overstay our welcome, or become the target of various resentments, or foster a relationship of dependency that retards Afghan progress instead of promoting it. It is a delicate balance. So far, I believe we have maintained that balance.

But, as the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act shows, the Administration and Congress clearly share the goal of doing what is needed to finish the job.

*Operation Enduring Freedom—Update*

Remnants of the Taliban and al-Qaeda remain in outlying areas, and the Coalition war to defeat them continues. In cooperation with the Afghan government and our Coalition partners, U.S. forces are continuing combat operations, particularly in the South and Southeast of the country. Most recently [27 January], U.S. Special Forces, with the help of local Afghans, identified and defeated a terrorist sanctuary near the southern town of Spin Buldak close to the Afghan-Pakistan border. U.S. forces in Operation Mongoose [27 January] killed a number of terrorists and seized arms caches and cave complexes. While all terrorist forces have not been enumerated, our forces are playing offense, not defense. We have eliminated terrorist sanctuaries in the country and are continuing to pursue them in the rugged terrain of

the Afghanistan-Pakistan border area—with the active cooperation of both governments.

#### *Security/ISAF*

The overwhelming majority of Afghans live free of terrorism. Seventy-five to eighty percent of the relatively few continuing terrorist-related incidents occur in twenty percent of the country—and that is the South and Southeast portions of the country where the Taliban and al-Qaeda threat persists.

In Kabul, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), first under British and more recently under Turkish lead, has been a force for peace and stability. Whether patrolling the streets of Kabul, lifting the 24-year old curfew or helping to renovate schools, ISAF troops—about 4,500 strong—have helped to restore a sense of normalcy in a city that has been ravaged by war. In November of last year, the United Nations Security Council voted to extend the ISAF mandate until December 2003. Following Turkey's successful tenure, we look forward to continued cooperation with the Germans and Dutch as they take over as lead nations in this important mission. And we are already considering who might be able and willing to take on the follow-on responsibility.

ISAF's mandate in Kabul, as its name suggests, is to assist the Afghans in providing security. This only underscores the importance of rebuilding Afghanistan's own national security institutions. The most important of these tasks are the training of the Afghan National Army, National Police, and Border Guard, and the demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of Afghanistan's regional militias.

#### *Security Sector Reform*

We recognize the key role of building an Afghan National Army. As President Bush said to newly selected Chairman Karzai last January “we are going to help Afghanistan develop her own military. That is the most important part of this visit.” Following the President's direction, the United States has taken the lead in assisting the Afghans to build a new national army. Our immediate objective for the Afghan National Army (ANA) is to build a strong Central Corps in Kabul that can protect the government of Afghanistan, give that government a counterbalance to existing regional forces, and conduct internal security operations without Coalition support.

- To date, U.S. and French trainers have trained six battalions, with a seventh currently undergoing training.
- These battalions are all multi-ethnic and broadly representative of the country. The personnel are also vetted with respect to human rights standards.
- Over the next year and a half, we will continue to assist the Afghans in developing a capable Ministry of Defense and General Staff and a Support Command capable of providing logistical and administrative support to the Army.
- Two companies from the 3rd battalion of the ANA have deployed to Orgun-E in Paktika province, with a Special Forces team. These U.S.-trained Afghan soldiers have effectively carried out both combat missions and civil presence tasks.

The Afghan National Army is a top priority for President Karzai and for this Administration. A well-equipped and well-trained national army will be the foundation for security and national unity in Afghanistan. We look forward to working closely with Congress in allocating the needed resources, and we welcome your continued support in the weeks and months ahead.

The U.S.-led effort to build the Afghan National Army is just one element of the international effort for security reconstruction. Major General Karl Eikenberry serves as the U.S. Security Coordinator in Kabul and Dr. Dov Zakheim, the Department of Defense Comptroller, also serves as the Department's Reconstruction Coordinator for Afghanistan. A key part of their mission is to spur as well as coordinate efforts among the lead nations for security reconstruction.

Germany has the lead for training the Afghan police force, and Italy is the lead for reconstruction of the Afghan judicial sector. Japan and the UN are responsible for disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration. The UK has the lead in working with the Afghan government to fight the scourge of narcotics. The United States is also working to identify and assist a lead nation for the Afghan border police, which has been transferred from the Ministry of Defense to the Ministry of Interior. Here in Washington, the State Department coordinates U.S. assistance for these sectors.

#### *Economic Reconstruction*

Economic reconstruction is a cornerstone of long-term stability in Afghanistan. President Karzai and Finance Minister Ashraf Ghani are leading Afghanistan's effort to recover from years of war, drought, and Taliban mismanagement. Recon-

struction and security are mutually reinforcing. Clearly, conditions of security facilitate economic reconstruction. But economic progress is also a long-term condition of stability—and perhaps also short-term. The international community has pledged more than \$6.6 billion in aid over 5 years at a series of donor conferences. For its part, the United States last year in Tokyo pledged nearly \$300 million for the first year of Afghanistan's reconstruction, but we have delivered twice that. Since October 2001, in fact, the United States has delivered over \$840 million toward Afghanistan's humanitarian aid and economic reconstruction.

Coordination of U.S. Government assistance to Afghanistan is the responsibility of the State Department under the guidance of Ambassador David Johnson—major roles in the delivery of that assistance are played by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM). The United States devoted \$200 million worth of emergency food assistance to Afghanistan in fiscal 2002, helping to prevent a famine and reduce hunger. The United States has helped vaccinate 4.3 million children against measles, treat 700,000 cases of malaria, and provide basic health services for more than two million people last summer. The United States is contributing \$80 million to a \$160 million effort by the United States, Japan, and Saudi Arabia to rebuild the southern half of the "ring road" linking Kabul, Kandahar, and Herat. The United States is also helping with other infrastructure projects, including efforts to rebuild more than six thousand wells, springs, and irrigation canals, and to restore the water supply to Kabul, Kandahar, and Kunduz.

While the State Department and USAID lead the effort, the Department of Defense also supports and assists reconstruction. U.S. military Civil Affairs troops in Afghanistan implement projects that support both the military mission and the reconstruction priorities of the Afghan central government and the U.S. Government. This support has included more than 200 projects worth over \$11 million to help reconstruct 127 schools benefiting over 200,000 students, 26 medical facilities benefiting over two million people, and 400 wells benefiting 631,000 people.

The Afghan government has called for accelerated reconstruction assistance, and rightly so. We are in consultation with President Karzai and his associates on priorities.

In 2001 we overthrew a terrorist regime in Afghanistan. Last winter we helped avert a humanitarian disaster. Our goal in 2003 is to build on the successes of the preceding years by working with the Afghan government, other nations, and the United Nations and other international organizations to help accelerate reconstruction across the country.

#### *Provincial Reconstruction Teams*

The improved security situation in Afghanistan as a whole has made it possible for us to begin a transition from combat operations to what we call stability operations in most of the country. This transition will include the deployment of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs), two of which have already been deployed to Gardez and Bamiyan, and a third will be deployed to Konduz later this month. They will be deployed in other locations, to include Kandahar, Herat, Mazar-e-Sharif, Jalalabad, and Parwan over the next few months. The PRTs will work with central government and regional authorities, and with the United Nations Assistance Mission to Afghanistan (UNAMA), to assist in securing the conditions for economic, civic and other programs.

The teams will be Coalition-led, multi-national and inter-agency in composition. The size of each team will differ based on regional requirements (approx. 50-60 personnel). Each team will include a range of military and civilian disciplines including Special Forces, engineers, medical personnel, State, USAID and other U.S. government agency representatives, working in close coordination with Afghan governmental ministries, local authorities, UNAMA, NGOs, and other international organizations. They are meant to facilitate the efforts of others, not substitute for them.

#### *Conclusion*

We are realistic about the difficulties and about how far we have to go. But it is not "realistic" to fail to recognize how far we have come. We value Congress's vital and constructive role in the evolution of U.S. policy. We also emphasize the essential role that other nations must play—this cannot be only an American responsibility. But I can assure this Committee of the Defense Department's strong positive commitment to support the President's goal of helping the Afghan people secure their country and rebuild their society.

Thank you once again, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to brief you and the other members of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Rodman.

We have attendance of five Senators at this point. Let me consult with the ranking member. Shall we try 7 minutes at the outset?

Senator BIDEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. I will start the clock running on my questions now.

I want to quote from an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal yesterday called "The Other Front," by Ahmed Rashid. You may have seen this, but let me just cite the sentences that I think are important. He says, "Hundreds more extremists are mobilizing in Waziristan in the Pakistan tribal belt adjacent to eastern Afghanistan for a spring offensive calculated to coincide with a U.S. assault in Iraq. They come from a variety of groups—al-Qaeda, former Taliban, Afghans loyal to the renegade commander Hekmatyar, and members of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan."

Then later in the article: "Western diplomats in Islamabad and Kabul, Afghan officials, and U.S. Army officers at Bagram now strongly believe that segments of the Pakistan Intelligence Services and its religious parties are allowing the Taliban to regroup on the Pakistani side of the border. U.S. officers at Bagram say 90 percent of attacks they face are coming from groups based in Pakistan. 'I think the security situation in Pakistan is going to be a problem for some time because of freedom on the border,' says General Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in an address to U.S. troops there on December 21."

As the article by Mr. Rashid says, "Simply put, Pakistan's strategy appears to be to continue hunting down non-Afghan members of the al-Qaeda hiding in Pakistan, so a level of cooperation with the U.S. continues, while at the same time allowing the Pashtun Taliban and others to maintain their presence in Pakistan."

Further in the article, "India and Russia, who are arming several non-Pashtun warlords, are giving support to the President of Tajik and Russia has proposed," according to the article "\$100 million worth of weapons to Mr. Famm's army, which is outside the U.S.-led initiative to build a multi-ethnic Afghan National Army. Interference in Afghanistan by all the neighbors"—and cited are "India, Russia, Iran, the central Asian republics are involved in one warlord group or another in the process of this."

I mention this not because it is a total surprise to both of you, but because we had compelling testimony yesterday about the future of Iraq and the point that was made by at least two of our witnesses in the second panel, that after the hostilities are over we can anticipate activity by all the neighbors, vigorous activities.

I believe that those are occurring in Afghanistan, and I suspect, as my opening statement said, I believe the ISAF span of control is too small, that the aid arrangements and defense being prescribed out there are important. Giving full credit to all the good things that are occurring, the fact of the matter is that this is a situation which came upon us, the United States of America, very unexpectedly. We did not anticipate the attack by the terrorists on the World Trade Center or the Pentagon, nor that very shortly thereafter we would be engaged in military activity in Afghanistan.

But we were and we are still, with our Armed Forces in harm's way. And I find I sense, not a quietude about this, but, as the rank-

ing member pointed out, a sliding almost off the radar screen of a situation that militarily is still in play and in terms of the politics is a jumble of areas covered by warlords, with a valiant Chairman Karzai in the capital hoping to work with Americans to get a national police force or some control of the roads that do not rely upon the warlords, and with a whole segment of the country, as Secretary Rumsfeld has briefed us, in military play, with Pakistan and the inroads back and forth—hardly stability in any respect.

Now, this has got to move, it seems to me, into a much more successful, confident pattern. I stated frankly yesterday that I find it astonishing that in our preparation for Iraq we are so far behind the curve of our military preparation. We heard one witness after another point out that there will be chaotic conditions if military success is visited there. There still are law and order problems, a problem of justice, a problem of how to feed the people, two-thirds of which are now receiving food from 40,000 stations.

In Afghanistan, mercifully, the numbers of persons were smaller. The world community, working through the World Food Program and other organizations was well-equipped. The United States facilitated that, as did other nations.

But we are coming to the end of the line even with ISAF, including with the Germans and the Dutch, unless somebody volunteers.

As one final thought—and I ask for a comment if you have one—from time to time there has been discussion that NATO—Lord Robertson made this suggestion—might be very helpful in trying to find volunteers for ISAF. There might be assignments. This may be a way in which the international community enters very visibly and effectively.

I hope that might be the case. But nevertheless, I am not quieted at this moment by the situation in Afghanistan. I think this is fraught with potential difficulty militarily, quite apart from terms of the civil economy. And I have great respect for all who are working with a problem that we had not anticipated, but one with which we have to have success because our credibility is on the line. Failure would be to witness the question of another vacuum and the recurrence of all the problems that have been visited upon us by 9/11.

This is an editorial, a statement, a summary, a plea. But I ask either one of you for comment, Mr. Johnson or Mr. Rodman.

Mr. RODMAN. Let me start. I first want to say that it should not fall off our radar screen. We agree with you completely. As a nation we have to follow through. The committee is doing a service by holding this hearing and is doing a service by keeping us on our toes, and it should be in the Nation's consciousness until the job is done.

But let me just respond to two points you made. First of all, the last point. ISAF is not coming to "the end of the line." I can say that we are already engaged in looking for follow-on candidates and there are some countries that—they haven't yet made public commitments—so I don't want to mention them—but I am reasonably optimistic that there will be interest in taking the next turn.

You are right, NATO can have a role. It is already playing a role in helping force generation and planning. Whether NATO would take over as such is a different question. But if we have lead coun-

tries or countries taking the lead and NATO supporting it, then I think its future is assured.

And as you know, the mandate was extended through the end of this year, and I think there is plenty of international support for ISAF.

Second, I just wanted to address one of the first points you made, about the Wall Street Journal article. It is true that Taliban and al-Qaeda elements are attempting to regroup in the Pakistan-Afghan border area. But first of all, that is a war-fighting job. That is what our forces are doing and coalition forces. That is not an ISAF job in any circumstance. That is not ISAF's mandate. It is not its capability.

ISAF is well suited to helping provide a backstop to security where the Afghans are able to do some of it. The war-fighting is in the south and southeast part of the country. That is our job, which we are handling as best we can. Some of the fighting is shifting; some of the Taliban and al-Qaeda are shifting to the south from the southeast, partly because we are more active in the southeast in chasing them.

As I said in my statement, our forces are playing offense, not defense, and a lot of the clashes that go on come from circumstances in which we are actively patrolling and catching people and going after people. So even the statistics of violence reflect that to some degree.

But you have to separate the war-fighting job and the job that ISAF does and ISAF-like operations can do and the job of our Provincial Reconstruction Teams, which again is not war-fighting.

The CHAIRMAN. Can we separate, though? The point I am trying to make, the Pakistan view here is unclear. The allegation of the article in essence is that on the one hand Pakistan is cooperating fully, trying to pin down Taliban and send them to Guantanamo and what have you; on the other hand, a part of Pakistan is sending people across the border or allowing them liberally to come into this picture as a part of establishing Pakistan influence, in the same way Iran is establishing influence or Russia or India.

In other words, there is an impact of all of these countries that I presume our statesmen, the two of you and others, are aware of, but clearly is bigger than ISAF. This is international politics impinging upon a very small country.

Mr. JOHNSON. If I could attempt to address a couple aspects of that. I think, with all due respect to Mr. Rashid, he probably writes in a little more detail than is known there. But we are actively engaged with all the States that you had mentioned, that are neighbors or have had traditional interests in Afghanistan, some of them not very helpful interests, some of them very destructive interests.

We believe that President Musharraf is fully committed to this fight, but I think it is also clear that portions of the territory of Pakistan are not completely controlled by the central government. That is not a new situation, and that is the area where the exchanges go back and forth.

We have worked through various fora both directly, bilaterally, and in multilateral exchanges with all the countries you mentioned to encourage, cajole, in every way we can to bring them into the process of creating these institutions, working with us. In par-

ticular, I had a discussion as late as yesterday with representatives of the Russian Federation about how to integrate what they wish to give to Afghanistan into our program of training the Afghan National Army. They have had a long-term relationship with the Northern Alliance and so those ties are longstanding, but I think that ultimately they see their interests with building the central government.

There are probably some hedging of bets going on with all these States, but we are particularly encouraging and working with those States who have traditionally used Afghanistan as a forum to work out bilateral differences not to do that and to see their future in terms of encouraging stability in Afghanistan.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Biden.

Senator BIDEN. The author of that article may not know much about Afghanistan, but I am going to say something outrageous: I do, and the fact of the matter is they are all hedging their bets. Not one single solitary surrounding country has any faith there will be a central government—none, n-o-n-e, and both of you know it. Not one surrounding government is betting on the staying power or that there will be a central government controlling all of Afghanistan.

What bothers me, gentlemen, is not you personally. What bothers me is the administration redefinition of what constitutes security and stability. I have had this longstanding discussion up until recently on a weekly basis with the White House and with the National Security Adviser, for whom I have great respect. You have redefined what constitutes stability: lack of violence.

That was not the mandate. The mandate was a central government controlling all of Afghanistan that was multi-ethnic and violence-free. You cannot get in an automobile, either one of you, without a military escort and travel from Kabul to Herat. You cannot do it. You would not do it.

There is no stability in Afghanistan as we defined it initially. And what is exactly happening here is Musharraf is hedging his bet. Musharraf is wondering whether or not when Afghanistan goes down and Karzai leaves or is assassinated, whether or not—what does he face at home? You have parts of the International Security Service for Pakistan once again either turning a blind eye to or cooperating with part of the Pashtun. Why? Because Ismail Khan is cooperating with the Iranians, because the Tajiks are cooperating with the Russians.

This is a replay, a replay of the last 100 years of history. And we knew that. I wish we would stop talking about stability. Give me a break, Mr. Rodman. You cannot, Karzai cannot, go outside of Kabul. There is no stability. Ismail Khan does not have to pick up the phone and ask whether or not any program is going to be developed in his part, his part, of Afghanistan, that comes from the central government.

The whole purpose of the central government and us funneling the money through in the first place, as I sat there for hours in Karzai's office, was that he had to have something to give. Otherwise he has no—he needs one of two things: He either has to have a goody basket that decides when he is going to build a road, he



decides whether a road gets built in Herat or a well gets dug; or he has to have the military force to be able to do it, to control it.

Now, as the young kids say, “we ought to get real here.” I mean, look, we have made progress. Americans are out there risking their lives every single day. They are trying to track down the Taliban and they are trying to track down the al-Qaeda. But right from the beginning the way we characterized this—how many al-Qaeda, how many Taliban forces did we say as we moved in we expected to have to confront? 50,000, 100,000, 150,000?

Do any of you remember the number that we talked about? Mr. Rodman, Defense Department, what do you think? What was the number we were talking about?

Mr. RODMAN. A year ago?

Senator BIDEN. A year ago, before we invaded, as we prepared.

Mr. RODMAN. I do not remember the number.

Senator BIDEN. Well, it was well over 100,000. Now, it does not take a mathematician for us to figure out every single Taliban killed, even with the exaggerated estimates, every single Taliban captured, every single Taliban member who came along and said, I have changed my ways, I have seen the Lord. Add them all up, that leaves somewhere between 50,000 and 90,000 of them out there.

Where do we think they all went? Do we think they all of a sudden had a, as we Catholics say, “an epiphany?” They are there. They are there, and it frustrates the devil out of me, as you can tell, by us sort of sugar-coating this. It is a terrible job, but the sine qua non is that no outside power other than us and an international force would mold Afghanistan, and Iran is molding western Afghanistan, Pakistan is molding parts of southeast Afghanistan, and the list goes on.

So my frustration is you still cannot travel in the west. Ismail Khan has now decided that women should wear burkhas again. Man, that is stability. That is real stability. I do not mean this to be humorous. I am not trying to be a wise guy. But speaking for myself, what I am worried about is if the same standard is set down, if this is what we call commitment and, the phrase, “stability-building, because I know “nation-building” is not a good thing to say—whatever we call it, if this is the standard we are in, as they say on the east side of my city, “in a world of hurt” when we decide what our policy is with regard to Iraq.

I will come back because I have questions and I have used up my time editorially here. But you know, when you have Atta, Dostum’s rival, the Tajik former Northern Alliance commander, Ismail Khan, you have Gul, you have these guys who are out there who are the strongest of the warlords, and there is zero, zero, zero control from the central government, zero, that is not stability.

That was not what we said and announced in Bonn was our objective. We are changing the definition of what success is.

My last comment, Mr. Rodman is, you say “we will stay there until the mission is finished.” Have we redefined the mission? Is the redefinition of the mission that not that many people are being killed, because all the women are wearing burkhas again, the men are required not to shave any more, that we have ourselves in a

situation where no one dares travel the roads, where the university is not functioning as was intended?

That is stability. If that is how we define it, you are right, we are approaching stability. But if the mission is a centralized government that is able to be strong enough to resist the pressure of the surrounding States to alter the environment in Afghanistan, we are on the first rung on the ladder.

So I need at some point a clear definition from the administration of what constitutes the mission, the mission. When do we know we have succeeded? When everyone salutes Ismail Khan—I keep picking on that one example, but—in Herat and no one is dying? Is that success, when we know his relationships with Iran, we know they are increasing? Is that stability? Is that the mission?

If it is, that is not the one I signed onto.

I would be happy to invite comments and I will be back with very specific questions.

The CHAIRMAN. At this point let me proceed and then we will be back with another opportunity.

Senator Hagel.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Gentlemen, thank you for coming before this committee this morning. As Senator Biden and Senator Lugar have stated, we are aware of the difficulty that you all are charged with, your colleagues. So you should know that we appreciate the kind of challenges that you are dealing with in this imperfect world.

That recognized, which I think is important to recognize, the questions and comments we have just heard—and we will hear more before this hearing is complete this morning—are relevant for all the reasons you understand.

Before I get to a couple specific questions, I was struck by both your testimonies, as I was with your colleagues' yesterday who were here to talk about a post-Saddam Iraq, in how many times you referenced our allies, our partners, coalitions to assist us. And as a result of that, I am further struck with certainly this administration's understanding that we cannot do this alone in Afghanistan or Iraq or North Korea or wherever. That should guide our acceleration of an enthusiasm about going to war in Iraq, but you are not here to talk about Iraq.

But all of this does connect, I think. There is linkage to this, because we are talking about regions of the world. We are not talking about Afghanistan in a vacuum, as Chairman Lugar said, nor were we yesterday talking about Iraq in a vacuum. We have world terrorism. We are in Afghanistan for a number of reasons, but we are there as a result of world terrorism being visited on the United States of America.

So even the much-maligned NATO allies Germany and France get some credit from the two of you this morning, so I am sure they appreciate that, and Americans must have some sense that France and Germany occasionally do their part. And I make that point because I hope your leaders are appreciating what you are saying today and what was said yesterday and what Tenet will say, I suspect is saying now, before the Senate Armed Services Committee and what I heard in the Intelligence closed door hearing yesterday, that in fact America cannot take on world terrorism alone.

So we should slow down a little bit here and understand that others might have a different view of the world than us. But it may well be that that is important, to accommodate those views, because if we are to fulfill the commitments that you have laid out as a result of what the President of the United States said our commitment was going to be—and I think we all support that commitment up here for all the reasons we understand—then it is going to take a tremendous coalition of common interests, working with institutions like the United Nations and like NATO, to accomplish it.

Now, with that said, let me get to some budget numbers. We talk about reconstruction projects, the provincial reconstruction teams, the “ring road”. I would like to get into some of the specifics of how much money have we actually spent on reconstruction projects, infrastructure projects, job-producing projects, the kind of economic power that Karzai needs to give some semblance of governance and some indication to the people of Afghanistan that he has a government, that there is somebody supporting him, rather than Special Forces in the mountains dealing with the east and western borders of Afghanistan.

When, for example, is the “ring road” to begin? Has it begun? How much money in the \$6.1 billion that was just asked for by the administration goes to reconstruction? It would be very helpful if the two of you could lay out some of those numbers for the committee and additional anticipated reconstruction numbers. And either can begin.

Thank you very much.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Senator. Allies are important in what we are doing in Afghanistan. The Germans and the Dutch working together in ISAF is a great move for us in the right direction and so we are grateful for their help. We are also grateful for the more than 1,000 troops who are participating in the coalition itself.

With respect to the question about providing President Karzai with the resources that he needs in order to provide services, I would like to say that our primary goal in this entire undertaking is helping Afghans build the Afghan State. We have provided more than \$20 million in the last year to help rebuild the ministries. We have provided more than \$10 million for children’s and women’s institutions in health care.

The President has committed \$80 million to build this “ring road.” The first of the contracts for the first 50 kilometers has already been let. Surface preparation has already begun. It is the equation between the cost and the temperature. It is not appropriate right now to start laying blacktop, but that will begin probably on or about the end of March because that is when it will be appropriate to do so in terms of construction techniques.

The Japanese will begin this month their survey of their portion of the road, which begins in Kandahar and heads back in the direction of Kabul. It will be our goal and intention to complete the section of this road from Kabul to Kandahar in advance of the elections in 2004. That is a big goal to meet, do not know if we can, but the President has publicly committed to complete the entire road within 3 years. There is going to be some funding required beyond the 2004 report that the President has placed before the Con-

gress in order to do that. But we will be working on those numbers into the future.

I think that our commitment and our goals and even our methods of trying to help the Afghan Government create these institutions are actually quite similar: trying to give him the textbooks he needs, the funding for the schools that he needs in order to provide education for his people. We are committed to doing this through the center, providing the central government with these types of resources, so that the population sees those good things coming from the central government.

And it is not just in terms of the military that our allies and partners are important. It is also in terms of this reconstruction effort. European Union countries and the European Commission have themselves provided about a half a billion dollars in assistance during the first year of this project and will continue to provide more over time.

Senator HAGEL. May I ask, Secretary Rodman. I think this is the \$6.1 billion that was requested from DOD, is that right, in additional moneys?

Mr. RODMAN. I am not sure.

Senator HAGEL. Is that correct, the \$6.1 billion in additional moneys for Afghanistan for the war on terrorism, for the fiscal year 2003 budget? Is that coming out of DOD or is that coming out of State?

Mr. RODMAN. That is what I assume.

Senator HAGEL. You assume?

Mr. RODMAN. I do not have the budget figures in front of me.

Senator HAGEL. Are you aware that that request was made?

Mr. RODMAN. Yes.

Senator HAGEL. And you cannot tell me anything about it?

Mr. RODMAN. No, I am not up on the details of the budget. But I can reply for the record.

[The following information was subsequently supplied.]

In the consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 (P.L. 108-7), the Congress appropriated \$6.1 billion for Department of Defense activities. The majority of these funds will be used to fund the operations and personnel costs for Operation Enduring Freedom and the Global War on Terrorism. Some of these funds, however, may be used to fund "Operation Noble Eagle" (homeland defense and civil support missions, including air patrols over New York and Washington, in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2000). DOD currently estimates these later costs at approximately \$1.6 billion per month.

Senator HAGEL. Did you understand the purpose of this hearing this morning, really?

Mr. RODMAN. Yes.

Senator HAGEL. OK. Well, we would appreciate it if someone at DOD could explain to us why they asked for \$6.1 billion and what that \$6.1 billion would be used for.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Hagel.

[Prepared statement of Senator Hagel follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR CHUCK HAGEL

Afghanistan has come a long way since its liberation from the Taliban, but it remains a country on the razor's edge. The Government of President Hamid Karzai has made great gains in setting Afghanistan on the path to stability and progress,

and in gaining the respect and support of the international community, but the job is far from complete.

Afghanistan continues to need our help to construct its economy, health-care, education systems, and democratic political infrastructures. The general population of Afghanistan remains, for the most part, poor and malnourished. The forces of reaction and oppression still exist in Afghanistan's political culture and society. The reach of President Karzai's government does not yet extend very far beyond Kabul. Stability in many of the outlying provinces depends on the good graces of warlords whose interests and intentions cannot be trusted.

Afghanistan is early into a long-term transition to stability. America and the international community must assure that Afghanistan does not slip off the precarious road it has taken away from civil war and oppression and toward a hopeful future.

Afghanistan cannot be considered in a vacuum. America's commitment to Afghanistan is not simply for the benefit of the Afghan people, although that is all to the good. Our commitment to Afghanistan is also an investment in the security and future of the United States and our allies. What we do in Afghanistan is directly linked to our interests in fighting the global war on terrorism; to combating illegal narcotics trafficking; and to promoting regional stability in Central and South Asia. The struggle in Afghanistan is far from over. We must prevent Afghanistan from again becoming either a "Great Game" for outside powers or a refuge for despots and terrorists.

Afghanistan is the first test in the global war on terrorism, and we cannot fail. The world is watching. Failure in Afghanistan would be a failure for U.S. power and prestige everywhere. America's security interests would suffer. The stakes are high and the margins of error are low. As other events dominate the headlines of our media and the agendas of our policy-makers, we cannot forget the stake that we have in Afghanistan, and how its future is now linked to our security.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Feingold.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you to the witnesses, and let me first compliment both the chairman and the ranking member. I do not want anything from either of you yet, but I just want to say that the hearings that were held under Senator Biden's chairmanship on Iraq at the end of July and early August were really some of the most useful hearings. I am not necessarily happy with the way we have headed, but I really felt that they set the stage for a lot of what has happened since then in our inquiry on this.

Mr. Chairman, this series of hearings that you have set forth in the first few weeks of your chairmanship on North Korea and Afghanistan and Iraq have really allowed this committee to live up to what I think is its role—is to examine these matters in connection with each other rather than in isolation. I think it is a comfort to the American people that this committee is really stepping up to the plate and asking the tough questions.

So I thank you for that and I look forward to more of these hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator FEINGOLD. Following on what Senator Hagel was talking to you about, if you could give me a general sense: What is the administration's assessment of total aid requirements, what is the plan for reaching that level, and what portion of the total burden does the United States expect to shoulder and what kind of commitments do we have from other donors to date indicating that the expectation about our own involvement will be realistic? Sir?

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you. The World Bank provided the estimate that was used for the Tokyo conference and that is what we are basing our best estimates on at this point. Their estimate was over a 10-year period approximately \$10 billion would be required. The

Tokyo pledges covered a range of dates up to 5 years. Ours was for 1 year. Some States pledged for a longer period of time. And the total pledges from that period were \$4.5 billion over that period of time.

I think that, if anything, the assessments over time are going to rise, because the degree of destruction is becoming more and more apparent, as is the expense of addressing that. So I think that, while the World Bank estimated that a year and a half ago, if they were to provide us a current estimate it would exceed the amount that they provided in that point.

We have not posited a specific percentage that we wished to pledge against on this. Instead, we have sought moneys for specific programs that we think would provide the most impact in terms of helping build the Afghan State. For that reason, we have—the President decided this past fall that, in a turn from the traditions that we had provided general infrastructure over the last dozen to 20 years—we had left that to the international funding institutions, but because of the political impact of rebuilding this transportation network we stepped up and we began the effort to organize the reconstruction of the “ring road.”

We anticipate that at a meeting that will take place on the 16th of March scheduled for Kabul, where the Afghan Government will present its next year’s budget and its development budget, that the World Bank will make some announcements, pending their decisions over the next several weeks.

Senator FEINGOLD. I understand that, but if you can help me with this.

Mr. JOHNSON. Sure.

Senator FEINGOLD. Because if a constituent asks me, and they will, constituents will ask me, of the \$10.2 billion or higher figure, how much are we paying and how much are other people paying, could you give me a rough estimate of what you expect?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think I can tell you what the—I can give you a rough estimate of what the pattern has shown so far, and the pattern has shown so far, if my head math is correct, that we are paying around a third of the amount that is being disbursed.

I would also hastily add that our money is leaving our hands and going to projects more quickly than other people’s, as is the historical trend. On the other hand, a lot of those other States have a great deal of staying power. So I do not doubt that they are going to come through on their commitments. We have provided I think only in the last few days a set of estimates of the payments that have been made by other States to the Congress that goes into some detail on this question.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you.

What is the major impediment to expanding ISAF’s scope of operations outside the immediate vicinity of Kabul?

Mr. RODMAN. I can take that one on. There are a number of reasons why this has not occurred. One is that none of the countries in ISAF is interested or willing to do it. In fact, the Turks and the Germans and Dutch who followed them made it almost a condition of their acceptance of the role. They wanted the mandate limited to Kabul, as it was in the original resolutions.

Second, as we assessed this over the course of the past year thought we had other ways of addressing the problems that others were raising. The first solution we came up with was small teams around the country of Special Forces with an admixture of State Department personnel and other personnel, in a liaison role with the different regional figures, who have had a demonstrable effect in exerting American influence to avoid and minimize clashes among the different figures.

That we thought served reasonably well as a more economical way of exerting our influence in the interest of stabilizing the situation.

Finally, as we looked over the whole picture toward the end of last year, we came up with this idea I was discussing of Provincial Reconstruction Teams. We looked at the mission that our forces were carrying out and we discovered that the war-fighting mission was really confined to this small portion of the country, the south and the southeast. In the rest of the country we really were not doing war-fighting any more, because the problem was not Taliban and al-Qaeda any more.

So we came up with the idea of sort of expanding this concept of the smaller teams, having American forces and coalition forces get into a phase of what we call stability operations. We think we have addressed the concerns that a lot of people were raising about the sense of insecurity around the country. What we have come up with we think is a very flexible instrument, which adds to a sense of security, which facilitates the humanitarian efforts which are going on. One of the concerns that was expressed to us was that the agencies doing humanitarian work felt nervous about the security of where they were operating. So we think we have a partial answer to that in most of the country.

The question of expanding ISAF is still open in theory, but President Karzai, Ambassador Brahimi and so on are very intrigued—"excited" may not be too strong a word—by this new idea we have come up with, and I think we should give that a test and see whether it provides a sense of security that people have wanted in most of the country.

Senator FEINGOLD. Mr. Chairman, I know my time is up. I just want to comment that we went to war in Afghanistan because we were attacked and it seems to me we have an urgent need for real stability country-wide. I am, at least at this point, certainly not persuaded that this approach will work.

If I could just ask a quick question that maybe has a very brief answer, how would you characterize the morale of U.S. troops currently in Afghanistan, Secretary Rodman?

Mr. RODMAN. Our sense is that it is quite good. I have an assistant of mine who spent 6 months in Kandahar on reserve duty as a corporal in the Special Forces, and he finds our people highly motivated, at least the Special Forces. They are on the front line, they are doing something vital. They interact with the population and their sense is that they are a welcome presence.

I know General Pace, various officials, Paul Wolfowitz, who have been out there recently have the same sense, that our people are motivated and know that they are doing something important.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the extra time.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Feingold.

Senator Chafee.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Following up on some of the previous questions, I think the direction we are going in was the risk of our unilateralism or perceived unilateralism in Iraq and how that might affect ISAF. And is there any overt pressure from any of the 18 countries to your boss, to Mr. Johnson, to Secretary Powell, that if you are going to go it alone in Iraq you can go it alone in Afghanistan also? Is there any of that going on?

Mr. JOHNSON. In a word, no. I think that all of the countries which are participating in ISAF, as well as those who are participating in the civilian reconstruction effort, are fully committed to what we are all trying to do in Afghanistan. Many of them see their own bilateral interests affected. They see the security of their own populations affected. And I think that it is—I have not found a single instance where they have asked me any question related to other things outside of Afghanistan. They want this to work and they want to participate in it, and it is very much an effort which includes a range of countries, including alliance countries, but also including countries well beyond the NATO alliance.

Senator CHAFEE. Yes, Mr. Rodman.

Mr. RODMAN. Senator, may I add a note to the same answer. If anything, it may be the opposite effect. I cannot psychoanalyze allied leaders, but some of them who are uneasy about Iraq seem eager to show that they are helping us in Afghanistan. The Germans and Dutch are quite eager to step up to this. Even when some of the recent tensions with Germany had begun several months ago, the Germans and Dutch were very eager to show they were going to step up to this responsibility.

In any of the other countries, I do not detect any falling off of willingness to participate.

Senator CHAFEE. So you can pretty much flatly say in the next few weeks we cannot expect to pick up the paper and see any of these 18 countries withdrawing from the Bonn Agreement?

Mr. RODMAN. I do not see any sign of that.

Senator CHAFEE. My next question is on the elections. They are scheduled for June 2004, a year and a half away. Do you have any fears that there could be anti-American candidates elected, and what would we do in that instance?

Mr. JOHNSON. The process of the elections is just getting under way. The International Foundation for Election Systems has just put a team on the ground. They are doing some early planning. They have got I think a very sound group that has got a lot of experience, that we have relied on in the past.

I think, because this process has not really gotten very far, the constitution has not taken shape, that even the type of election this is going to be and whether there would be opportunities for opposition candidates that may not be popular with us to emerge is still open to question. So I think how we would deal with that is at this point, a bit hypothetical.

That we would deal with it is not, though. If there were indeed candidates who represented a threat to our interests, if they were



al-Qaeda candidates, to choose the most extreme example, we would have to take steps to protect our interests.

Senator CHAFEE. So would you say that you are beginning to think about ways of preventing, as you said, the opportunities for those people to be involved in the democratic process?

Mr. JOHNSON. We are in the process of assisting the Afghans, as we have said before, and assisting the U.N. in this case, in creating the structures for these elections. So we are aware of this potential. We will pay a great deal of attention to it. I think it is probably premature to say that we have thought about steps to prevent it at this point, because we have to see how the situation emerges as to what sort of election process is going to be created, what sort of candidacies are out there. But it is not something that we are going to take our eye off, that is for sure.

Senator CHAFEE. Over and over we heard yesterday and today, yesterday about Iraq and here today, Afghanistan for the Afghans, Afghanistan is for the Afghans. Are you completely committed to that as we go forward to that democratic process? It is coming. A year and a half, it is not that far away.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is absolutely correct. Eighteen months—even less than that now—16 is not a long time to plan an election, to provide the structure for it, to engage in the civic education process for a country which is not used to having elections at all.

So we have to get and we are getting accelerated on that timetable. We do believe that it is possible. We do think that the elections in the Bonn timetable are a timetable we should stick to there, in a sense an action-forcing event, so that compromises are forced to be made and we can move along the path that we think we need to move toward in order to keep the Bonn process intact and to help the Afghans build this government.

I think we are talking about Afghanistan for the Afghans, if you will, and helping them build their institutions, not having us or any other institution of international power take over their country, remold it, and then hand it back to them. We want to assist them in building up their own institutions.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you. I know it is a prodigious task, herculean in fact, to try and transform into a democratic process. But it is relevant because of what we could be doing in Iraq, and what we heard yesterday is the same pitch, that we are going to have democracy in Iraq. So this could be the test tube for what might happen west of there. So thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Corzine.

Senator CORZINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and to the witnesses for being responsive.

Let me identify first with the difficulty that I know reconstruction, rebuilding, and nation building may be. I had the good fortune of actually visiting Afghanistan last March and it is a high task, a hard task, that we are talking about here today.

I also want to identify with the concepts that we have to think about the world on a comprehensive basis and allies in one area may be influenced. I am glad to hear that people are lining up to help us in Afghanistan. I presume that will follow through and that \$10 billion World Bank target of resources, hopefully we will even be able to spread it more than just one-third to the United States.

I have a question that I guess will probably be more forcefully asked by Senator Biden, but we continue to have discussions about what is our mission here. I have one—I get this simple question regularly at town hall meetings: Wasn't our mission to bring to justice Mullah Omar, the leadership of al-Qaeda? We heard the simple, back of the envelope numbers that Senator Biden talked about. Are we fulfilling that mission in our war-fighting areas?

Then I have the general question, since we are beginning to see a re-imposition of some of the Islamic enforcement measures—we heard the part talked about in western Iran with Ismail Khan. But there seem to be a number of steps, whether it has to do with cable television or whether the rights of women, that are seeming to be eroded relative to where we started out this process. Is that consistent with our mission?

And third, do we really think that these provincial or regional teams, which we have not heard described in numbers, but are they really able—we heard numbers from 10 to 60 people, scattered in regional teams—to bring about the accomplishment of the kind of mission that is so broad-based? I can only say that if that is what we are going to do in Iraq, where weapons of mass destruction are scattered about, one has a serious concern about whether we are going to be able to do it.

And I think again I compliment the chairman for holding these hearings in a sort of a back to back context, because one is a guidepost for what might happen in the future. So on all three of those basic fronts, I would like to hear your commentary.

Mr. RODMAN. Let me start off. The first question was about the war-fighting mission, catching Mullah Omar. I think the President, at the beginning of this, stated multiple goals. Certainly finding some of these individuals was something we wanted to do and are still pursuing. But we also defined the goal in terms of making sure that Afghanistan was no longer a sanctuary and a training area and a headquarters for terrorists.

So the terrorists are hiding, they are on the run. One thing they have not been able to do is to reconstitute and take back Afghanistan. We took Afghanistan away from them, and I still would hold to the view that most of the country is in the hands of the Afghans that we wanted to give it back to, not the Taliban and al-Qaeda.

I cannot vouch for the number that Senator Biden said of how many al-Qaeda and Taliban there are. I do not know what the number is. I can ask people in our intelligence agencies. I am not sure that is the benchmark of what we were setting ourselves to do. We had, as I say, multiple goals and I think we have achieved a number of them.

And the al-Qaeda and Taliban are in a particular area, in the border area, and we are chasing them. We know that al-Qaeda is around the world and possibly planning to come after us. But I do not think they are doing this planning in Afghanistan any more, and that was part of the goal we set for ourselves.

Let me say a word about the Provincial Reconstruction Teams. I have no idea whether this is an adaptable model for Iraq. This is something we devised in the Afghan situation, not for the war-fighting mission, but to facilitate reconstruction and to help to provide a general sense of security for the civilian tasks of rebuilding

that are going on. We think it addresses the problem that it was meant to.

Senator CORZINE. Are these numbers credible in trying to provide that kind of security for, a sense of security for the communities and regions that they are responsible for?

Mr. RODMAN. It is consistent with our assessment that most of the country is basically stable in terms of violent incidents. I am sorry Senator Biden is not here, but I think reducing the number of incidents is not a small matter. That is precisely the issue that the humanitarian organizations have been raising to us, saying they are nervous about operating in certain parts of the country because of violent incidents. So if that can be reduced and they have some sense of security, that is one of our objectives.

And we have been accomplishing this up to now with even smaller teams, in liaison with the regional commanders. We are now doing that on a more robust basis. The numbers I think you have seen; these teams might have 50 or 60 people, some of whom would be military, others would be civilian, and it would depend on the need. Gardez is a place with a certain amount of insecurity. Bamiyan I do not think is a place where there is a lot of violence going on, so the team in Bamiyan is probably differently constituted than the other teams.

But people spoke about the "ISAF effect," wanting some psychological effect of a presence, international presence, that buttressed the sense of security, that was a kind of surrogate for the central authority of the Afghan Government and a representation of the international community, and that presence was thought to have a beneficial effect politically, psychologically, as well as being able to help with security functions.

We think this idea is certainly worth trying out, and that is what we are doing right now.

Senator CORZINE. Human rights and women's rights, with respect to that?

Mr. RODMAN. David, why do you not take that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think one has to bear in mind that there are "conservative elements," to use a term, that are in Afghanistan. This society does not look at things in one single way. So we are seeing some resurgence of that. In the particular case that has caught the most attention, and rightly so, in the west, I think our assessment is that Ismail Khan is losing support rather than gaining it in behaving the way that he is. And we think that over time that is going to affect him and his ability to maintain any influence in the west of Iran. That is not going to be a one-day operation.

I think that one of the things that I would emphasize here is that, whether we are on the first rung of the ladder or the second or the third or however many rungs the ladder has, we are involved in a process here that is going to have a long period of time associated with it, working with the Afghan authorities to help them build their institutions and assisting them over a very long period of time. So this is not a—we are not stopping now.

If I could also say a little bit about the teams that you referred to, whether you describe it as learning by doing or we too are capable of responding to external stimuli, we have changed the way we have dealt with this. Peter referred to some efforts we had a year

or so ago that were successful, but over time we adapted and this is another idea to try to address this.

They are not cookie-cutters each one. They are different. And the command is going to deploy the first three and take what it calls a pause and assess how it is doing and then decide how to configure or to change the configuration of the remaining ones as it goes on. So this is not something where we have decided this is going to be the way it is done. We are going to learn as we go along. We are going to engage our partners in this process and we are going to, I think, do a better job as the summer goes on.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Corzine.

Senator Coleman.

Senator COLEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was not part of this esteemed body when U.S. forces entered Afghanistan, but as a lay citizen I really thought there was a singular mission, with the goals being a subpart of that. The President spoke very forcefully about nations that harbor terrorists and that the mission would be to ensure that Afghanistan was a place that no longer harbored the terrorists that were responsible for September 11, depriving terrorists of their sanctuary.

I thought that was the mission, and it appears to me then there are various goals that if you want to make sure that mission stays successful you do not want to step back. So clearly we need long-term stability in Afghanistan. We need to deal with and have concerns about the influence of Afghanistan's neighbors, and I want to get back to a question about that. We want to understand and be cognizant of and deal with the fragility of the Karzai regime and what are its long-term prospects for success. We are obviously concerned about the limited geographic reach of ISAF.

So there are a series, then. If the mission—and again my sense is, and please correct me, that we were successful in the principal mission as established by the President, that Afghanistan was no longer going to be a place that was going to harbor terrorists responsible, provide sanctuary for terrorists who were responsible, for September 11.

My concern is about the long-term, the success of that mission, and in particular a question raised by the chairman when he talked about the influence of the neighbors. Iran has been described as part of the "axis of evil." If Iran is having an influence, do we run the risk of in portions of Afghanistan losing the success, losing what we have achieved in terms of the mission?

So if you can help me on that one, and then I will throw out one other question. There was an article in the Christian Science Monitor just the other day that talked about the Afghan National Army, 600 new recruits being entered, and I presume that is a long-term, long-term prospect. But can you talk to me a little bit about the prognosis for the impact of the Afghan National Army in terms of providing the kind of stability that will allow for the continued success of the mission, which is to make sure that Afghanistan is not a place that is providing sanctuary for terrorists?

Mr. RODMAN. I do not think there is a dispute here. Maybe it is a semantic question. The main mission was to clean out Afghanistan and make it, as you said, no longer a haven for al-Qaeda, and

we are still chasing the al-Qaeda remnant. And that is not a secret. We have not finished that job, but we think the great bulk of the country is now in the hands of the Afghans that we want to run their own country.

And just as you say, our interest in stability or our interest in helping this country rebuild its political system is precisely to make sure the post-Taliban vacuum, is filled by the good guys as the best long-term insurance against its being filled by the bad guys.

On the interference of neighbors, I will leave to Dave to elaborate, but it is clear that the neighboring countries want to have their hand in it. They play favorites; they have their own clients in the country. They all like to do this. Now, whether they are succeeding is a judgment call, and our assessment is a little less dire than what we have heard today.

And all of these outsiders worry about the influence of somebody else. They are rivals. It may be that everybody's second choice is the Bonn Agreement, so that if they cannot dominate, they do not want some other neighboring country to dominate. And that is the space that we have to strengthen the Afghan legitimate government, to make it more resistant to this outside interference.

As I said, our assessment is that, yes, there are a lot of people trying to interfere. But whether they are undermining the process is a judgment call and we do not think it is in such danger.

On the Afghan National Army, I can just say that it is progressing slowly but successfully. For the first several battalions, we were not able to recruit the full number of about 600. We turned them out and trained them, but they were understrength. The most recent battalion is at full strength, and there will be a seventh battalion that will be used mainly for filler units.

So what we see is that the recruitment process is succeeding. There seems to be more interest among Afghans to join it. And we will continue this process of training, at least for the next year or so, at least through the election process, and we will keep going. One of the limiting factors has been up to now our ability to recruit, but we think that is clearly improving.

Second, one of the benefits of these Provincial Reconstruction Teams is to bring Afghan units with us. So they will do missions and they will benefit from that experience.

But in addition, the Afghan units have gone out on their own and done missions on their own.

So we think this is working. The numbers are small, but they are multi-ethnic units. They are meeting the criteria that we set out. They are vetted according to human rights standards, and they are multi-ethnic. As the central authority grows in this dimension, it will have a political effect.

Senator COLEMAN. If I can, Mr. Chairman, just raise one other question with the time that I have, and this is an area that I have not touched upon. But a U.N. report released in February 2003 noted that Afghanistan was the world's largest source of raw opium in 2002. I am concerned about in this country the rise again in heroin abuse and addiction and wondering what is being done to reduce opium production. How aggressive has the Afghanistan Gov-

ernment been in enforcing, in enforcing the ban on production, given these alarming statistics?

Mr. JOHNSON. We have a slight dispute with the U.N. numbers, but even our number is quite large, so we do not have any dispute with the overall assessment.

In terms of trying to divide up responsibilities and share burdens, the United Kingdom has taken on the role of the lead donor, the lead State, to help in the counternarcotics effort. That is because they have a very selfish interest since most of the heroin coming into London comes out of Afghanistan, whereas most of ours comes from Latin America.

They had a program last year of so-called compensated eradication that they estimated managed to destroy about a third of the crop, which was quite successful given the circumstances. But that still leaves a very large amount outstanding.

The Karzai Government we thought took a relatively—not just a relatively—a courageous step in pushing back and banning the production of opium. They have told us this year that they wish for foreign donors, foreign actors, to work on the Alternative Livelihoods Program and they are going to work on the eradication. The Governors in the various provinces have taken on that responsibility. There have been various assertions of how much of the crop they have destroyed at this point, but I think the jury is very much out on how that program is going to work and it is something that is going to bear a lot of watching by us.

Senator COLEMAN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Coleman.

Senator Sarbanes.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I yesterday commended you for scheduling this hearing and I want to repeat that commendation this morning, and also the fact that this is but the first in a series of hearings that the committee will hold with respect to Afghanistan.

I very strongly support your opening statement that if we are able to help Afghanistan transition into a secure democracy we will bolster our ability to attract allies in the war against terrorism. American credibility is on the line and we must understand that failure to follow through could have extremely negative consequences for the war on terror. I think that is absolutely on point.

I am encouraged that you and Senator Biden and others on this committee have been pushing this very hard. In fact, it is my own perception that it is the prompting of the Congress that has moved the administration to take more interest, although in my view nowhere near the interest that needs to be taken.

I would say to the two witnesses at the table, we have a leadership now in Afghanistan that was arrived at through a process that bestows a legitimacy upon it within the country, as I perceive it at least, and a leader in Mr. Karzai who from all impressions is seeking to institute in his country a system and a commitment to values that would command our respect and international respect.

So the Afghans have produced a leadership with which we can work closely and coordinate, and the rest of the international community as well. And I am concerned that we are not doing enough.

Clearly we are falling short of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, which the Congress approved.

Let me put this question to each of you. If the President were to call you in and say, I do not think we are doing enough on Afghanistan, I read Senator Lugar's opening statement and I listened to Senator Biden and others and I think they are right, we need to do more, I think our credibility is at stake, we have a government there we obviously can work with, and I want an action program to step up the U.S. and the international involvement to try to address some of these pressing issues that exist there and to make sure that a military operation which by all estimation was a success, that we do not lose it, what action program would you have for the President?

Suppose he said, I think the Congress would give me more money. They obviously have indicated as much. They have passed this authorization act. We are falling far short of it. I think that is correct. You are nowhere near the authorized figures, I think, in your efforts. And the President said, What is your significantly upgraded action program to try to make sure that we get the stability and reconstruction and reform in Afghanistan? What would you put forth?

Mr. RODMAN. We are asking ourselves the same kind of question all the time. Our policy has evolved over the past year. We have talked about the Provincial Reconstruction Teams, which are meant to address a need that a lot of people thought was not being addressed. That is a concept that can expand to do the job of supporting stability.

The Afghan National Army is clearly the priority. It is a priority of President Karzai; it ought to be one of our main priorities. We have contractors looking at that training program constantly to see how we can expand that training program.

As I say, one of the limiting factors had been getting recruits and part of our job is to work with the Afghans to make sure that the Afghan leaders, both in Kabul and around the country, are cooperating with—

Senator SARBANES. How much are they paid, those recruits?

Mr. RODMAN. I do not have the exact number, but I am told that it is a salary that is competitive with other things.

Senator BIDEN. If the Senator will yield—

Senator SARBANES. How much is it? I mean, you are the Department of Defense. You are involved.

Senator BIDEN. It is \$50.

Mr. RODMAN. It is \$50 after they graduate, \$30 while they are in training.

Senator BIDEN. And the guy who sweeps the barracks floor, according to Green Berets we have talked to, gets paid more money. A U.N. driver gets paid considerably more money. It is not competitive.

Senator SARBANES. I think you responded—

Senator BIDEN. I think I interrupted you.

Senator SARBANES. No, that is all right.

Mr. RODMAN. Those are the numbers. I asked the same question myself when I was visiting CENTCOM a few months ago. Their assessment was that the salary was drawing recruits and it now

clearly is drawing recruits. The most recent battalion was at full strength. The seventh battalion, the number of candidates is over what they sought. So the recruiting, the number of recruits, is not the obstacle to the same extent it was at the beginning.

Senator SARBANES. Well, are you getting the kind of recruits you want? I have the impression that this is a situation in which the commitment of some additional money, not in large amounts, can make a big difference. What is happening?

All the external reports we get raise alarm and concern that this thing is not going to work, that it is going to fall apart on us. You all are responsible for making it work. When we meet we get kind of a defensive reaction to what is being done, and I am just kind of searching for some sort of positive vision of what can be done, of a further upgraded program to try to assure ourselves that this thing can be a success.

Mr. RODMAN. Let me finish the answer. The setting of salaries is something we do in consultation with the Afghans, and President Karzai has a hand in this. Our impression, rightly or wrongly, is that this is not the main obstacle right now. So you are right to ask the question what should we do if we had more resources. This may not be the missing piece.

Senator SARBANES. Well, can I get an answer out of—what would you do if you had more? I still do not have any answer as to what you would do if you had a significantly upgraded program.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think we are—

Senator SARBANES. What needs to be done?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think we are on the right track. If there were no need to make decisions, if money was never a scarce object, we would of course accelerate what we are doing.

With respect to the salary levels for these individuals, Senator Biden is correct. If anyone has a foreign language skill and is employable by a funding NGO or the United Nations, they command a very high salary level compared to those who do not. So in the marketplace this is bringing people in.

I was in Afghanistan about 3 weeks ago, observed a live fire exercise from these troops who had been trained, and the military people who were with us—I do not count myself an expert in this, but they were very impressed with what they had been able to do with these troops in a very short period of time. They are being formed into two brigades, in the course of the next couple of weeks will be providing we believe a force that is available to President Karzai as commander in chief, and this is very much moving in the right direction.

Senator SARBANES. Well, Mr. Chairman, I see my time is up. I would just note I did not get an answer to my question. Neither of these witnesses was able to lay out to the committee any sort of view or vision of what they might do if you really stepped up the American and the international commitment in Afghanistan in order to address these problems.

I thought I gave you an easy hypothetical. I mean, I tried to structure it with the President calling you in and saying he is ready to respond to what Senator Lugar and Senator Biden and others have been saying; what is the action program? I did not get any response to that question.



Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Yes, Mr. Rodman.

Mr. RODMAN. Just to add a point. A lot of the challenges we wrestle with from day to day are not resource problems. A lot of them are political challenges—for example, making sure that the defense establishment is not dominated by a particular group. There are issues of political structure and political stability which we wrestle with all the time. Maybe that is why I did not have an answer how to spend the money if you were generous enough to give us more money, because a lot of the issues are about political balance, political reconciliation, making sure the central government and its institutions are functioning properly.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. I am going to make this—

Senator SARBANES. Let me just make this observation. I think if the administration had a well thought through approach and were to request the Congress for additional money, they would get the additional money, and I just want to underscore that.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the Senator.

I just want to make a short comment and then I will turn to my distinguished ranking member, Senator Biden. It seems to me as I have listened to the reports since September 11 and onward on Afghanistan, both in front of witnesses like yourselves and behind closed doors, an evolution of thinking has occurred. And I would trace it, just as a personal comment, in about this way.

I think Senator Biden is probably on track in trying to say that it is very difficult to have the plan or the vision that Senator Sarbanes asked of you today without our government having come to a definitive policy of what we hope for in the country. I do not think we have gotten to that point. So my advice to the President or to anybody else was that we need to do that.

It is still a work in process and it has been on an ad hoc basis really from the beginning an emergency. What our committee has been trying to think through with Secretary Powell last week is the fact that American diplomacy is an extremely important component, not only of Afghanistan or any other situation, but of all the ways in which we try to bring together coalitions with allies, as well as public policy in terms of administration of humanitarian, financial, business affairs.

Secretary Rumsfeld has said much the same sort of thing when he is questioned closely by Senators. And that is that the military has an important role. It was to go to Afghanistan with Special Forces or other people, to work with the Northern Alliance, to work with the Afghans, to repel the Taliban, and to root out al-Qaeda.

But then Secretary Rumsfeld very rapidly realized that he feels he is being saddled with the thought of administering the country, administering relations with all the surrounding countries—in other words, the same sort of problems that Dr. Cordesman raised yesterday with regard to our thinking about Iraq.

It will be one thing to have a well-executed military plan if we or others are called upon to do this, and we are confident that it will be successful. But the interim problem of what happens as people begin to fight each other or they starve or they have all kinds

of needs requires a huge amount of planning that flows right along with the military planning. Well, we did not have that option in Afghanistan, and so we have been improvising with our allies and with ourselves.

But it appears to me that, even if we are getting better at it, we really have to define more of the goalposts or what we are about here, and I hope that we will do it. That is one of the purposes of the hearing today, to not only jog the memory of where we are, but likewise how we got there and some success story.

Now, I started this morning by pointing to the intrusion of other powers into Afghanistan. Not unusual—the history of the country. The real option is will there be a different history for Afghanistan, and I hope that there will be. I think that we have in the United States, with our allies and with our diplomacy, an opportunity to make a historic situation come true for the people of that country, and they clearly want it to come true, as we are going to hear from the Ambassador from Afghanistan in the next panel.

Here is a gentleman, a patriot of Afghanistan, a citizen of our country for a long time, as are many people from Afghanistan, who have risen to the occasion now to serve because they appreciate the historic opportunity for a breakthrough, as we do.

But this is going to take some doing. So I will not hector you with more questions as to why we have not done more, why your vision is incomplete. That may be true for all of us. Maybe we have some responsibility in this committee, in the Senate, and with our colleagues to help fashion this, and we tried in a way by authorizing money. And in due course this requires an administration prepared to spend the money, to flesh out the programs.

Perhaps our fault was failure maybe to have more mandates, to be more specific, to write the plan, to write the vision. That I do not think is our role. The President ought to do that as well as the Secretaries of State and Defense and others. But ultimately somebody has to be in charge.

I get back to one of our themes yesterday. One of our witnesses suggested that the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief and maybe Secretary Rumsfeld then as the boss of General Franks would be the ultimate authority in Iraq. But General Franks will not be able to administer Iraq indefinitely. There will have to be somebody else, and an extensive structure beyond that. Who are the Assistant Secretaries?

That we have not thought through as a country and we must, quickly. We never thought through it in Afghanistan and I would suggest there is a good opportunity to do so even now. That is a personal opinion sort of arising from listening to some people who have thought a lot more about this than I do and have had a lot more experience in the field.

But once again, I appreciate your coming today and the reports that you have, and I think the assessments of all of us have been that remarkable things have occurred and would not have without United States leadership. But at this point we still have a distance to go to define what we want to do and to find the means, the allies, and the structure within our own government to administer it.

Senator Biden.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, please do not take my frustration personally. My frustration has existed from this time a year ago in Bagram to today, and I have seen—and I can say this without equivocation, without fear of being contradicted, and there is no way you could have seen this. I have seen the transition, to use the popular phrase, a morphing of the policy. You know as well as I do—and it is a legitimate position—that there are senior administration officials who believe that—and I will quote one—that Afghan is “ungovernable, it has never been governable,” it is a polyglot—my word; so far it is a quote—“ungovernable, it has never been governable,” and the idea that we can govern it or set up a central government that is going to be capable of governing it is an unrealistic expectation. And therefore—and this is a legitimate position—it is in our interest to see to it that “the center,” quote—it is not even the center, but Kabul—is stable, that it has a relationship with the rest of the country, not a dominant relationship in the sense that it is the central government, but it is the titular center of the State, where you have replacing in effect the Governors of the various provinces individual warlords who are able to maintain security in their region, the underlying premise being if they gain security in the region it is unlikely that the swamp can fill back up again and we will have a reenactment of what happened before, that is the Taliban in control, because the Taliban did control. They did a pretty good job of controlling the whole country and subsuming the warlords in most cases to their will. But that is not what our announced policy is.

I do have a few specific questions, but that is my frustration, our announced policy not mirroring our actions. ISAF. I sat for a couple hours with the previous commander of ISAF over a year ago in a tent outside of—actually, it was in the city limits of Kabul. Very impressive guy, General McCall, a Brit.

And he went on, along with two American liaisons, a colonel, two American colonels, one, if I am not mistaken, in Kandahar—I mean, excuse me, one, if I am not mistaken, from Bagram and one from Kabul. But they were assigned liaison to ISAF. And McCall was just staffing up his force. He was at about 1,700, 1,800, going to 4,000, I think the number was. I cannot recall the exact number. And they gave me a very detailed brief.

And I said, well, you need to expand ISAF beyond. And I am not going to attribute, because I do not want to get anyone in trouble, I am not going to attribute what I am about to say to any one person. But I can say to you there was the consensus of all the military personnel representing more than one country sitting in that tent. You are going to have to extend ISAF beyond Kabul. Uniform view? Absolutely, yes.

I turned to McCall and I said, are you—is your government, your parliament, going to allow you to stay. And I remember what he said. He said, “If the big dog is not in the pen, the small dogs are not going to be there.” He said, “Are you going to stay?”

Now, what “stay” meant—remember the discussion that took place, Mr. Rodman, about a year ago? The discussion was would we provide intelligence, would we be the source for all the intelligence or the primary source of intelligence for ISAF, would we supply for

ISAF as well the lift capacity, and would we be the guarantor of extraction? They were the things we were discussing and debating.

I came back and talked with my friend Senator Hagel about this, talked with a number, John McCain, others who had been in and out. And the question was and the debate was: Was our military ready to make, in effect, that guarantee without us having boots on the ground with ISAF?

And I remember talking about that at length and being told—and there was a debate that ensued between State and Defense as to the efficacy, the utility, the wisdom of expanding ISAF, and it was a relatively hard-fought debate. State was saying, you got to expand. They are not saying that now. And Defense was saying, do not sign us up to that, for the reason my friend from Indiana the chairman said: Do not make us the lord and master of the whole area and take on the whole responsibility.

So then I later heard: Well, you know, the other countries will not expand, they do not want to expand. Sure they will not expand. They were not guaranteed that we would be part of the operation. They were not guaranteed that we would meet the three missions. We said: Look, do not worry; we are still in the country; we have got 4,000 forces still in the country. And they said: That is not good enough; are you in on the deal? You the United States, are you committing your forces, your resources, your guarantee that if we are up against it you will be the ones to come in.

The Brits do not, NATO does not have the capacity to lift into that region without us.

To the best of my knowledge—I may be mistaken. I ask Dr. Blank behind me to correct me if I am wrong, but we never gave that guarantee to the best of my knowledge.

So now we are told that no one wants to expand. We also, as I remember—I do not want to implicate my good friend the chairman here. If I am not mistaken, he and I both wrote a letter or asked the President to be able to see him for the sake of NATO unity, to suggest to him that the advice he was getting of not accepting front end, unrelated to ISAF, 1,000 German crack forces that Schroeder risked a vote of confidence on wanting to deploy and I think it was 3,000 French, was it? I cannot remember the numbers. And Defense said, “No,” thank you, we do not need them.

We importuned the President to say: Whether you need them or not, take them, because these guys just declared an article 5. These guys said—the French newspaper *La Monde* said, “we are all Americans,” and now you are telling them: “We do not need you.”

So now we are at a point where the argument is being made to folks like me, when I say why are we not expanding it, the White House says, “Well, no one else wants to expand.” So that is a long prelude to a short question. Mr. Rodman, Mr. Secretary: If you know—and you may not know; it may be an unfair question to ask you, and if it is you just tell me and I will seek an answer from Defense—is the United States prepared to guarantee lift, intelligence, and extraction if our NATO and other allies are prepared to expand the ISAF force beyond Kabul into other regions? Do you know the answer to that question?

Mr. RODMAN. It is a hypothetical question because we have never engaged in a negotiation with our allies on an expanded ISAF—

Senator BIDEN. Oh, yes, we did, unless they have misrepresented to me.

Mr. RODMAN. Let me start by separating two issues.

Senator BIDEN. OK.

Mr. RODMAN. The commitments you have recited are commitments we have made to ISAF with respect to their present mission—

Senator BIDEN. Right.

Mr. RODMAN [continuing]. Intelligence, emergency extraction, and lift, to help them with lift as available and as needed. Now, with the Turks in fact we and the British helped them hire lift; it does not have to be American lift. So certainly in the Turkish case, we fulfilled the commitment to help.

On the expansion issue, I have to say I have been involved in these discussions with the successive ISAF commanders and talked to the Europeans and asked them at various times when there was a debate here about expansion outside of Kabul: Is it a good idea? And when I was asking, I was asking the question in an open way I got a negative reaction from the military personnel of other countries that I talked to.

At the policy level we never reached the point of engaging in a negotiation or trying to push them to do it or push them from another direction.

Senator BIDEN. But in fairness, did we not publicly say we would not, we would not make those guarantees?

Mr. RODMAN. Secretary Rumsfeld has hedged. He has tried for many months to be more agnostic and to point correctly to the fact that we were not getting a positive response or interest from others.

I can also tell you that the Turks made it a condition of their taking over the lead that they would take no responsibility outside of Kabul, and the Germans and Dutch similarly. And that is where we are. Now, we never pushed it because we were looking for alternative ways of addressing the same problems that ISAF expansion was meant to address.

Senator BIDEN. I will not beat a dead horse, but I will get from the record the early statements, if my memory serves me correctly, of the Secretary of Defense about expansion of ISAF, before we had any discussions with anybody, about our unwillingness to be part of it, our unwillingness to make any guarantees. Now, I will let the record correct me if I am wrong about that, but I will get that information.

If I may make just one last point and a very short question. My understanding—now, this is about—so this is almost 5 months old, what I am about to say, first-hand knowledge. It is my understanding that one of the reasons why we were having trouble initially recruiting the first two classes of Afghan integrated military under the control of Mr. Karzai was not the money—the money was a problem, it still is a problem; I will be interested what the Ambassador thinks—but was that the warlords who control the bulk of those fighters who have a capacity to command were very unwilling to give up their best and wanted to keep the bulk of their force structure in place.

Initially we were actually getting people out of mental hospitals and they were emptying institutions the first time out, I am told by one Green Beret who was doing part of the training. This was the first time out, when we were trying to fill up the difference between what we needed to fill the first classes and the difference between what was sent to us and not, because if I understand it—it is a two-part question: No. 1, is the way in which U.S. military trainers and others get these forces is that they are sent—we seek support from the Tajiks, from other, from the Northern Alliance, from the various warlords, to suggest sending, so we have a multi-ethnic military? And No. 2, is there a—well, I will just stick to that. Is that how we get them? Is that the place from which they come, or is it a recruiting poster hanging on a storefront in Kandahar? How do we get these folks?

Mr. RODMAN. I think it is a combination of these things.

Mr. JOHNSON. The regional Governors are the ones who have been responsible for providing these recruits, and I have not heard exactly the anecdote that you ascribe to the first individuals who were provided, but I think it is clear that, at least with some of these people, we were being tested as to what we were up to.

I think there was also a questioning on the part of some of these people who were leaving their homes and potentially taking part in this as to just what they themselves might be getting into. I think as these people have shaken out, even the early ones, the ones that we retained have proven to be capable individuals, capable of education.

There is not a dearth of individuals who can become soldiers in Afghanistan, able-bodied people. So it is not as though we have to take people out of a militia army, if you will, and bring them into this army. We were quite happy with able-bodied individuals what were capable of learning, and so we are looking for that.

We have worked a long time on the recruitment process and we have had various models that have been offered to us. The Defense Commission, which is beginning to show some real activity and productive capacity in Afghanistan, has now taken on this responsibility and, I think at least in part because of that, we are seeing these battalions come in at full strength.

Senator BIDEN. I will followup with some questions. I thank you for your answer. I have some more detailed questions. I will followup in writing. I appreciate both of you being here and your testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Biden.

I want to move on fairly soon to the Ambassador, but, Senator Hagel, you have just a question?

Senator HAGEL. I have two short questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could either of you tell the committee who now provides the security detail for President Karzai?

Mr. JOHNSON. Senator, I happened to be in Afghanistan this summer when we made this offer to President Karzai. The Special Forces, because they were on the ground, moved in rapidly to take this responsibility over. In the fall, the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, working with a contractor, took this responsibility from the Special Forces.

They have done a multiple set of jobs. They began providing the direct security immediately upon taking over from the military. They began a process of providing a range of security upgrades to the compound for perimeter security so that it would be less susceptible to threat to President Karzai. They have already begun a process of training Afghans to take over this responsibility eventually.

So it is a multi-phased project, but we have dedicated significant funds to it. As late as yesterday, we got a report from our embassy in Kabul that President Karzai was not only quite pleased with what had been done, but he was especially pleased with what he had observed as to the Afghans who are being trained eventually to take over this responsibility.

Senator HAGEL. When do you think that will occur?

Mr. JOHNSON. Sir, the training is ongoing. I do not want to put an X on a calendar. I think we want to see how this develops and make sure that we do not do it prematurely. We are committed to doing this right.

Senator HAGEL. I would suspect that has a direct effect on the attitude and the evaluation and the confidence that an Afghan army would instill in the people in Afghanistan, if in fact that security force is Afghani and can protect an Afghani President, rather than outside forces. Would you connect that?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, as I have said in response to a number of questions here, our model, our objective, is to build the Afghan State. So we want to train Afghans in all capacities, to provide assistance to them. Yes, I would agree with you that having Afghans provide security for their President is the objective that we and they want to secure.

Senator HAGEL. A last, very brief question. On the Provincial Reconstruction Teams, we do not need to go into it now because the chairman wants to move on, but would you provide the committee a budget for those? What kind of resources are you dedicating to those teams, and break it down specifically, security, reconstruction, all the things you generally touched in your testimony, so how much money are we dedicating to those teams? Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Hagel.

Do other Senators have any further questions?

If not, we thank you both very much for your testimony and for coming to us today.

The chair would like to now call to the witness table Ambassador Ishaq Shahryar, Afghanistan's Ambassador to the United States.

Ambassador Shahryar, we are delighted that you have been able to be with us today. You have benefited, as we have, by hearing testimony from our Department of State and our Department of Defense, parts of our government that are clearly charged with many responsibilities, and we have been discussing their successes and likewise the challenges and parameters at least we seek for them.

We look forward to your testimony as someone who has a responsibility on behalf of his country, looks at all of this perhaps in a different perspective, although sometimes the same, as you have

visited widely with colleagues in the Senate and the House, as well as obviously you have worked with the administration.

We welcome you and ask for your testimony this morning.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ISHAQ SHAHRYAR, AFGHANISTAN  
AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Thank you very much. It is a great honor to be with you today and to share some thoughts about the vital work and progress in Afghanistan. I feel particularly honored since I understand that only on rare occasions you seek the views of the Ambassador of a foreign country.

I believe that, given the heroic investment of American dollars and American lives in the liberation and rebuilding of Afghanistan, it is appropriate that you have a progress report directly from the beneficiary.

I have a written statement that I would like to place in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be published in full in the record.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Thank you.

In my summary remarks, I would like to begin by thanking you, Mr. Chairman, for the invitation to appear today and for your thoughtful vision for an Afghan Enterprise Fund that will be critical for Afghanistan's journey and arrival. I also wish to thank Senator Biden for his consistent voice of support through our early months of liberation and rebuilding and for his particular focus on the plight of women in Afghanistan.

I believe there can be redemption through suffering. In Afghanistan the world saw the systematic brutalization and discrimination against women by the Taliban and was horrified. I believe that this moved leaders of the world and leaders in this chamber to mount a renewed effort to end all forms of discrimination against women in all nations of the world. To achieve that lasting end would indeed serve to redeem the suffering of so many women in Afghanistan.

I also wish to thank you, Senator Hagel, for your leadership in sponsoring the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act and to thank all the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for their generous support of Afghanistan.

On behalf of President Karzai and the Afghan people, I wish to thank President Bush and the leadership of his administration for our liberation. We are a grateful nation. There is also a long list of men and women in the military and many others from U.S. Government agencies, especially USAID, and in private companies who have embraced the cause of freedom in Afghanistan whom I would dearly like to say thank you.

I would like to begin with a simple observation. The official name of my country is the Transitional Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. "Transitional" is a key word. We are a work in progress and this work occurs in the context of history and in the context of regional instability.

Two decades ago a very bright professor named Brzezinski referred to our region in the Middle East, the north and west side of the great Hindu Kush Mountains that divide Asia from Europe, as the "arch of instability." In recent years, without question that



arch has become a “circle of instability,” matched by an arch that extends across Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, and reaches as far as Indonesia. At the center of this circle is Afghanistan.

But this is not new. This is history repeating itself. For 4,000 years, Afghanistan has been a portal for history—more than just a crossroads; a portal. For all of human history, overland travel from Europe or the Middle East to Asia could only pass one way, through Afghanistan and the Khyber Pass. Ghenghis Khan, Tamerlane, Alexander the Great, to name a few, crossed Afghanistan and left their mark on Afghan government, arts, and sciences. Others of course entered and occupied Afghanistan, but were not so benevolent.

I offer this brief history lesson to suggest the following. Afghanistan is literally the moral “high ground” of history. Control the Afghanistan high ground and you will influence for good or for evil that which flows into Europe and into Asia.

If the Western world has a lapse of attention and turns elsewhere, the institutional memory of the region will reach back into a weak Afghanistan with drugs, corruption and terror, and invariably the circle will turn toward conflict. If the Western world sustains support and stays focused until democracy and prosperity are firmly rooted, then Afghanistan will become a hub, a hub for the wheel of regional stability, democracy, prosperity, that will become self-sustaining.

This is not theory. It is a model and a replay of recent and successful deployment of U.S. and international will on a smaller scale. I invite you to compare landlocked, impoverished, but historically significant Afghanistan to that of landlocked, impoverished, but historically significant Macedonia. As you know from history, Macedonia in many ways is the historic portal that connects Europe with the Middle East in the same way that Afghanistan is the portal that connects Asia and the Middle East.

There in Macedonia, for the first time ever, the United States and NATO very smartly deployed a military presence before conflict spilled into that historic tinderbox. Yes, there has been flashes of conflict in Macedonia, as flashes of conflict continue today in Afghanistan. But that historic center of Balkan instability was made secure and major conflict was avoided, a conflict that might have brought two NATO powers to blows.

The analogy of that successful and modest investment holds for Afghanistan and the current circle of instability in the Middle East. Consider the following comment from Ahmed Rashid, which was mentioned earlier, writing in the *Far Eastern Economic Review* in an article titled “A Desire to be Left Alone, Alone.” In summary, it reads:

“Russia is arming one warlord, Iran another. Some central Asian republics are backing their ethnic allies. India and Pakistan are playing out an intense rivalry in the playing fields of Afghanistan.”

This is pretty straight talk. It does not get more concise in describing what could reemerge or can be prevented if the United States and world community invest in the security and rebuilding of Afghanistan.

We must hold firm to the principle that Afghanistan, like every other sovereign nation, is for the Afghan people and not the play-

ing field for regional rivalries, and that is what President Karzai with his Kabul Declaration is trying to do so.

The people of Afghanistan have turned to President Karzai as the one person who is truly able to unify Afghanistan and turn the nation from a past filled with war and oppression to a future focused on prosperity and democracy.

We began our future last year, flushed with liberation. The greys and blacks imposed on us by the Taliban are now being replaced by color. Our men can again play music, our women and girls are returning to schools, and our children can fly a kite again.

You have seen these things on CNN. You also know that we have a long way to go. One of five children born today will not reach the age of 5 years. One in ten Afghan women will die in childbirth, leaving her other children as orphans. Of Afghanistan's 27 million people, the United Nations estimates that nearly a quarter are refugees, and Afghanistan is the most heavily mined country in the world and, as is the case in other war zones, children at play will become the victims of leftover land mines.

Addressing the humanitarian issue, the security issue, the rebuilding issue, and the economic development issues are not simple. It has meant an international collaborative effort, and the date this multinational collaboration is working and working better than perhaps any comparable effort since the Marshall Plan. In many ways Afghanistan for the moment still lingers in a honeymoon period, where we are designing and building a new nation from a clean sheet of paper.

In the immediate post-Taliban defeat in Afghanistan, there were no universities, no army, no police, no TV, no newspaper, no banking system, no judiciary, very little food, and even less in the way of health care, the only thing in abundance—guns and land mines.

We established a triage plan to urgently fill institutional vacuums and quickly moved to right the most terrible wrongs of the Taliban, such as immediate administration of free elections and restoration of women workers and students to their pre-Taliban positions. Today women constitute over 50 percent of civil servants and teachers.

Those were tangible acts of immediate reform, but there are urgent needs under the heading of cultural reconstruction. The reestablishment of a national sense of identity, that will take longer. For 20 years the moral compass of our nation has been spinning like a top. Today we are telling our children that most of what they have known has been wrong, that in the 21st century open societies, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of commerce, freedom from want, fear and intimidation is where the world is going and this is where Afghanistan must go, too.

But for us to do that while living in the center of the circle of instability will require significant support. The landmark Afghanistan Freedom Support Act that originated in this committee provides a strategic framework for U.S. policy on the political and economic development of Afghanistan. We respectfully urge the Congress in this appropriation cycle to fully fund the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act.

I also ask this committee to continue to support the expansion of ISAF and I hope that the administration will make every effort

to press American friends and allies to join in this effort. Afghanistan's internal security remains fragile. Noninterference from our regional neighbors is key and the expansion of ISAF and the establishment of a national army will support noninterference and demonstrate international support for the central government, weaken the influence of regional leaders and their personal armies, speed reconstruction and economic recovery, increase the confidence of private investors, will promote stability and our ability to form a national army that needs to be trained at a faster pace and bigger size.

The expansion of ISAF is good for all of the Afghan people, who have known only war for the last generation. It will also help finish the job of extinguishing all vestiges of the Taliban and al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, so democracy has a chance. All nations stand to benefit from new elements of stability in the Middle East, from any source.

Yes, the situation in Iraq is a very serious problem and should be dealt with. But let us also secure the victories that we have already won, and the best way to secure our victory in Afghanistan is to secure democracy and build prosperity. We have the basic elements for building wealth in our nation. We have natural resources and they need to be mapped and thoughtfully developed. We are located in a strategically important location in Central Asia. There can be a logistics and transportation industry in our future and we have an entrepreneurial tradition.

But these elements will never be organized and mastered independent of peace and security and a business plan. We have recently created a private sector development task force for Afghanistan to accelerate capacity-building and institution-building of the Afghan Government and strengthen infrastructure. We are working to write laws and protect private investment. We are setting up private banks, getting started with exploiting our natural resources, and later this year we will host an international trade show in Kabul, and you are hereby invited to attend.

In closing, I hope I have offered a useful assessment of where we are and where we hope to go. But I must be candid: We are not there yet.

My summary concerns cover five points: One, we urgently request funding support for fiscal year 2003 to meet the levels in the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act.

Two, we support the expansion of the current 4,800-member ISAF force to at least three times that level, with these forces to be stationed around the country, not just in Kabul.

Three, work with the Tokyo donors and the international financial institutions to apply as quickly as possible the pledges made during the Tokyo Round.

Four, wherever possible reconstruction funding should be directed to the central government under President Karzai to reinforce its national reach.

Fifth, encourage the return to Afghanistan of the many dedicated citizens of Afghan origin in the United States who want to return to our country to help in the rebuilding effort. But again, this help should not be viewed as altruism by the U.S. or world community.

The return to the United States and global security will be commensurate with the investment.

President Karzai and I are passionately determined not to squander this moment in Afghanistan history. Afghans are a remarkably resilient people and a proud people, proud to learn, proud to do a good job. As Churchill widely stated, “give us the tools and we will get the job done.”

Thank you for your attention and I will be most happy to take your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Shahryar follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ISHAQ SHAHRYAR, AFGHANISTAN AMBASSADOR  
TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE RESTORATION AND REBUILDING OF AFGHANISTAN

It is a great honor and to be with you today and to share some thoughts about an important, perhaps even vital, work in progress in Afghanistan.

Given the heroic investment of American dollars and American lives in the liberation and rebuilding of Afghanistan it is most appropriate that you have a progress report direct from the beneficiary.

And that is what I will provide here today—with the overarching theme that America’s investments in Afghanistan are commensurate with the returns—greater progress in the war against terrorism, enhanced regional and global security—and with enhanced security comes enhanced economic growth.

I wish to thank you, Chairman Lugar, for the invitation to present testimony this morning, and to thank you for your thoughtful vision of what Afghanistan can become, and your support for an Afghan Enterprise Fund—that will be critical for our journey and arrival.

I also wish to thank you, Senator Biden—for your consistent voice of support through our early months of liberation and rebuilding—and for your particular focus on the plight of women in Afghanistan.

I believe there can be redemption through suffering. And in Afghanistan, the world saw full force—the systematic brutalization and discrimination against the women by the Taliban gangsters—and was horrified.

I believe that these revelations moved leaders of the world and leaders in this chamber to mount a renewed effort to end all forms of discrimination against all women in all nations of the world—and to achieve that lasting end, would indeed serve to redeem the suffering of so many women in Afghanistan.

And I also wish to thank you, Senator Hagel, for your leadership in sponsoring the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act authorizing \$3.3 billion in economic, political, humanitarian and security assistance for Afghanistan during the next four years.

And while I have the microphone, on behalf of President Karzai and the Afghan people I wish to thank the members of this Committee, the Members of the U.S. Senate and the House, Secretaries Powell and Rumsfeld, their senior staff, and of course President Bush—for liberation.

We are a country the size of Texas and we have a great deal to be thankful for. We are a grateful nation. And there is a long list of men and women in the military, our government agencies, NGOs and private companies—who have embraced the cause of freedom and restoration in Afghanistan, and I would dearly like to thank—but it would consume all my time this morning.

Instead, I would prefer to turn to the actions and plans in place and going forward that will bring lasting and positive change to the region—and best represent the gratitude of the Afghan people, for those who have invested so much there.

I would like to begin my remarks with a simple observation—and to present and context for this hearing.

The observation: The Official Name of my Country is “The Transitional Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.” “Transition” is a key phrase and umbrella theme for my remarks this morning.

We are a work in progress—and in a context—the context of history and the context of regional instability.

Two decades ago a very bright professor named Brezinski, referred to our region in the Middle East—the north and west side of the great mountains that divide Asia from Europe—As the “*Arch of Instability*.”

But in recent years—without question, that arch has become a Circle of Instability—matched by an arch that extends across the southern and eastern side of the

mountainous continental fence—and includes Pakistan, India, Bangladesh and even as far as Indonesia.

At the center of this circle—is Afghanistan. Afghanistan is at the center of today's "Circle of Instability."

But this is not new. It is history repeating itself. For 4,000 years, Afghanistan has been a "portal" for history . . . more than just a crossroads . . . a portal.

For all of human history, overland travel from Europe or the Middle East to Asia could only pass one way—through Afghanistan—and through the Kyber Pass.

Ghengis Kahn, Tamerlane, Alexander the Great, to name a few—crossed Afghanistan and left their mark on Afghan government, arts and sciences.

Others, of course entered and occupied Afghanistan as well—but left behind only destruction and chaos. In our generation, it was the Soviets in the 1980s, and the Taliban of the 1990s.

I offer this brief history lesson—to suggest the following:

Afghanistan is literally the "high ground" of history.

Control the Afghanistan high ground, and you will influence for good or for evil—that which flows into Europe and into Asia.

If the Western World has a lapse of attention and turns elsewhere, the "institutional memory" of the region will leach back in to a weak Afghanistan with drugs, corruption, and terror—and invariably—"the circle" will turn back toward terror and conflict.

If the Western World sustains support—and stays focused and present until democracy and prosperity are firmly rooted—then Afghanistan will become a hub—a hub of wheel of regional stability, democracy and prosperity—that will become self-sustaining.

This is not theory—it is a replay of another recent and successful deployment of U.S. and international will on a smaller scale—where foresight was acted upon—indeed the foresight of this Committee was acted upon—and conflict on a broad scale was essentially prevented.

I invite you to compare the regional geopolitical situation of land-locked, impoverished—but historically significant Afghanistan in the Middle East and Asia—to that of land-locked, impoverished—but historically significant—*Macedonia*—in the Balkans.

As you know from history—Macedonia in many ways is the historic portal that connects Europe and the Middle East—in the same way that Afghanistan is the portal that connects Asia and the Middle-east.

There, in Macedonia, for the first time ever—The U.S. and NATO—very smartly—deployed a military presence BEFORE conflict spilled into that historic tinderbox.

Yes, there have been flashes of conflict in Macedonia—as flashes of conflict continue today in Afghanistan. But that historic "Center of Balkan instability" was made secure and regional conflict was avoided—a conflict that might have brought two NATO powers to blows.

The analogy of that successful—and modest investment—holds for Afghanistan and the current Circle of Instability in the Middle East.

Consider the following comment from Ahmed Rashid writing in the Far Eastern Economic Review in an article titled: *A Desire To Be Left Alone*—with a tagline:

"Afghanistan's power-hungry neighbors threaten to revive the ruinous civil war of the early 1990s that gave rise to the Taliban.

"Russia is arming one warlord, Iran another. Wealthy Saudis have resumed funding Islamic extremists and some Central Asian Republics are backing their ethnic allies. India and Pakistan are playing out an intense rivalry as they secretly back opposing forces. The playing field is Afghanistan, and the interference threatens to revive a multifaceted power struggle that in the early 1990s eventually gave way to a near-ruinous rule by the Taliban."

This is pretty straight talk.

It doesn't get more concise in describing the cycle of the 1990s—and what could re-emerge—OR—can clearly be prevented if the U.S. and world community remain invested in the security and rebuilding of Afghanistan.

Perhaps it is a stretch to ever envision Afghanistan as a "Switzerland of the Middle East." But I find it useful to think in those terms.

We must begin with the premise that Afghanistan, like every other sovereign nation—is for the Afghan people—AND NOT the playing field for regional rivalries. And we must begin with this premise and hold firmly to it.

The institutional memory in the region that reaches back 4,000 years. And regrettably that institutional memory favors dictatorship over democracy—and economic suppression over economic prosperity.

And the bad habits that go with that history also include devoting resources to developing nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons to enforce repression—at the expense of economic opportunity and prosperity for people.

Look at Iran and Iraq—two countries blessed with immense petroleum wealth—where people live in poverty.

Repression is a medieval concept—that does not belong in the 21st century.

- The denial of personal liberty removes transparency in government that leads to corruption.
- Corruption repels investment and economic development.
- Poverty is the soil where terrorism takes root—and makes the whole process of democracy, stability, and security impossible.

Now—I know that I am preaching to the choir here.

These concepts are second nature to you. But there are novel—if not radical concepts to the 100s of millions of people in the Middle East and South Asia.

I have heard some say that openness and democracy conflict with our Middle Eastern culture and tradition.

Nonsense.

It was Cyrus the Great of Persia who issued the world's first declaration of human rights.

Yes, there have been periods of greatness in the Middle East. But to date, the ancient cultures have failed to translate themselves into modern times, because there has been no one to lead beyond the past—with the knowledge and convictions that—

- Theocracies fail;
- Dictatorships fail; but
- Democracy—somewhat more cumbersome to implement—works.

But I believe, however, that the cycle of history in Afghanistan is being broken by leadership with a new vision.

The people of Afghanistan have rallied to President Hamid Karzai as the one person who is truly able to unify Afghanistan, and turn the nation from a past filled with war and repression—to a future focused on prosperity and democracy.

We began our future last year with liberation—and with the restoration of our spirit. For a country that has literally been reduced to rubble—it is our creative spirit and our culture that anchors our new beginning.

To be frank—there is little else in our country that will hold an anchor.

With liberation—we've had the opportunity to reclaim our culture—our art, our music, our educational systems, our entrepreneurship—our freedom to create was given back to us. The grays and blacks imposed on us by the Taliban—are being replaced by color.

- Our men can again play music.
- Our women and girls are returning to schools.
- And our children can again fly kites.

You've seen these things on CNN. You also know that we have a long way to go:

- 1 in 5 children born today will not reach the age of 5 years;
- 1 in 10 Afghan women will die in childbirth—leaving her other children as orphans;
- Of Afghanistan's 27 million people—the United Nations estimates nearly a quarter are refugees; and
- Afghanistan is the most heavily mined country in the world. And as is the case in other war zones—children at play, will become the victims of left-over land mines.

Addressing the humanitarian issues, the security issues, the rebuilding issues, and the economic development issues are not simple.

It has meant an international collaborative effort—and to date, this multi-national collaboration is working—and working better than perhaps any comparable effort since the Marshall Plan.

#### REBUILDING—CULTURAL AND TANGIBLE

We have a rare and historic opportunity in Afghanistan—to change the course of a region that has triggered substantial global turmoil for the last generation, and

been the focus of U.S. foreign policy for the last 18 months—and I dare say will be for the next 18 months.

With respect to Re-building and Security Concerns I would like to briefly describe:

- Where we have been;
- The works in progress being crafted with the tools at our disposal focusing on security and reconstruction;
- Where we can go—according to a rather urgent timeline.

#### THE LAST 12 MONTHS

In many ways Afghanistan still lingers in a honeymoon period—where we are designing and building a new nation from a clean sheet of paper.

In the immediate post-Taliban defeat in Afghanistan, there were no universities, no army, no police, no TV, no newspapers, no banking system, no judiciary, very little food and even less in the way of health care. The only thing in abundance: Guns and land mines.

Looking back 12 months—we established a triage plan to urgently fill institutional vacuums. It began with the Bonn Agreement that provided the political road map and an interim administration to make a start. We then quickly moved to right the most egregious wrongs of the Taliban.

- All women workers and students were immediately restored to their pre-Taliban positions. Today, women constitute over 50% of civil servants and teachers.
- Some three million children have gone back to school.
- His Majesty King Zahir Shah returned to Afghanistan after almost three decades.
- The Grand Decision Making Assembly known as the Loya Jirga was convened and 1501 representatives from all over Afghanistan participated. And a woman was a candidate for the Presidency.
- Over two million refugees from outside and internally displaced have gone back to their homes and villages.
- Liberal investment laws were passed to attract foreign and Afghan investors and free enterprise has re-gained a foothold.
- All state enterprises have become subject to open bidding.
- A neighborly conference was held in Kabul on the anniversary of Bonn Conference to mark our neighbors' commitment to non-interference, good neighborliness and mutual respect. This has resulted in the Kabul Declaration.
- National Defense Council, National Security Council, Civil Affairs Commission, Human Rights Commission, Constitutional Commission and many other entities have been established to speed up the work of the government.
- A Constitutional Commission was established, drafting began, and is now nearly completed. By the end of the year it will be completed and ratified by another Loya Jirga.
- And just like here in the United States, in 2004, we will again hold free and fair general elections.

Those were tangible acts of immediate need. There have also been needs to lay foundations for *Cultural Reconstruction*—the re-establishment of a national sense of identity—and providing an education to the Afghan people—both of which are critical to ending factionalism of the sort that plagued Afghanistan in the aftermath of the Soviet defeat and withdrawal.

You see, for over 20 years the Afghan people have endured two attempts at brain-washing. First by the brutal far-left extremes of communism. Then by the brutal far-right extremes of the Taliban's "*Thug Theocracy*."

Is it any wonder the brains of our young people are scrambled?

For years, the moral compass of the nation has been spinning like a top.

Today, we need to remind the adults of Afghanistan who they are, where they have been.

And at the same time we are telling our children—that their entire lives, all that they have known for 20 years—is an aberration. That in the 21st Century—Open societies, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of commerce, freedom from want, fear and intimation—are the models for Civil Society—and where the world is going.

To that end:

- Work urgently to restore our libraries, our museums, our cultural monuments, and our national parks

- We must also encourage the direction where the invisible hand of freedom has already led us—the creation of *free and independent media*. Indeed, there are already 150 new News Organizations in Kabul, and Kabul Radio is now up 24 x 7 and broadcasting to a national audience.
- We are working hard to create a Judiciary System—that is transparent, based on the rule of law and representative of the entire nation. Our new Judiciary Commission and Commission on Human Rights have been hard at work, and I am pleased to day that 200 women Judges have been restored to the bench.

I think we have made great progress. Here is the testimony of Robert Oakley, former U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan in a recent Op-ed from the *Washington Post*:

“Starting from zero a year ago, the administration of President Hamid Karzai has achieved many attributes of a responsible government.

- It has a long-term national development framework and budget, worked out with the World Bank, the United Nations, the United States and other donors, and is carefully applying it to ensure that donor proposals meet Afghan realities.
  - A central bank, fiscal discipline and a new national currency have been established.
- Construction of the large-scale “ring road” program has begun; large-scale community development projects will soon follow smaller efforts.
- An Afghan Defense Commission (including senior ‘warlords’) has reached agreement on the size, makeup and training of the new army and the demobilization of local militias.”

Ambassador Oakley goes on to say what I firmly believe:

The key to this trend line continuing in a positive direction—is the continued presence and focused attention of the United States of America.

The American effort has already been heroic, creative, and generous.

Consider, just in recent months:

- The Congress and Administration produced the \$3.3 billion Afghan Freedom Support Act;
- Secretary Powell unveiled the Administration’s U.S.-Middle East Partnership Plan; and
- The President dispatched a special delegation of American women to Kabul under the auspices of U.S.-Afghan Women’s Council.

But this trend line of attention and active support must continue into 2003.

If it does—and I believe it will—the good news will continue and Afghanistan will become the first example in this new century and centuries to come—of what democracy can do for a struggling nation.

#### AID AND RECONSTRUCTION

Last year began with \$5 billion being pledged for the reconstruction of Afghanistan, including \$1.8 billion for 2002, at the January 2002 Donor Conference in Tokyo. An additional \$1.2 billion has been pledged for 2003. Although many major reconstruction projects had begun towards the end of the year, the majority of our population is living in poverty, below the pre-war 1976 levels in many cases.

The Loya Jirga that was held last June helped to spur activity on a numbers of projects, including small scale initial recovery efforts, macro-reconstruction projects such as roads, energy and power, many of which were supported by funds channeled through UN agencies.

But, as Nigel Fisher, the UN Secretary General’s Deputy Special Representative for Reconstruction, noted:

“Tokyo pledges have largely been met, but the fundamental problem is that those pledges fall far short of the level of international assistance required to really kick-start Afghanistan’s recovery. In per capita terms, the assistance provided to Afghanistan falls far short of aid provided for recovery from other major crises—in the Balkans, East Timor or Rwanda.”

What’s more, for the pledges that have not been met, checks are still in the mail, grants have been converted to loans, and many loans have become conditional or placed on hold.

The softening of global commitments to rebuild Afghanistan makes the U.S. commitment—as declared in last fall’s Afghanistan Freedom Support Act—all the more important.



Our needs, living at the center of the “Circle of Instability”—remain most urgent and we require significant financial support.

The landmark Afghanistan Freedom Support Act—that originated in this Committee provides a strategic framework for U.S. policy on the political and economic development of Afghanistan—to provide that support.

- It protects and enhances the security of Afghanistan by authorizing military and security assistance, and supports counter-narcotics, crime control and police training activities for our government.
- The legislation also authorizes \$1.7 billion in economic, humanitarian and development assistance in Afghanistan.
- Through the efforts of Members of this distinguished panel, \$300 million was provided for an Enterprise Fund to promote job creation and private sector development, and another
- \$300 million in draw-down authority for military and other security assistance is authorized.
- The bill also provides a total of \$1 billion to support ISAF, if the President makes the necessary determinations.

We respectfully urge the Congress, in this appropriations cycle to fully fund the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act.

The Act created a template for reconstruction funding at not less than \$450 million in fiscal year 2003. *The need is urgent.* Yet, the FY 2003 Omnibus Budget looks like it will fall considerably short of the mark. I would urge you and your colleagues to bring the actual funding level up to the authorization mark so that funds can be deployed—not next year, but in the months ahead—to enhance education, improve health, especially for children, to strengthen our democratic institutions and to empower the women of Afghanistan.

As you are aware, President Bush will meet President Karzai in Washington toward the end of the month for talks on postwar reconstruction. President Bush has indicated that he looks forward to discussing with President Karzai “the progress being made toward our shared goals of rebuilding the country’s society and economy, and securing a nation free from terror, war and want.” We certainly are aware that President Bush has a great deal on his plate at this time. Thus, we are particularly grateful to him, to Secretary of State Powell and others in the Administration for their continued attention to Afghanistan and their commitment, in Secretary Powell’s words, “to create an Afghanistan where terrorists and traffickers can never again flourish.”

And that leads me back to security—and the critical role of ISAF and its expansion to corners of Afghanistan.

As you know, the transition to Dutch and German oversight of ISAF has gone smoothly. And going forward, we believe that this force, as it expands its mission beyond Kabul, will guarantee the long-term security of our entire country and make it possible for reconstruction efforts to succeed without terror or intimidation. Eventually—and I hope it will be sooner rather than later—we will establish, with the help of our allies, an effective military and police force to allow us to control our own destiny and our own affairs.

I urge this Committee to continue to support the expansion of ISAF, and I hope the Administration will make every effort to press America’s friends and allies to join in this effort. As you once remarked, Senator Biden, “ISAF is the vital security blanket without which rebuilding efforts will be in grave jeopardy and the strength of the Central Government eroded and weakened.”

Afghanistan internal security remains fragile. Recent outbursts of fighting—including air strikes yesterday against residual presence of Taliban and Al Qaeda forces reminds us of the specter of oppression and terrorism that was only too real 18 months ago.

Non-interference from our regional neighbors is key. And the expansion of ISAF and the establishment of a national army will:

- demonstrate international support for the *central government*
- *weaken* the influence of regional leaders and their personal armies
- *speed reconstruction* and economic recovery
- increase the confidence of *private investors*
- will promote stability and our ability to form a *national army*

Afghan Army needs to be trained at a faster pace and bigger size. 2000 men in one year are just not enough. Experts say that at least 700,000 guns are unaccounted for and it takes a strong army not only to collect them but also to counter the warlords. And their rapid deployment along with U.S. forces would not only

make them better soldiers but also amount to smaller number of casualties of U.S. armed services.

The expansion of ISAF, is very good for all of the Afghan people—who have known only war for the last generation.

The expansion of ISAF—will also help finish the job of extinguishing all vestiges of the Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan—so democracy has a chance—good for the Afghan people AND the global community.

To that end—it is critical even in these times of global economic slow-down—that Afghanistan receive the promised security and financial assistance to help Afghanistan to recover, and rebuild.

Clearly—all nations stand to benefit from all new elements of stability in the Middle East—from any source.

Yes, Saddam Hussein is a very serious problem.

I am heartened that America and the world community are determined to deal with that despot.

And I pledge to you that Afghanistan will support whatever direction the U.S. and Allied nations take in dealing with Saddam Hussein—and winning another victory for democracy.

But let us also secure the victories that we have already won.

And the best way to secure our victory in Afghanistan is to secure democracy and build prosperity. And, the task of doing that centers squarely on the shoulders of the new government in Kabul and the international business community. And to no surprise, there is much to do.

- We need to make a major commitment toward “big infrastructure development” like rebuilding our roads—that will bring jobs, and add to a national psychology of peace and security.
- Because 85% of the Afghan people are farmers, we need to embark on a massive program to support new agricultural initiatives—dams, irrigation canals and systems—that would employ millions of Afghans. This, combined with an Alternate Crop Substitution for poppy farmers, could curtail illicit drug production tremendously.
- There needs to be a gradual shift from short-term humanitarian help to long-term sustainable development projects.
- We need reliable electric power.
- We need to re-fill the hundreds of empty factories in our cities with workers—making textiles, cement, and other finished goods.
- We need capacity building for the central authority means attracting the Afghan Diaspora, particularly, from the U.S.. I appeal to you to consider additional funding for their provisional return back home to utilize their professional skills.
- We need to keep focused on Afghan’s women—and the establishment of centers for mothers and children in need—in need of literacy, vocational training, and especially medical care. And,
- Money is needed to fight the campaign against narcotics, production, processing and trafficking, including its nexus to narco-mafia and cross-border instability.

The Karzai government has organized with remarkable speed and transparency to organize and get on with the business of rebuilding. And we are making progress against a very long checklist. Here are highlights:

- We have implemented a plan for efficient processing of economic development assistance—housed in the Ministry of Finance—under a program that would make the Director of OMB proud.
- We have introduced our new national currency—the Afghani.
- We have embarked upon a highway “ring-road” reconstruction program to build arteries connecting a country the size of Texas. Additional road building will begin with the arrival of spring.
- The Voice of America and the Afghan Information Ministry, with \$10 million from the Pentagon, are installing transmitters to create a national radio network.
- Also with America’s help, through Transition Initiatives funding in the amount of \$6 million, we are empowering Afghan-run NGO’s, particularly focusing on women’s groups and community development projects. We want to make sure that women are full participants and full beneficiaries in the economic growth that is part of Afghanistan’s future.

I believe that with the restoration of civil society and the rule of law—the international private business community will see a welcome mat for business and pri-

vate investment. And in recent months, we have begun reaching out to the private business and financial communities—with an invitation to come and do business.

indeed—this is the mission I have personally embraced in my role as Ambassador. We have great wealth in our undeveloped natural resources in Afghanistan. But we also understand that international businesses will not invest and joint-venture with us until they see:

- a safe environment,
- the banishment of corruption,
- adherence to commonly accepted business practices, and
- re-establishment of reliable transportation and telecommunications infrastructure.

And with the generous support of international institutions and the U.S. we are working hard to bring these things to pass.

We have the basic elements for building wealth in our nation.

- We have Natural resources—and they need to be mapped and thoughtfully developed;
- We are located in a strategically important location in Central Asia—much like Denver, there can be a logistics and transportation industry in our future;
- And we have an entrepreneurial tradition . . .

but these elements will never be organized and mustered—independent of peace and security—and the establishment of a civil society.

Security and Economic Development—are the two rails of our track toward the future.

Better security paves the way for businesses and investment.

Businesses provide freedom with jobs, money for education and personal empowerment—and more opportunities for women.

We know where we want to be—and here is part of our strategy—our business plan—to get there.

I have helped to create the Private Sector Development Task Force for Afghanistan. It is a

- Coalition of private companies, non-governmental organizations and volunteer experts—dedicated to accelerating the development of a private enterprise-driven market economy in Afghanistan.
- The primary goal of the Task Force is to promote capacity building and institution building of the Afghan government and strengthen infrastructure.
- We are working with the Ministry of Justice to create laws that will protect private investment.
- We are setting up private banks.
- We are working with the U.S. Geological Survey and private energy companies to explore our natural resources.
- We are bringing in the most recent and cost-effective telecommunications technologies—and a new license for a new wireless company was just recently let.
- And later this year, we will host an international trade show in Kabul and YOU—are hereby invited to attend.

When you arrive, just tell them Ishaq sent you.

It will be good for top accommodations—not 4 star . . . yet. But . . . one with relative luxuries—a beautiful carpet on the floor—and reliable electric power.

In closing, I hope I have offered a useful assessment of where we are and where we hope to go.

I must be candid—we are not there yet, by any means. And if the progress that we have made in the past year or so is to continue, we will need help—financial help, technical assistance, and a certain amount of patience.

But I will say again, should not be viewed as altruism by the U.S. or world community. The returns to the U.S. and global security will be commensurate with the investment.

And I will also tell you that President Karzai and I are passionately determined not to squander this moment in Afghanistan's 4,000 year history.

Afghanistan has had enough political revolutions.

Afghanistan has been invaded and occupied by the armies of soldiers.

What we need today is to be occupied by a new benevolent kind of army: an army of teachers, doctors, builders, farmers, civil engineers, merchants, bankers and public safety experts—and perhaps even a few lawyers.

The goal here is a jump-start. Not a permanent occupying force. And many of you here in this room—are in many ways part of this benevolent army.

We all need to make sure that the work undertaken on behalf of rebuilding Afghanistan is done in a manner which empowers the people of Afghanistan to take matters into their own hands.

As the Afghan proverb says, "A river is made drop by drop." Any great project, any important human undertaking, takes time and requires a long-term commitment. Clearly, the rebuilding of Afghanistan after more than 20 years of war and foreign occupation will take sustained effort and patience. And the timing is urgent.

Afghans are also a remarkably resilient people and a proud people—proud to learn; proud to do a good job.

As Churchill wisely stated, "Give us the tools and we will get the job done."

Thank you for your attention. I would be most happy to take your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Ambassador. And I appreciate, as I think all members do, your programmatic suggestions at the last, the five suggestions.

Let me ask, if I may, once again have a 7-minute round so that all members can participate. I will start the clock on my questions now.

Ambassador, in addition to the specific suggestions that you made on the Freedom Support Act and ISAF, the construction activities through the President, the encouragement of many Afghans who are here in the United States to offer their talents, maybe their presence, you have made some profound statements in your testimony that I just want to underline. The thought that you will attempt to teach the children of Afghanistan something entirely different, maybe opposite, to all that has been taught for years is an extraordinary statement and, if possible, an extraordinary achievement. But then you have illustrated that already the learning curve is substantial. Your comment that 50 percent of the public servants in Afghanistan now are women, reflects a remarkable achievement in a very short period of time as you push uphill with regard to the learning curve of the whole country, given the doctrine that, as you have pointed out, was a part of the teaching of children and maybe some adults, too.

I was struck by the comment that 25 percent of your population in fact as of the moment are refugees. In due course, each of these persons will be settled and will become less refugee and more Afghan all the time. That is a remarkable transition in itself simply in the population of the country, probably with more people on the way. But the assimilation of these 2 million people, or 25 percent of the population, is once again astonishing in this period of time.

I thought it was profound that you said you were starting with a clean sheet of paper as you think about the governance of the country, maybe about the fundamental ideals, quite apart from the language of a constitutional framework that you are working with. That is important. Some nations have tried that and not done well. Things either lapsed back into an agenda that was already ingrained, or people could not be taught something new or move ahead.

But nevertheless, up front as a representative of your country, representing your President, you said, that is our status. Now, you ask us to look at this not as a charitable offering, but as an investment in our security, our future, our interests and the rest of the world, by describing your country as a part of a crescent that brings together Asia and the Middle East, with Afghanistan right in the middle.

This reinforces some of our questioning of the last panel, that this is not an Afghan specific situation. Your country is described by those who do try to think of a business plan for the country as a potential crossroads, in the event the transportation system would be enhanced, the infrastructure be built, a place in fact where a good number of countries could ship their goods and services, could in fact enrich not only your country but themselves, in a degree of international trade that the area has never seen because of safety reasons or simply lack of infrastructure.

That gets to an important point. How will people in the country make a living? How can the gross national product and the individual incomes of persons increase? So that is a quest of some, but it is not a casual one. It almost once again has to be a crash program. The expectations of people as they discover the rest of the world or as they become a crossroads likewise escalate to a point well beyond that which you have experienced.

So all of this I simply say as one who has listened carefully and I appreciate the thoughtfulness that accompanied the statement on behalf of your country.

Now, my question normally would have been, OK, what can we do? Now, you have offered five things and these are reasonable. Even the ISAF augmentation to three times the 4,800, 4,900 people would not appear in the whole scheme of things in the world to be an outrageous item. As a matter of fact whether 1,500 people can cover a country as large as your own and provide the degree of safety—and Senator Biden has graphically described his own experiences in the country and others—I suppose is open to some question. But I will not quibble over that. It is a modest request, that we fund the authorization that we have already described.

But I want to at least contemplate, just picking up again on my colleague's thought—really, the vision in terms of United States policy. What should be our goal? If we had this hypothetical conversation with the President of the United States that we have been talking about today—we are all addressing the President. He is not here today, but maybe he will be to visit with us some time. So as a result we are preparing for that conversation, and what we want the President to suggest, because only he can coordinate ultimately. Our State Department, the Defense Department, the security people, the Commerce people, the NGOs, the whole lot come and go from our contribution.

We are going to have to reorganize, I think, our own thoughts about Afghanistan and how we respond to these challenges. But can you offer us some vision of that sort? You are not constrained by the fact that you are an employee of the Department of State or the Department of Defense or reporting to anybody except the President of Afghanistan. You are our guest today, at this open hearing in which we are inquiring of you what the vision ought to be or how we could better realize our own objectives for security in the area, which has been a vacuum for a long time.

Can you respond at all to that inquiry?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Yes. Well, as a former businessman, Mr. Chairman, I believe that economic development will bring stability and security, and security brings stability, and stability brings democracy. So I suggest really an aggressive sort of Marshall Plan for

Afghanistan's reconstruction. I think that is most important. The people of Afghanistan are expecting a great deal from the international forces, from the United States, to put them to work.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you and your experts flesh out such a plan? I am not certain on our side we are able to for the moment. Maybe you could.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. I think, as I had mentioned in my testimony, Afghanistan is very rich in terms of natural resources. It has oil, it has gas. There is already, I was told by the Minister of Mines and Industry who was here, there is already in the north that the former Soviet Union developed—it went up as far as about 1,000 meters down and found a lot of oil and gas, and that is capped up now. That is needed to be piped into Kabul, and that alone was worth about \$7 billion.

To develop that further and do that, it will put a lot of people to work. And also, investigate and map out the natural resources in the south. We believe there is tremendous resources of oil and gas in the south also.

Afghanistan is very rich in terms of minerals. Afghanistan has the best copper, the best iron. It has coal. Afghanistan has tremendous resources of precious metals—emeralds, gold, lapis lazuli, and many others, all of that to be in a rapid case to be started up and developed.

I think a reform in agriculture would help a great deal to put people back to work. Afghanistan always was an agro-economy. I believe that immediate, the next 18 months before the election—the concerns, what happens in the elections of extremists or others take an advantage? I think if we can start an aggressive reform in terms of putting people to work and bring some visible, tangible, large-scale projects to Afghanistan such as the “ring road.”;

I believe that if we can put the Afghans to work—I believe the jobs should be given to Afghans, not to others to come and do the job for Afghanistan. I believe that there is hundreds, if not thousands, of factories that have been disabled during the war. I believe that those factories should be put back, rehabilitated, and get them started and put the Afghans to run them.

I believe that the free enterprise economy should be started in Afghanistan and the private sector should be developed. I think the idea of yours of the Enterprise Fund would probably help jump-start all of these projects that we talk about.

So I emphasize a tremendous jump-start and an aggressive economic reconstruction for Afghanistan. I think that will not only help to create jobs, it will demobilize the regional leaders, as we call them. It will probably put all the people to work and bring security faster to the country than any other means.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you very much. I thank you for mentioning the Enterprise Fund, which was really your idea that I put in the bill.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Enterprise Fund concept had good success in Poland, and it can be an effective way to help build an economy. You have an ambitious idea here for investment, and maybe most Americans do not realize the possibilities for oil, gas, diamonds, gems, minerals. But a lot of investment is required for extraction.

Perhaps we can help you form the international partnership and attract the expertise that you will require.

Senator Biden.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you very much.

Welcome, Mr. Ambassador.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Thank you.

Senator BIDEN. One point I would make. Being an American citizen, having been an American citizen, you know that it would be helpful if you acknowledge the altruism of the American people. This idea of us not doing this for altruism—my folks back home do not understand the other reasons. They think they are doing it to help. So the extent that you are grateful for what is being done is a useful thing, because they are not interested in helping any Islamic republic or State for any reason. So it is born out of some altruism and it would be nice if you occasionally acknowledge that, No. 1.

But No. 2, let us take the gas and oil that you said should be— that is worth several billion dollars and, quote, “piped into Kabul.” When I last had—and I occasionally, as you know, have spoken to President Karzai, not only in person but on the phone to find out. Last time I—and this is a stale conversation, but let us take the practical problem of, assuming the economic investment is there to develop the gas and oil in the north.

You have Dostum, you have General Atta, you have Fahim, who is, I know, Defense Minister, but has another little hat he wears, and you have Sayyaf, who is a very good friend of Mr. bin Laden’s, all in the north, all competing for the affections and attention of the people in the north. Tell me how you think, no matter how much money got sent to the north, there would be a reasonable prospect of being able to safely begin to develop those oil reserves, which I strongly support us doing?

The reason I ask the question, so you do not think I am attempting to “mousetrap” you here, as we say, is that President Karzai has always made the point to me: “Unless I can secure the area first, there is no likelihood that the resources in the rest of my country are going to be the province of or under the control of the central government.” Maybe you could speak to that question for me, specifically using the gas and oil as an example.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Well, Senator, your point is well taken. As I have indicated, No. 1 is the security of the region. ISAF is very, very important. Many businesses, oil companies or gas or other businesses, in the United States I talked to, they do not dare to go inside unless there is security. So my condition for developing all of that, to give an incentive to push up and jump-start the ISAF and increase the security of the country, while we can do all of that.

Senator BIDEN. I think that is a very important point for you to continue to make, because the President makes it to me every time I see him. And I think it is a central and critical point in order to be able to give people who are reluctant, whether they are members of the administration, Members of Congress, leading business people in and out of the United States, in the region, and that is that there is a prescription here, but it all rests upon the idea that Afghans as well as outside donor groups, as well as outside devel-

opment initiatives can come in and feel they can operate without finding themselves in the crosshairs of these competing interests in the region, in whatever region we go into.

So it is not merely—and that has been one of my primary arguments with the administration when they tell me, “do not worry, there is basically calm and peace,” quote unquote, in the region. And I am going to be very hardhearted about this for a moment to make a point. I am more concerned about the duct tape and the plastic that is being sold in the stores today in Washington, DC, and around the country than I am about making sure the human rights of the people of Afghanistan are returned, although I think I have demonstrated by my record I am very concerned about that.

And so it is very difficult for us to convince the administration, at least the dominant view in the administration, and our colleagues—I should not say us. It is very difficult for me anyway to convince them that we in fact should be taking a greater risk by extending ourselves even more relative to Afghanistan, unless it can be demonstrated that there is a direct correlation between our failure to do that and the duct tape that is going up on people’s windows here in the United States, or potentially.

So to the extent that you can make the argument—because you are persuasive, you are a very successful businessman, you are an Afghani by birth and now an Afghani by choice in terms of a citizen, but you made your fortune here in the United States, you know how this place operates. To the extent that you are able to connect the dots for people like that, I think it would be very helpful. I think it would be a very helpful point.

I know you are trying very hard to do that, but I want to reinforce the broad point you are making. When you talk about—what is your impression—let me put it another way. The President of the United States, not Chairman Lugar or Joe Biden or Chuck Hagel or Paul Sarbanes, the President of the United States is the one what used the phrase “Marshall Plan for Afghanistan.” I do not recall any of us using that phrase, and the President used that word in talking to us privately and publicly as a nation, that we needed a Marshall Plan, and he sent Colin Powell to a donor’s conference in Japan immediately after the fall of the Taliban or very close to thereafter, and a man who I have an inordinately high regard for, the No. 2 man at the State Department, Secretary Armitage, came back and he said that number for the next several years was about \$10 billion.

I thought it was closer to \$19 billion, but about \$10 billion. Now, from your perspective, from Mr. Karzai’s perspective—and I realize you are in a tough spot because you are here and you know you have to convince the administration to stay the route, so you do not want to be publicly criticizing anybody—not that you necessarily would—because you are here, not with hat in hand, but with petition in pocket, and so it is kind of hard to, you know, to say some things.

But to the extent you can with us, I would like to ask you, have we from your perspective met our specific commitment under the \$10 billion umbrella that was—almost became the definition of a Marshall Plan by the President, which I do not think is a Marshall Plan. Have we met that commitment? And to what degree and with



how much timeliness, have the other donor countries met their commitment? If they have met it, tell us they have. If they have not, why do you think they have not?

Would you speak to that for us, please.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Yes. Senator, thank you.

The United States has met its commitment. The United States I think—the country, as you know, went through war, destruction, and it was rubble for 23 years. Relatively speaking, tremendous progress has been made, and this is due to the help and commitment of the United States of America.

We are grateful for that and the people of Afghanistan understand this, President Karzai understands it. I think we are extremely happy with the progress being made. But unfortunately other donor countries have not made that commitment yet. And Senator, if I knew the answer I would be doing something about it. I do not know it.

Senator BIDEN. Is it your view that we have the ability—and I am truly agnostic on this. I do not know the answer to this. Is it your view that we have the ability to impact on their keeping their commitment?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. I believe so. I believe that if the administration and the Senate would persuade the donors why they have not met their obligations, I think they would probably do something about it.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you very much.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. And I like very much that effort that you do on behalf of Afghanistan. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Biden.

Senator Coleman.

Senator COLEMAN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ambassador, I thank you very, very much for being here. It is very clear that Afghanistan is just kind of on the tip of a precipice. Using your words, you have an opportunity to turn the nation from a past filled with war and oppression to a future focused on prosperity and democracy. Certainly the great challenge is to get there. You have recognized that relationship. I think it is a very critical relationship. You cannot have economic security without national security.

Certainly we have talked today about a number of the challenges to get that national security. The distinguished ranking member before the earlier panel raised an issue about what has happened to the Taliban, where are they today. We have got some sense of, you know, they are on the run. I am interested in getting from you an assessment of, as we focus on this issue of national security, how are we doing? Have the Taliban, have they kind of melted back into the general populace and do we run the threat of them simply reappearing? Should there be any difficulties with the Karzai administration?

Can you give me your best assessment of where we are at with the Taliban today?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Well, again, in 1 year again, I look at everything as relative. Relatively, tremendous progress is being made. And there are two types of Taliban, the moderate Taliban and then the Taliban of extremist Taliban. I believe that some

of the moderate Taliban have been incorporated into the public and getting to become parts of the new Afghanistan, and hopefully that will be working and hopefully that will be a process of inclusion and to make them to become a better citizen and working toward building a nation.

The extreme Taliban, I do not have enough statistics about it, but hopefully that most of them are eliminated. But there are a great deal or number of them are in the border States, as has been discussed before. I believe that a number of them are in Pakistan and they are still very active into causing problems within Afghanistan.

I also believe that the Government of President Musharraf has been a courageous man joining the international community fighting against terrorism and Taliban and al-Qaeda, that needs to be helped to sort of root out the remainder of the Taliban and al-Qaeda in the borders between Afghanistan and Pakistan. And I think that is why, again, that we emphasize the increase of security and ISAF and that other part to sort of root out the rest of them within Afghanistan.

Senator COLEMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Coleman.

Senator Sarbanes.

Senator SARBANES. Mr. Ambassador, I join my colleagues in welcoming you before the committee and also to thank you for the fine work which you have been doing.

It would be helpful, I think, if you would sketch out for us the steps ahead directed toward achieving political stability in Afghanistan. I gather there is a constitutional commission now at work and if you could set out for us how that is progressing, how and when the constitution will be put into place, and then what would follow from that as we look ahead over the next year or two, I think that would be a helpful entry for the record.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Yes. We are very grateful again to the United States for helping to build the infrastructure of Afghanistan, the capacity of the institutions, and developing a country to be a democratic Afghanistan. Based on that, President Karzai has appointed commissions on the constitution. There is a commission working on army and military forces and a commission working on judiciary and commissioners working on women's rights and commissions working on humanitarian, commissions are at work.

The commission on constitution—I had the honor to be part of the Bonn conference—is based on the preliminary suggestions that were made in the Bonn conference and the constitution to follow that. The constitution is declaring a democratic Afghanistan, Afghanistan is for all Afghans, equal rights for men, women, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press.

Already, Mr. Senator, there is about 150 newspapers in Afghanistan, operating freely. There are many, many radio stations being installed around Afghanistan and talking very freely. There are women running for offices, women on the cabinet. So a great deal of the beginning, the birth of democracy, is taking place in Afghanistan.

That constitution that to my understanding was to be, the draft was to be completed some time this month, but already it has been ahead of itself. The draft has been completed in October, and is being presented for discussing it and more evaluating it to come out with a final draft. And hopefully the final draft of the constitution would be ready for the election to be submitted and approved by the constituents.

Senator SARBANES. When do you expect that to happen?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Well, the next loya jirga election, general election, is set for June 2004.

Senator SARBANES. Will the constitution be adopted before or after the general election?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. I think the constitution is going to be preliminarily looked at, but then it would be submitted to the election body for approval.

Senator SARBANES. Now let me ask you this question. Are the pressing needs which the population faces in Afghanistan being met at a sufficient rate that their outlook for the future is one of hope and optimism? Or are we falling short of responding quickly and openly enough, so that their attitude is lapsing into one of pessimism?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Well, I was in Kabul last year and the people that come from Afghanistan, they are telling me that the Afghanistan of today is an Afghanistan of hope, opportunities, and challenges. The people are very much hopeful. The people feel very good about what is happening. Eighty-five percent of Afghans are supporting the Karzai Government. Eighty-five percent of the people in Afghanistan are supporting democracy and freedom. They are sick and tired of fighting and wars and destruction.

So there is a tremendous atmosphere of hope and opportunity among the people. And they all say that, we see the light in the tunnel. They are all very hopeful for a good future.

But we need to aggressively create jobs and employment for them. There is still poverty in the country. People have no jobs. People have no place to stay. So I suggested the projects such as the "ring road" aggressively should be pursued and aggressively be put to action, and other jobs should be created, projects, to create many jobs.

I think special funding for the agro-economy should be allocated to start the agriculture. A lot of Afghans are farmers, and get them started on that.

So that is what the people are very hopeful on. If we can be able to provide that, to put those people to work, I think it will go a long way.

Senator SARBANES. In the agricultural sector primarily. What about the housing—

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Mostly agriculture, and others also.

Senator SARBANES. What about the housing issue? There was a story recently in the New York Times about that.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Well, absolutely the cities that I saw, Kabul is totally down to rubble. So I think the housing issue is a very important project and is taking place now. Many homes are being built. People are building homes, people are building roads

in their neighborhoods. So the housing project has been started and needs to be aggressively moved forward.

Senator SARBANES. What are the projects that you would put at the top of the list that, if a renewed effort were to be made, should be moved forward quickly as a very visible demonstration to the Afghan people that this is really going to be a real departure from the past and a new start for Afghanistan?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Restoration of the disabled factories and businesses in Afghanistan that put a lot of people to work, No. 1. Building more roads and construction and building homes and highways are second or in the same category. Building airports and, most importantly, building the energy capacity. The electrical power plants were destroyed, need to be restored. So these kind of projects to put electricity and energy back, and communications and telecommunications, restoration of all these projects would be very much helpful to get things started.

Senator SARBANES. Well, good. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Sarbanes.

Senator Biden, do you have a final comment?

Senator BIDEN. I just have one, not a comment, one closing question if I may.

Mr. Ambassador, can you give us a sense of—I was going to say how confident; that is the wrong way to phrase it—your and President Karzai's most optimistic assessment of when he would be in a position to have a military that had some actual capacity, if need be, to secure anything from highways to gubernatorial provinces if need be, that he would have confidence in?

How far out is that?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Well, it is very hard to quantify the timing of it. The process has been started and 2,000, 3,000 armies or 10,000 up to, to my estimation if I am correct on that, has been a great deal of progress in the time it has been started.

I think the problem that I was trying to find out, what is it to jump-start this and aggressively train them is recruitment. And earlier was mentioned that if you pay more; I think you will have probably more quality people come forward and take the job. So if that kind of allocation will be made for increasing their salaries, I think you will see more people volunteer to come.

Senator BIDEN. One of the things that I will respectfully suggest that I found last year when I spent so much time with President Karzai, I asked him to do something and he initially thought that I was—that maybe it was a little bit too, I do not know, too precise. But his brother was with him, who is a Maryland citizen—

Senator SARBANES. And a constituent of mine.

Senator BIDEN [continuing]. And a constituent, a Baltimore restaurant owner. And I remember him sitting in the room with us and turning to his brother and saying: "This is a good idea; you ought to do this." And what I asked was specifically, not generally, what his most urgent need was. And he said—he gave me a general answer about administrative facilities, meaning buildings that you could occupy, electricity you could turn on.

I said, can you be more precise, to make a point? And he then began to get down to specifics. A gentleman walked in who worked

for the President—I mean worked for the executive, maybe not personally for the President—and he said, “For example, I am going to lose the man who just brought in these papers for me because I cannot pay him and because he does not have what is the equivalent of a computer terminal or even an old typewriter.”

And I met with the Minister of Women’s Affairs, a woman, who said—I asked what she needed and she said, “I need a desk.” I mean, she was not being facetious. She needed a desk.

So I came back and we talked about what that immediate need was and it was about—what was the actual number? Was it \$20 million? About \$20 million that was needed just to keep the lights on, if you will. And literally, as we were talking the lights flickered on and off in the President’s office.

So I came back and I went to a guy I like dealing with very much because he gets things done. I went to the Assistant Secretary of State—the Deputy Secretary.

Senator SARBANES. Armitage.

Senator BIDEN. Armitage.

The CHAIRMAN. Deputy.

Senator BIDEN. Deputy. And I said, this is what we need. And he said, “Well, we do not have the money.” I said, No, there is a thing in your Department where you have this fund that you can use. So he immediately released \$20 million. I got a note and a call from the President saying it was transforming, it had immediate impact.

The reason I bother to tell you that is this. To the extent that you can—and the President is coming to see us.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator BIDEN. To the extent that you can advise him about what—not even asking for a specific amount, what specific things that are totally able to be digested by our colleagues, myself included, that are, to use American slang, “bite-sized,” that would make a difference. Case in point?

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. I would say one case in point would be, “bite-sized” as you mention it, is that all the funding and all the money to be channeled through Karzai himself.

Senator BIDEN. Well, see, that I totally agree with you on that. But that is a programmatic, that is a policy decision we have been having trouble getting the administration to sign on.

Let me be more specific. The American people understand that, because we have told them, you have told them, everyone has told them, that very conservative elements of Islam, particularly Wahabi in origin, out of primarily Saudi Arabia, over the past years have built roughly 7,000 madrassas in parts of Afghanistan and in Pakistan. We spent some time, Dr. Blank and I spent some time, and got a very hard number and checked it out with your people at the department of education as well, whatever you exactly call it.

You can build a school in Afghanistan that will house warmly and cleanly boys and girls, teach them reading, writing, arithmetic, and hire competent teachers, because you have this plethora of women qualified to teach—and by the way, the 50 percent of the women in the bureaucracy, 50 percent of the bureaucracy are women, most of those are teachers and they are not employed. You

are not paying them. There are no schools for them to go to. So it is a bit of an exaggeration on your part to talk. It shows intent. It shows that you are open to, that you are committed to a society that includes women. But they are not working.

So we actually worked up some figures. It costs \$20,000 to build from scratch and operate an Afghani school. I think you should be coming back to us and saying things like: Build us 1,000 or 5,000 or 10,000 schools now and here is where I would build them. I promise you, as somebody who sat here for 30 years, we can get you that money. We can get you that money, because it is virtually impossible for anybody, including the administration, to say “no, we will not support that.”

So the irony is the more you are able to, in addition to your macroeconomic requirements and fiscal requirements for the government and the country as a whole, to the extent that you can pinpoint for us, particularly as an American who understands what appeals to Americans’ hearts, interests, and desires, I think we can be of some immediate help beyond what is already occurring, that in fact might have some cumulative impact on your ability to do what you are going to have to do, is show progress.

The irony is the burden is on you to show progress. The irony is we are not giving, the world is not giving you all the tools you need to be able to demonstrate progress, and so you are going to be held accountable to a standard that we imposed but did not help apply.

So that is unsolicited advice as your unpaid counsel. But I promise you—

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Thank you.

Senator BIDEN [continuing]. I promise you it is worth the effort. As they say, trust me. I may not know much about a little—about foreign policy. I have a little bit of knowledge of politics, and it would be a very useful thing, I suggest. Schools are a single example. I am not suggesting anything beyond that.

You, you decide what those needs are. To the extent that the President can come giving illustrations to the American people and the administration, I think it may be helpful.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Thank you, Mr. Senator. The 50 percent I said, you are right, was intention.

Senator BIDEN. Yes. I was not implying you were trying to mislead us. I was just trying to make the point.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. But your point is well taken and I will be happy when I come with President Karzai to visit you, I will give you a shopping list for what is to be done. But you have to remember—

Senator BIDEN. Well, again, I would be like my daughter, not my son. My daughter is smart enough to give a list she knows I can fulfill. So I would not overdo it, but I would come with some specifics.

I really mean it, seriously. I think you will find you will get some help. Our friend Senator Coleman is an extremely qualified guy, new to this committee, new to the Senate. I will bet you a thousand dollars there is no way as mayor he could have known that. To build 1,000 schools at \$20,000 a school, if he could do that in Minneapolis-St. Paul area he would have done it.

So my point is this is doable, this is doable, and I think you might find you get some support.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. We would be happy to do that. Thank you very much, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Coleman, do you have any comment about that?

Senator COLEMAN. Former mayors understand the importance of doable, doable. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank all Senators. Let me just mention that President Karzai will be with us on February 26, Wednesday, February 26. So we are looking forward to that.

As you have observed, Senator Biden is a consultant in addition to a great United States Senator, and this process of a hearing today has turned into much more of a consultation, but that is constructive and we appreciate that.

I would just add that, with the school idea, I would suspect there are many people in the United States that would perhaps give the money to dedicate a school.

Ambassador SHAHRYAR. Absolutely.

Senator BIDEN. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. It is something that unites the people, and I think Senator Biden's political judgment is, as usual, impeccable with regard to that.

Let me also mention to committee members that we will have the distinguished President of Ecuador, Lucio Gutierrez, with us this afternoon at 3 o'clock in S-116. So we look forward to this distinguished new leader in Latin America, an opportunity to visit privately with him.

The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

