

**NOMINATION OF HON. SUSAN E. RICE
TO BE U.N. REPRESENTATIVE**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————
JANUARY 15, 2009
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web:
<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

54-640 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2010

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
BARBARA BOXER, California
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland
ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., Pennsylvania
JIM WEBB, Virginia
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
EDWARD E. KAUFMAN, Delaware
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
Republican Leader designee
BOB CORKER, Tennessee
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi

DAVID McKean, *Staff Director*

KENNETH A. MYERS, JR., *Republican Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Kerry, Hon. John F., U.S. Senator From Massachusetts	Page 1
Lugar, Hon. Richard G., U.S. Senator From Indiana	8
Rice, Hon. Susan E., Nominated to be Representative to the United Nations ...	10
Prepared statement	16

APPENDIX

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Responses to additional questions submitted for the record by members of the committee to Dr. Rice	51
---	----

**NOMINATION OF DR. SUSAN E. RICE
TO BE U.N. REPRESENTATIVE**

Thursday, January 15, 2009

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:34 a.m., in room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Hon. John F. Kerry, chairman of the committee, presiding.

Present: Senators Kerry, Dodd, Feingold, Boxer, Nelson, Menendez, Cardin, Casey, Lugar, Corker, Murkowski, DeMint, Isakson, and Barrasso.

Also Present: Senator Shaheen.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. KERRY,
U.S. SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS**

The CHAIRMAN. This hearing will come to order, please.

We have nine. So we are one Senator shy from a quorum, and while we wait for that one Senator to arrive so that we can do the business portion of the meeting, I know that both of our Senators—we are delighted to welcome you, Senator Collins, Senator Bayh. Thanks for taking time to be here. They both have pressing schedules. So what we are going to do is let them make their opening introductions of Dr. Rice initially and then as soon as the Senator is here, we will do the business meeting and then proceed to the other openings and testimony.

So Senator Collins, thanks so much for taking time. We are glad you are here.

**STATEMENT OF HON. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. SENATOR FROM MAINE**

Senator COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege today to introduce Dr. Susan Rice, the President-elect's nominee to be the next United States Ambassador to the United Nations. The people of Maine are proud of what this remarkable woman has accomplished in her distinguished career of service to our Nation, and we take special pride in her strong ties to our State.

In order to fully describe Dr. Rice's accomplishments, first let me describe those ties, for they are the foundation of her character. Her grandparents emigrated from Jamaica to Portland, Maine in the early years of the 20th century. Like so many who have come to our shores, they came with little in their pockets, but with spirits overflowing with determination. On modest wages, they raised

five children, and they believed that education was the key to the American dream. Their four sons all graduated from Maine's Bowdoin College. Two became physicians, one an optometrist, and one a college president. Their daughter, Dr. Rice's mother Lois, who is here today, was valedictorian of Portland High School and president of the student body at Radcliff College. She is a former vice president of the college board and a former advisory council chairwoman at the National Science Foundation. She married Emmett Rice, Dr. Rice's father, who is also here today, a retired senior vice president at the National Bank of Washington and a former governor of the Federal Reserve.

The determination of Dr. Rice's grandparents to build a brighter future did not end with their own family. They founded a USO center for blacks in Portland during World War II and were active in the Portland branch of the NAACP.

That determination to succeed and to contribute thrives in their granddaughter. Dr. Rice was valedictorian and a three-sport athlete at the National Cathedral High School here in Washington. She graduated from Stanford where she was elected as a junior to Phi Beta Kappa and earned both a masters degree and a doctorate in international relations from Oxford University where she was a Rhodes Scholar.

After a stint at the global consulting firm, McKinsey & Company, she joined the Clinton administration as a member of the National Security Council staff. Dr. Rice then became the youngest person ever to serve as a regional Assistant Secretary of State, taking on the African Affairs portfolio at a particularly challenging time. While in that position, Dr. Rice played a key role in addressing conflict resolution in Africa, helping to develop a U.S. response to conflicts in the Sudan and the Horn of Africa and working to secure enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act. She was also the first American official ever to address the Organization of African Unity summit.

After her Government service, Dr. Rice became a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and served as the senior foreign policy advisor to the President-elect during his campaign.

Although, of course, I knew of Dr. Rice when she worked at the NSC, I first met her when we were both participants in a series of seminars sponsored by the Aspen Strategy Group. I was so impressed with her brilliance and nuanced insight as I listened to her discuss various foreign policy challenges. I knew at that time that she was a real star.

Dr. Rice would bring to this position experience, expertise, and enthusiasm that are especially crucial during these difficult times. She has special expertise in the challenges posed by weak and failed states, poverty, and global security threats, particularly in Africa. She is known for being direct, yet always diplomatic. She is not driven by rigid ideology, but rather by firm principles. She has the reputation as a keen, critical thinker who is always learning. Her intellect, experience, and character will serve our Nation well.

Mr. Chairman, one of Dr. Rice's most recent visits to the State of Maine was exactly a year ago when she came to Portland to address the annual Martin Luther King breakfast. In her eloquent re-

marks, she made clear that human rights are not defined by race, ethnicity, or national borders, but rather, are the universal birth right of all mankind. To secure that birth right, she said— and I quote—“we can and we must overcome the divisions of past centuries as well as the traumas of the recent past.”

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Lugar, I can think of no better message to convey to the United Nations and no better messenger than Dr. Susan Rice. I am honored to present her to this distinguished committee, and I enthusiastically endorse her nomination. Thank you. Thanks to all the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you very much, Senator Collins. What a wonderful introduction. Remind me that if I am ever in need of an introduction, I want to put in my reservation right now. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. It does not get better than that. And really, you have given great, important background to the committee, and so we really appreciate that.

Senator Bayh, I think we will go with yours, just to keep the continuity, and then we will interrupt for the business meeting and start again. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF HON. EVAN BAYH,
U.S. SENATOR FROM INDIANA**

Senator BAYH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Lugar. Let me just say that in these difficult times for our Nation, we can be reassured that you are providing foreign policy leadership to our country.

Members of the committee, it is an honor to be before you today.

I too have known Dr. Rice for many years and can attest from personal experience that she has the keen intellect, the strong work ethic, and the collegiality to be an outstanding Ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, as you know very well, our Nation faces a set of formidable transnational challenges that threaten the security and prosperity of our people in the 21st century: terrorism, radicalism, and extremism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, global climate change, poverty, and disease. These are problems that threaten our people that cannot be solved by our Government alone. The U.N. offers an important vehicle to assert American global leadership through collective action with other nations around the world.

President-elect Obama has rightly noted that the United Nations is an imperfect but indispensable institution for advancing America's security. In the 21st century, our goal must be to make the United Nations a more effective mechanism to work with other nations to advance our interests in combating common threats.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need an Ambassador to the United Nations with a demonstrated ability to represent our country in the international community in a credible, forthright, and influential manner. Mr. Chairman, I believe Dr. Susan Rice is uniquely qualified to do exactly that.

Throughout her career in public service, she has served with distinction. Her service includes key roles on the National Security

Council as Director for International Organizations and Peacekeeping and Senior Director for African Affairs.

In 1997, Dr. Rice became one of the youngest Assistant Secretaries of State in American history when she was appointed Assistant Secretary of State of African Affairs. In this role, she oversaw 43 U.S. embassies, 5,000 employees, and an annual operating budget of \$260 million.

At a time when the United Nations is in great need of internal reform, Dr. Rice has proven that she is an adept and capable manager. She will help the United States strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations, modernize it, and make it more capable of meeting the challenges of the 21st century. That means implementing an agenda of management reform and working to strengthen its program capacities.

We are asking the United Nations now to do more than ever to promote global security. Yet, we have not aligned capabilities with the mandates that we have given U.N. missions. Dr. Rice has demonstrated the intellectual heft required of this position. As a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute, she has written extensively on multilateral diplomacy and how to deal with the security challenges posed by failed states. She will represent America's interests on the world stage thoughtfully and vigorously.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen her in action, and I am pleased to report to the panel today that, if confirmed, she will be a formidable negotiator and a skilled diplomat on our Nation's behalf.

Last February, Dr. Rice and I sat together on a foreign policy panel, the U.S.-Islamic World Forum in Doha. She attended as a representative of candidate Obama, and I represented Senator, then-candidate, Clinton. Dr. Rice offered a spirited defense of America's prerogatives and a keen understanding of the importance of leveraging buy-in from U.N. member states to tackle global security challenges.

Dr. Rice understands the myriad challenges facing the United States, and she is prepared to work with our allies around the globe to marshal world opinion and spur action to ensure our country's security. She also carries a currency invaluable in this endeavor, the ear and full confidence of the next President of the United States.

The United States will never ask permission to defend ourselves or our allies. Yet, the last 8 years proved that there is great peril in acting alone in a dangerous world. We do not seek alliances because we are weak, but because acting with our friends and partners around the world makes us strong. It is important to use the United Nations as a vehicle to promote peace and stability, the prevention and resolution of conflict, and the stabilization of conflict zones once war has ended. It is in our interests to make the United Nations more effective in this regard.

President-elect Obama has outlined an ambitious agenda with respect to climate change, nonproliferation, poverty reduction, and strengthening the capacity of weak and failing states. All of these elements can and should be addressed in the U.N., as well as in other contexts. Dr. Susan Rice will strive to make the United Nations a more effective mechanism to advance our national security and meet global challenges.

I have high confidence, Mr. Chairman, that if confirmed, Dr. Rice can help build new bridges to nations with whom we do not always agree while renewing America's leadership in the world.

Finally and on a note that I think Senator Lugar can relate to well, I understand that back in the day, Dr. Rice was a capable basketball player, which will endure her to the hearts of Hoosiers everywhere. She has proven that she can succeed in some of the most competitive arenas. I am confident she can in the United Nations as well.

So, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Lugar, it is my distinct pleasure to recommend that this committee confirm Dr. Susan Rice as our next Ambassador to the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Bayh. We respect your observation about her athletic skill and regret to inform you that born in Portland, she is a Celtics fan. [Laughter.]

Senator Bayh: I did not say she was perfect, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

Dr. RICE. Just for the record, I was born in Washington, D.C. A Bullets fan.

The CHAIRMAN. Born in Washington. There you go. Bullets.

We thank both of you for your introductions today. You are both respected voices in the Senate on national security and foreign policy issues. And so these introductions are important to us, and we are very, very grateful to you.

We know you have other business, so we will excuse you while we begin quickly the business meeting, and then we will come back to the hearing itself. But thank you for taking time to be here. We appreciate it.

Senator COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 9:49 a.m., the hearing was recessed, to resume at 9:53 a.m.]

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Dodd has asked a point of personal privilege. Again, as chairman of the Banking Committee, he is in the middle of major discussions and hearings. So I would like to honor that. Senator Dodd?

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER DODD,
U.S. SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT**

Senator DODD. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I'll be very, very brief.

First of all, my apologies to you, Dr. Rice. We are having the confirmation hearings for the nominee to be the Chairman of the SEC, a Federal Reserve post, and three positions on the Council of Economic Advisers. So we have a full day in the Banking Committee before us.

And we will have plenty of chances, I presume, in the coming days to talk and work together. So I congratulate you on accepting the nomination. I commend the President for suggesting your nomination to us, and we all look forward to working with you.

I think the statements of Senator Kerry, as I heard them, Senator Bayh and Senator Collins express the views of all of us about the importance of this role. We know you will do an admirable job at it. So thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Dodd.

It is my pleasure, on behalf of the entire committee in the Senate, to welcome you here, Dr. Rice. We are really pleased to see you here today. And obviously, I can see that some members of your family are here, ranging up and down the generations I see. We would love to have you introduce them, if you would. Can you just share with us quickly who they are? And then I would like to say a few words, and I know Senator Lugar would too.

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really am very pleased and proud that my family can be here. I would like to introduce my mother, Lois Rice; my father, Emmett Rice; my son Jake; my daughter Maris; and my husband Ian Cameron. They are a wonderful source of joy and support to me, and I could not imagine taking on this responsibility without them.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we are really happy to welcome all of you. I know how proud you are. I listened to all those youngest-ever comments, and Senator Lugar and I were up here feeling grayer and grayer. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. But there is every reason to be enormously proud and we welcome you.

As a point of personal privilege, I would like to just say to members of the committee we are delighted to welcome our old colleague and friend. Senator Tim Wirth is here in his role as President of the U.N. Foundation, which is a very important addendum to our efforts here. And we are delighted to welcome you back, Senator.

The United States Ambassador to the United Nations is, without question, one of the most important national security and diplomatic posts in the administration and one from which there is an enormous ability to achieve a great deal. The Obama administration has recognized this by rightfully restoring it to cabinet level, and I believe that President-elect Obama has made an outstanding choice in Dr. Susan Rice.

I have had the pleasure of working closely with Dr. Rice over the past years, and I can tell you that she is exceptionally talented, fiercely conscientious, and one of the most dedicated public servants that I have met. She has been a trusted personal advisor, and I have worked with her closely on a special project outside of the Senate, and she is a friend. And I could not be happier than to welcome her here for confirmation for such a key position.

The choice of Dr. Rice for this elevated position is further evidence of the Obama's administration commitment to a renewed diplomatic and multilateral presence on the world stage. The United Nations can play a crucial role in mobilizing the world to meet complex international issues that are critical to our national interests.

From Iran's nuclear program to climate change, to the crisis in Darfur and beyond, we are living in a world where the actions of a single nation are profoundly and increasingly inadequate to meet the challenges that we face.

As I and others have said, if there were no United Nations, we would have to invent one. It is in our national and moral interests to cultivate a forum where frozen conflicts can be resolved before they become hot wars, where peace can be forged and protected,

where global consensus on transnational threats and challenges can be translated into bold action, and where America can lead by working cooperatively with willing and able partners.

At its most effective, the U.N. can and will be vital to our interests. The world is changing and it is changing rapidly. Narrower traditional notions of national interests are giving way to a broader, more holistic view, one that appreciates how the mass movements of people, melting ice caps, violent religious extremism, and global health challenges like HIV/AIDS are all interrelated facets of our security picture, and they all deserve greater attention.

That is the world that the next administration inherits, and Dr. Rice brings a deep understanding to addressing these issues. In fact, her own writings and testimony on failed states and transnational challenges have helped to educate many of us about the new and inescapable global set of realities that we face. Dr. Rice brings insight and passion to an institution that will benefit from both.

There have long been values of our foreign policy debate that somehow we leave aside, inadvertently I think, but they are often left aside. Certainly the rhetoric and the reality—there is a gap between them. And there are many voices in that debate that prefer to dwell on all that the United Nations is not, rather than how it does serve our interests today or what it can become if we commit ourselves to strengthening it.

On the other hand, support for the United Nations must not lead us to whitewash the institution's shortcomings any more than we should, obviously, accept the blanket condemnations. In the end, it diminishes the work of many good people, and it really reduces our ability to make the institution what it can be.

Support for the U.N. requires us to address legitimate flaws, including corruption scandals, abuse by peacekeepers, and bureaucratic gridlock, not to mention a sometimes unbalanced approach to the Middle East and an unaccountable Human Rights Council. Sometimes also working through the United Nations has proved frustrating when it comes to addressing humanitarian crises in places like Burma, Darfur, and Zimbabwe and threats like Iran's nuclear program. Clearly today, we look forward to Dr. Rice's thoughts on how we can all join together to enhance the U.N.'s ability to deal with each of these issues multilaterally.

But as we work toward making the U.N. a more effective and efficient body, we absolutely should not lose sight of the many ways in which it currently serves our interests. From managing over 90,000 peacekeepers in 16 missions around the world, despite chronic underfunding, to providing food and shelter to over 8 million refugees worldwide, to monitoring elections in Iraq, to much needed coordination efforts in Afghanistan, the U.N. and its affiliated agencies take on issues that no nation can or should take on alone. And in many cases, it is the best equipped and the only multilateral institution capable of doing so.

The United Nations also advances important international norms that will benefit all nations. A U.N. panel of top scientists ratifies the world's consensus on the threat of global climate change. The U.N.'s championing of core principles of nuclear nonproliferation are vital, as well as the indispensable work of the IAEA's moni-

toring compliance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. All of these have significantly improved our security.

And the U.N. also plays a critical role in advancing causes that everyone should be able to agree on: the fight against global hunger, global poverty, and the fight for global health.

The United States' support for the U.N. is critical. We are the largest contributor to both the regular and peacekeeping budgets at 22 percent and 27 percent, respectively. However, we are routinely behind in those payments and we handicap the United Nations in doing so. The administration's budget requests in recent years, particularly for peacekeeping, have not been enough to pay our bill. That is wrong. If we expect the United Nations to fulfill its important missions, we need to do better by upholding our end of the bargain, and that means paying our share in full and on time.

Representing America at a body as complex as the United Nations is a huge challenge. I am absolutely confident that Dr. Rice is up to that challenge. She has served in senior positions on the National Security Council, and as referenced, as the youngest-ever Assistant Secretary of State, she was responsible for U.S. policy toward 48 countries of sub-Saharan Africa, including 43 embassies, over 5,000 Foreign Service employees, an operating budget over \$100 million, and a program budget of approximately \$160 million.

Dr. Susan Rice is one of our most capable national security thinkers. She understands that our country is stronger when we enlist others in our cause, when we share our burdens, and when we lead strategically.

It is my pleasure to support her nomination as U.N. Ambassador, one who brings both vital respect for the U.N. and the courage to challenge it and improve it. And I look forward to confirming her as our next Ambassador to the United Nations.

Senator Lugar?

**STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD G. LUGAR,
U.S. SENATOR FROM INDIANA**

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Chairman, I join you in your warm welcome to Dr. Susan Rice. We first met as members of a selection committee for Rhodes Scholars, interviewing the distinguished students and making a selection. And I appreciated that day with Dr. Rice and have appreciated her testimony before this committee over the course of the years, most recently on Darfur in 2007 when she brought considerable insight to those proceedings.

The position of Ambassador to the United Nations is unique, as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, among diplomatic assignments. Its occupant is responsible not only for conducting diplomacy on most of the critical foreign policy issues of the day, but also for United States stewardship of a multilateral institution that plays a central role in global affairs. The diplomatic challenges that will face our nominee include the nuclear confrontations with Iran and North Korea, the spread of HIV/AIDS and other diseases, refugee crises related to Iraq and Darfur and other locations, and numerous other problems that confront the United Nations every day.

And while we all hope for a United Nations that can fulfill its potential as a forum for international problem-solving and dispute resolution, often the U.N. has fallen short of our hopes, particularly

in areas related to management, to financial transparency and oversight. The influence and capabilities possessed by the United Nations come from the credibility associated with countries acting together in a well-established forum with well-established rules. Scandals, mismanagement, and bureaucratic stonewalling squander this precious resource.

This committee and others in Congress have spent much time examining how the United States can work cooperatively with partners at the U.N. to streamline its bureaucracy, improve its transparency, and make it more efficient as it undertakes vital missions.

I recently read in the Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal reports that the General Assembly shut down the U.N.'s Procurement Task Force that was rooting out corrupt U.N. officials and had banned 36 international companies from further business with the United Nations. Regrettably, it appears that the U.N. has already begun to curtail or terminate many of the task force's ongoing investigations.

Many barriers exist to successful U.N. reform. Too many diplomats and bureaucrats in New York see almost any structural or budgetary change at the U.N. as an attempt to diminish their prerogatives.

Our next Ambassador must be dedicated to continuing meaningful reform at the U.N. in spite of the daunting atmosphere. Our Ambassador must be a forceful advocate for greater efficiency and transparency and an intolerance of corruption.

The performance of the U.N. Human Rights Council in Geneva also continues to be a source of concern in the Congress and among the American people. Sessions of the Council have focused almost exclusively on Israel. Much less well known is the role of the United Nations Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Affairs Committee in New York, which has voted in the past to condemn the deplorable human rights situations in Iran, North Korea, Belarus, and Burma, countries which the Human Rights Council in Geneva has often ignored.

Now, despite these and other difficulties, the United Nations remains an essential component of global security policy. The World Health Organization and the World Food Program, for example, have performed vital functions, reduced U.S. burdens, and achieved impressive humanitarian results for many years.

The United Nations peacekeeping missions have contributed significantly to international stability and helped rebuild shattered societies. Currently there are 16 peacekeeping operations ranging from Haiti to the Congo, to East Timor, and some 100,000 civilian, military, and police forces from around the world are helping to stabilize some of the most war-ravaged places on our earth. In 2008, there were 130 peacekeeping fatalities, the second highest level since 1994.

The ability of U.N. peacekeeping missions to be a force multiplier was underscored by a 2006 General Accounting Office analysis of the U.N.'s peacekeeping mission in Haiti. GAO concluded—and I quote—"the U.N. budgeted \$428 million for the first 14 months of the mission. A U.S. operation of the same size and duration would have cost an estimated \$876 million." The report noted the U.S.

contribution to the Haiti peacekeeping mission was \$116 million, roughly one-eighth the cost of a unilateral American mission.

Now, most Americans want the United Nations to help facilitate international burden-sharing in times of crisis. They want the U.N. to be a consistent and respected forum for diplomatic discussions, and they expect the U.N. to be a positive force in the global fight against poverty, disease, and hunger.

But Americans also are frequently frustrated with the United Nations, and the job of the United States Ambassador to the U.N. involves not only dealing with policies and politics in New York. Our U.S. Ambassador must also be able to communicate to Congress and to the American people why it is important to pay our U.N. dues on time, why peacekeeping operations benefit the United States, why cooperation at the U.N. is essential to United States foreign policy.

I welcome the distinguished nominee, look forward to hearing how she and the Obama administration intend to address these important issues.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Lugar.

And now, Dr. Rice, we look forward to your testimony. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF HON. SUSAN E. RICE, NOMINATED TO BE
REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

Dr. RICE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Lugar, and distinguished members of the committee. I am really deeply honored to appear before you as the President-elect's designee to be the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations. I want to thank the President-elect for his confidence in naming me to this vitally important position.

Mr. Chairman, my warmest congratulations to you as the new chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. You have been an ardent champion of a principled U.S. foreign policy to ensure this country's security and prosperity. There is a great tradition of probity on this committee dating back to Senator Fulbright. The man seated next to you, Senator Lugar, continued that tradition through his years as chairman, and I know you will do so with great distinction as well. I am very grateful to you both for convening this hearing swiftly to consider my nomination.

I also want to express my gratitude to Senator Susan Collins and Senator Evan Bayh for their very, very generous introductions of me and for their extraordinary service to our country. I am very appreciative of their support.

Mr. Chairman, like many Americans, I first heard of the United Nations as a child about the age of my daughter Maris. My initial images of the U.N. were not of the blue helmets of its peacekeepers or the white vehicles of its lifesaving humanitarian workers, but the orange and black of the UNICEF boxes I carried door to door each Halloween. UNICEF and the U.N. embodied to me then, as it does still today, our shared responsibility to one another as human beings and our collective potential and, indeed, obligation to forge a more secure, more just, and more prosperous future.

As I grew up during the Cold War, I saw the U.N. frequently paralyzed by geopolitical and ideological showdowns between the United States and the Soviet Union. Later, with the fall of the Berlin Wall, I joined millions in hoping that the vital mission of the U.N. could be advanced through enhanced cooperation. Serving in the Clinton administration in the 1990's, I had the opportunity to gain firsthand an appreciation of the organization's strengths and understanding of its weaknesses.

In the wake of the Cold War, the U.N. was modernized in important ways and did substantial good, from Namibia to Mozambique, from El Salvador to South Africa and Cambodia. At the same time, there were clear failures, witnessed in the unimaginable human tragedies of Somalia, Rwanda, and Srebrenica and in the inability to deal effectively with crises in Angola and Haiti.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we now stand at yet another defining moment. Terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, civil conflict, climate change, genocide, extreme poverty, and deadly disease are global challenges that no single nation can defeat alone. They require common action based on a common purpose and a vision of shared security. If confirmed, I welcome the challenge and will be humbled by the privilege to serve our country at the United Nations, where I will work to promote and implement President-elect Obama's commitment to strengthen our common security by investing in our common humanity.

More than 60 years ago, our leaders understood that a global institution that brings all of the world's countries together would enhance, not diminish our influence and bring more security to our people and to the world.

The President-elect has affirmed America's commitment to the United Nations as an indispensable, if imperfect, institution for advancing America's security and well-being in the 21st century. The goal of our diplomacy at the United Nations must be to make it a more perfect forum to address the most pressing global challenges: to promote peace, to support democracy, and to strengthen respect for human rights.

My most immediate objective, should I be confirmed, will be to refresh and renew America's leadership in the United Nations and bring to bear the full weight of our influence, voice, resources, values, and diplomacy at the United Nations.

The choices we face in addressing global challenges can often be difficult: allowing conflict and suffering to spread, mobilizing an American response, or supporting a multinational United Nations effort. The U.N. is not a cure-all. We must be clear-eyed about the challenges it faces. But it is a global institution that can address a tremendous range of critical American and international interests.

I know the U.N. sometimes deeply frustrates Americans, and I am acutely aware of its shortcomings. Yet, all nations understand the importance of this organization. And that ironically is why countries like Sudan, North Korea, and Cuba work so hard to render bodies like the U.N. Human Rights Council ineffective and objectionable. It is why efforts to pass Security Council resolutions on abuses in places like Zimbabwe and Burma occasion such fierce debate. It is also why many try to use the U.N. willfully and un-

fairly to condemn our ally Israel. When effective and principled U.N. action is blocked, our frustration naturally grows, but that should only cause us to redouble our efforts to ensure that the United Nations lives up to its founding principles.

Today, there is more on the agenda of the United Nations than ever before. Nearly 90,000 U.N. peacekeepers are deployed in 16 missions around the world. The U.N. is playing a vital role in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the United Nations is at the center of global efforts to address climate change and prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to stabilize weak and failing states, prevent and resolve conflict, reduce poverty, combat HIV/AIDS, assist refugees and the internally displaced, feed the hungry, promote food security, and confront genocide and crimes against humanity.

If confirmed, Mr. Chairman, I will work to strengthen the U.N.'s effectiveness to fulfill its many important missions, and working closely with the Secretary of State, I will devote particular attention to four areas.

First, I will work to improve the capacity of the United Nations to undertake complex peace operations more effectively. We need to weigh new U.N. mandates more carefully and review existing mandates as they come up for renewal. The fact that more than 1 year after the force was established the crucial U.N. mission in Darfur is only at half-strength is patently unacceptable. We will work to build global peacekeeping capacity and help streamline the U.N.'s as well as our own procedures for deploying and supporting U.N. missions.

Second, the Obama administration will provide strong leadership to address climate change. Under President-elect Obama, the United States will engage vigorously in UN-sponsored climate negotiations while we pursue progress in sub-global, regional, and bilateral settings. To tackle global warming, all major emitting nations must be part of the solution. Rapidly developing economies such as China and India must join in making and meeting their own binding and meaningful commitments. And we should help the most vulnerable countries adapt to climate change. If confirmed, I look forward to advancing the diplomatic and development elements of the President's climate change agenda.

Third, preventing the spread and use of nuclear weapons is an enormous security challenge that deserves top-level attention. Senator Lugar, thanks to your bold leadership and vision and that of others, we have made some meaningful progress in this regard, but the threat remains urgent. It is essential to strengthen the global nonproliferation and disarmament regime, dealing with those nations in violation and upholding our obligations to work towards the goal of a world without nuclear weapons. The United Nations plays a significant role in this regime. Our objective is to lay the groundwork for a successful Nonproliferation Treaty review conference in 2010, one that advances the world's nonproliferation and disarmament architecture and improves it for the 21st century.

Fourth, billions of the world's people face the threats of poverty, disease, environmental degradation, venal leadership, extremism, corruption, and violence. Conflict-ridden and fragile states can incubate these and other threats that rarely remain confined within national borders. President-elect Obama has long stressed the im-

portance of working with others to promote sustainable economic development, to combat poverty, enhance food and economic security, including by making the Millennium Development Goals America's goals. If confirmed, I look forward to working with member states to advance this critical agenda at the United Nations.

Regional political and security challenges will inevitably remain a central element of the U.S. agenda at the United Nations. Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon demands the urgent attention of the Security Council. Multilateral pressure is needed to eliminate North Korea's nuclear weapons program. A strengthened U.N. role in Afghanistan and Iraq will support elections and strengthen political institutions. The ongoing genocide in Sudan, the persistent violence in Eastern Congo, and the persecution of innocents in Zimbabwe and Burma all require much more effective action by the international community. And recent events remind us yet again of the importance of working to help Israelis and Palestinians achieve their goal of a peaceful two-state solution that achieves lasting security for Israel and a viable state for the Palestinians. I will work to enable the United Nations to play a constructive role in pursuit of this goal.

The Obama administration will also promote democracy, understanding that the foundations of democracy are best seeded from within. We will stand up for human rights around the world. Thus, we will work closely with friends, allies, the United Nations Secretariat, and others to seek to improve the performance and the prospects of the Human Rights Council, which has strayed so far from the principles embodied in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

The United States will address all of these challenges unencumbered by the old divisions of the 20th century. We cannot afford any longer to be burdened by labels such "rich" and "poor," "developed" or "developing," "North" or "South," "non-aligned" or "Western." In the 21st century, these false divisions rarely serve anybody's interests. In facing the challenges of the scale that lie before us, all peoples and all nations should focus on what we have in common: our shared desire to live freely and securely in health, with hope and opportunity. Those are the interests and aspirations of the American people and they are shared by billions around the world.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations must be strengthened to meet 21st century challenges. In cooperation with other governments, we will pursue substantial and sustained improvements across the full range of management and performance challenges. Important work on all of these issues has been undertaken, but we have much farther to go. Progress and reform are essential to address flaws in the institution, to meet the unprecedented demands made on it, and to sustain confidence in and support for the U.N. I pledge to you to work tirelessly to see that the American taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and effectively.

To lead from a position of strength, the United States must consistently act as a responsible, fully engaged partner in the U.N. President-elect Obama believes that the United States should pay our dues to the U.N. in full and on time. I look forward to working with you and other Members of Congress to ensure that we do so,

as well as to pay down our newly mounting arrears and to support legislation to permanently lift the cap on U.S. payments to the United Nations peacekeeping budget.

If confirmed, I will have the great privilege of leading our hard-working and dedicated team at the U.S. mission to the United Nations. I intend to work with the Secretary of State to attract our best diplomats to serve at the mission. I will also work to ensure that the new U.S. mission building is completed as expeditiously as possible and provides our diplomats with the tools they need to be safe, effective, and successful.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, Senator Lugar, if I am confirmed, I will be an unflinching advocate of America's interests and values at the United Nations. As I seek to maximize cooperation to address the most serious global challenges we confront, I will listen, I will engage, I will collaborate. I will go to the U.N. convinced that this institution has great current value, even greater potential, and still great room for improvement. I commit to being direct and honest in New York and always forthright with Congress. I will welcome the advice and support of members of this committee. I look forward to working closely with each of you, and I invite each of you to come to New York to contribute directly to our shared efforts to strengthen and support this important institution.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, it will be my highest honor to support our country's interest in renewing our global leadership and effecting critical and lasting change. In the 21st century, we can and we must transcend old barriers, build new bridges, strengthen our common security, and invest in our common humanity.

I thank you. I would like to ask that my entire statement be submitted for the record, and I am very pleased now to answer your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks so much, Dr. Rice. Your entire statement will be put in the record, as if read in full. And we appreciate your summary enormously.

I have no doubt that the things you have said you will do you are going to work to do, particularly work tirelessly. That I understand.

Let me ask you, first of all—for me and I think for a lot of us—you spoke to this a little bit in your comments just now, acknowledging the frustration that many of us sometimes feel. I think these last 8 years have been particularly frustrating because it seems somehow that the entire international community has lost the ability to act on its outrage. I do not doubt that the outrage expressed by a lot of countries is sincere, including our own.

But Darfur, Zimbabwe, Burma, just to mention a few, now the Eastern Congo. It is stunning, shocking what occurs on a daily basis in terms of young people being given guns and rampaging through villages, rag-tag armies that really are not that strong. They are certainly not that organized. And yet, those who are organized and who are strong do not seem to mobilize. And the caring is reserved to the rhetoric not to the reality of action.

I was really surprised. I had been in South Africa and Botswana and was in Sharm el-Sheikh right at the time that the African Union was meeting there. And it was the day after the Zimbabwe election. I met with President Mubarek and asked him how they

and he could receive Mr. Mugabe almost as if nothing had happened, despite the fact that he had openly talked about stealing an election because of the power of a bullet and the disrespect that he showed openly to the electoral process and to the people of his own country. And people just went on as if it was business as usual.

So the pregnant question I think, for a lot of us, is what do you intend to do. What do you really realistically believe can be done so that under the Obama administration this will be different? What is going to be different with respect to Darfur, Zimbabwe, the Congo, just to take those three, starting on January 20th of next week?

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is a vitally important question, and there are multiple aspects to it.

First of all, the United States will lead at the United Nations with a respect for the institution and a determination to make it work.

With respect to these thorny challenges of peacekeeping in the context of Darfur and Congo, and autocracy in the context of Zimbabwe, a common thread runs through these challenges, and it is twofold. We need as an international community not only to build additional peacekeeping capacity to be able to address these challenges on a timely basis on the ground because part of the problem we face in Darfur and Congo is a lack of ready, trained, and equipped troops to deploy to these operations on a timely basis. Building greater capacity globally is in our interest. It is in the interest of all United Nations member states, and it is something that we have in the past contemplated and even made early steps towards achieving, but have not pursued in a sustained and collective fashion. This is not a challenge for the United States alone. It is one that our partners and allies need to join, and it is one I am very committed to working on.

The other half of the challenge, though, Mr. Chairman, is that of will, political will. It is not uncommon to hear quite moving speeches given in the halls of the Security Council, but there is a deficit of determination to take the difficult steps to hold accountable dictators such as Robert Mugabe, to demand that his illegitimate government step down and honor the will of the people of Zimbabwe. And we need to lead from a position of moral strength in order to bring others along with us.

I hope very much, Mr. Chairman, that under President-elect Obama's leadership we will engage more actively with the countries in southern Africa and bring their often private condemnation into the public sphere. We need them to work with us and others to bring the necessary pressure to bear on that regime so that the Zimbabwean peoples' suffering can finally end.

And we also need to strengthen the will of the international community to do what is necessary in places like Congo and Darfur. We finally have agreement that there ought to be increased peacekeeping operations there. That is progress. But now the challenge of putting those troops on the ground remains.

[Dr. Rice's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. SUSAN E. RICE

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Lugar, and distinguished members of the committee, I am deeply honored to appear before you as the President-elect's designee to be the United States' Permanent Representative to the United Nations. I want to thank the President-elect for his confidence in naming me to this vitally important position.

Mr. Chairman, my warmest congratulations to you as the new chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. You have been an ardent champion and advocate for a principled U.S. foreign policy to ensure this country's security and prosperity. There is a great tradition of probity on this committee, dating back to Senator Fulbright. The man seated next to you, Senator Lugar, continued that great tradition through his years as chairman, and I know you will, as well. I am very grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to Senator Lugar, for convening this hearing swiftly to consider my nomination.

I would like to take a moment to introduce and thank my family. I am so pleased and proud to be joined today by my mother, Lois Rice, my father, Emmett Rice, my wonderful husband Ian Cameron, and our greatest blessing, our children, Jake and Maris. Without their unfailing wisdom, love and support, I would not be here today, nor could I imagine taking on this great responsibility.

In addition, I want to express my gratitude to Senator Susan Collins and Senator Evan Bayh for their generous introductions of me and for their extraordinary service to our nation. I am very appreciative of their support.

Mr. Chairman, like many Americans, I first heard of the United Nations as a child of about Maris' age. My initial images of the U.N. were not the blue helmets of its peacekeepers or the white vehicles of its life-saving humanitarian workers but the orange and black of the UNICEF boxes I carried door to door each Halloween. I grew up trick-or-treating for UNICEF—a tradition my children continue today. The concept is simple and powerful—children the world over helping other children. UNICEF and the U.N. embodied to me then, as they still do today, our shared responsibility to one another as human beings and our collective potential and obligation, to forge a more secure, more just and more prosperous future.

As I grew up during the Cold War, I then saw the U.N. frequently paralyzed by geopolitical and ideological showdowns between the United States and the Soviet Union. Later, with the fall of the Berlin Wall, I joined millions in hoping that the vital mission of the U.N. could be advanced through enhanced cooperation. Serving in the Clinton administration in the 1990s, I had the opportunity—first as the official on the NSC staff responsible for U.N. affairs and later as Special Assistant to the President and Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs—to gain a first-hand appreciation of the organization's strengths and an understanding of its weaknesses.

In the wake of the Cold War, the U.N. was modernized in important ways and did substantial good—from Namibia to Mozambique, from El Salvador to South Africa and Cambodia. At the same time, there were clear failures, witnessed in the unimaginable human tragedies of Somalia, Rwanda and Srebrenica, and the inability to effectively deal with crises in Haiti and Angola. We saw the difficulties and limits of U.N. action when conflicting parties are determined to continue fighting, as well as the imperative of mobilizing broad-based support behind U.N. efforts. We were disappointed when the U.N. occasionally served as a forum for prejudice instead of a force for our shared values. Finally, we learned that mismanagement and corruption can taint the dedicated work of skilled professionals, and that the reprehensible actions of a few can undermine the goodwill of many towards an institution, which most Americans nonetheless continue to support.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we stand now at yet another defining moment—one in which the peoples and nations of the world must find both the will and more effective means to cooperate, if we are to counter the urgent global threats that face us all. Terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, civil conflict, climate change, genocide, extreme poverty, and deadly infectious disease are shared challenges that no single nation can defend against alone. They require common action based on a common purpose and vision of shared security. I welcome the challenge and am humbled by the opportunity to serve our country at the United Nations. If I am confirmed, I will work to promote and implement President-elect Obama's commitment to "strengthening our common security by investing in our common humanity."

Advancing America's Interests in the United Nations

More than 60 years ago, in the aftermath of the destruction and devastation of World War II, the United States provided the leadership and vision that led to the

founding of the United Nations. Our leaders understood then that a global institution that brings all of the world's countries together would enhance—not diminish—our influence and bring more security to our country and the world.

Today, with our security at home affected by instability, violence, disease, or failed states in far corners of the world, the President-elect has affirmed America's commitment to the United Nations as an indispensable, if imperfect, institution for advancing our security and well-being in the 21st century. He has made it clear that we must pursue a national security strategy that builds strong international partnerships to tackle global challenges through the integration of all aspects of American power—military and diplomatic; economic and legal; cultural and moral. The goal of our diplomacy at the United Nations must be to make it a more perfect forum to address the most pressing global challenges: to promote peace, to support democracy, and to strengthen respect for human rights.

There is no country more capable than the United States to exercise leadership in this global institution, and to help frame its programs and shape its actions. My most immediate objective, should I be confirmed, will be to refresh and renew America's leadership in the United Nations and bring to bear the full weight of our influence, voice, resources, values, and diplomacy at the United Nations.

The Obama administration will work to maximize common interests and build international support to share the burdens of collective action to counter the most pressing threats Americans face, while working to help tackle the poverty, oppression, hunger, disease, fear and war that threaten billions around the world every day.

We will make our case to the U.N., and press for it to become a more effective vehicle of collective action. We will also be prepared to listen and to learn, to seek to understand and respect different perspectives. The task of our diplomacy must be to expand both the will and ability of the international community to respond effectively to the great challenges of our time.

I know that the U.N. often frustrates Americans, and I am acutely aware of its shortcomings. But that is precisely why the United States must carry out sustained, concerted, and strategic multilateral diplomacy. Many countries invest heavily in deliberations on what they view as the "world's stage." That in part explains why diplomacy at the U.N. can be slow, frustrating, complex, and imperfect. But that is also why effective American diplomacy at the United Nations remains so crucial.

Indeed, in some places the U.N. is the only capable institution trying to make a difference. Around the world, the United Nations is performing vital, and in many areas life-saving, services. Last year, the World Food Program fed 86 million people in 80 countries who would otherwise go hungry or even face starvation, including Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, Indonesia, and Congo. Thanks to the efforts of UNICEF and the World Health Organization, smallpox and polio have been nearly wiped out. UNICEF alone vaccinates about 40 percent of the world's children each year.

The choices we face in addressing global challenges can often be difficult: allowing conflict and suffering to spread, mobilizing an American response, or supporting a multi-national United Nations effort. The U.N. is not a cure-all; we must be clear-eyed about the problems, challenges and frustrations of the institution. But it is a global institution that can address a tremendous range of critical American and global interests.

The support of others can never be viewed as a prerequisite for U.S. action, but our actions are strengthened with the support of friends, allies and other stakeholders. Achieving the backing of an institution that represents every country in the world can give added legitimacy and leverage to our actions and facilitate our efforts to garner broad support for our policy objectives.

From the Balkans to East Timor, from Liberia to Kashmir, from Cyprus to the Golan Heights, the United Nations has, for more than six decades, played a critical role in forestalling renewed fighting, helping to resolve conflict and repair war-torn countries, providing humanitarian aid, organizing elections, and responding to threats to international peace and security. Countless lives have been saved. And when it works, the U.N. has helped promote the very democratic values that lie at the center of what the United States represents.

Indeed, the flaws and disappointing actions within the U.N. are rooted in its potential to serve as an engine for progress. All nations understand the importance of this institution. That is why countries like Sudan, North Korea and Cuba work so hard to render bodies like the U.N. Human Rights Council ineffective and objectionable. It is why efforts to pass Security Council resolutions on abuses in places from Zimbabwe to Burma occasion such fierce debate, and don't always succeed. It is also why many try to use the U.N. to willfully and unfairly condemn our ally Israel. When effective and principled U.N. action is blocked, our frustration natu-

rally grows, but that should only cause us to redouble our efforts to ensure that the United Nations lives up to its founding principles.

As in the past, there will be occasions in the future when deadlocks cannot be broken, and the United States and its partners and allies will nonetheless have to act. Yet, what our leaders accomplished over 60 years ago was to help establish an inclusive global institution that, by its very existence, provides the potential to enhance collective security, while affording a powerful platform for American leadership—leadership that can increase our own and others' security and prosperity.

Nature of the Challenges and U.N. Role

Today, there is more on the agenda of the United Nations than ever before, and with that full agenda comes increased expectations and increased need to shed inefficiency and implement management best practices. Nearly 90,000 U.N. peacekeepers—more than ever before—are deployed in 16 missions around the world. The U.N. is also playing vital roles in Iraq and Afghanistan—working to strengthen governance, foster democracy and development, and meet pressing humanitarian needs. The United Nations is also at the center of global efforts to address climate change, prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, stabilize weak and failing states, prevent and resolve conflict, reduce poverty, combat HIV/AIDS and halt the spread of other infectious disease, assist and resettle refugees and the internally displaced, feed the hungry and promote food security, and confront genocide and crimes against humanity.

If confirmed, I will work to strengthen the U.N.'s effectiveness to fulfill its many important missions, and working closely with the Secretary of State, I will devote particular attention to four areas:

First, we must make renewed efforts to improve the capacity of the United Nations to undertake complex peace operations effectively. We need to weigh new U.N. mandates more carefully and review existing mandates as they are renewed. Indeed, the gap between number and complexity of the missions the Security Council has committed the U.N. to perform, and its ability to do so, has arguably never been greater. The fact that more than one year after the force was established, the crucial U.N. mission in Darfur is only at half its authorized strength is unacceptable. We should work to build global peacekeeping capacity and help streamline the U.N. as well as our own procedures for deploying and supporting U.N. missions. We must also no longer allow host nations to dictate the composition of—and thwart the effective deployment of—Chapter VII U.N. operations.

Second, the Obama administration will provide strong leadership to address climate change and welcomes the U.N. Secretary-General's strong interest in this issue. Under President-elect Obama, the United States will engage vigorously in U.N.-sponsored climate negotiations while we pursue progress in sub-global, regional and bilateral settings. To tackle global warming, all major emitting nations must be part of the solution, and rapidly developing economies, such as China and India, must join in making and meeting their own binding and meaningful commitments. We must help the most vulnerable countries adapt to climate change and seize opportunities to accelerate their development by investing in supplying renewable energy and participating in emissions trading mechanisms. If confirmed, I look forward to advancing the diplomatic and development elements of the President's climate change agenda.

Third, preventing the spread and use of nuclear weapons is an enormous security challenge that deserves top level attention. Thanks to the bold leadership and vision of Senator Lugar and others, enormous progress has been made, but the threats are daunting and must be addressed. There is no more urgent threat to the United States than a terrorist with a nuclear weapon. Nuclear weapons materials are stored in dozens of countries, some without proper security. Nuclear technology is spreading. Iran continues its illicit nuclear program unabated, and North Korea's nuclear weapon's program is destabilizing to the region and an urgent proliferation concern. President-elect Obama will work on multiple levels to address these dangers. It is essential to strengthen the global nonproliferation and disarmament regime, dealing with those states in violation of this regime, and upholding our obligations to work constructively and securely toward the goal of a world without nuclear weapons. The United Nations plays a significant role in this regime, particularly through the Review Conferences held every five years under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. The next Review Conference in 2010 is an opportunity to strengthen all nations' adherence to the global non-proliferation regime for the 21st century. Our objective for the 2009 Preparatory Committee is to lay the groundwork for a successful Review Conference in 2010—one that advances the world's non-proliferation and disarmament regime and decreases the chance that nuclear weapons will end up in the hands of terrorists.

Fourth, President-elect Obama has called for us to “invest in our common humanity.” Billions of the world’s people face the threats of poverty, disease, environmental degradation, rampant criminality, extremism, and violence where states and public institutions cannot provide security or essential services to their own citizens. Conflict-ridden and fragile states also can incubate these and other threats that rarely remain confined within national borders. Indeed, some of the world’s most dangerous forces are manifest in or enabled by precisely these contexts. President-elect Obama has long stressed the importance of working with others to promote sustainable economic development, combat poverty, enhance food and economic security, curb conflict and help strengthen democracy and governing institutions. The Obama administration is also committed to supporting broad-based and sustainable economic development, including making the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) America’s goals. This is a broad but crucial agenda for the United States that will enhance our own security in an interconnected world. It is one that requires engagement from many different elements of the international community but where the United Nations has a unique and critical role to play.

Regional political and security challenges will inevitably remain a central element of the U.S. agenda at the United Nations. Iran’s pursuit of a nuclear weapon will continue to demand the urgent attention of the U.N. Security Council. Multilateral pressure will continue to be needed to eliminate North Korea’s nuclear weapons program. A strengthened U.N. role in Afghanistan and Iraq will promote governance, support elections, strengthen political institutions, improve coordination of development, and enhance regional security. The ongoing genocide in Sudan, the persistent violence in Eastern Congo, and the persecution and repression of innocents in Zimbabwe and Burma all require much more effective action by the international community. And, recent events remind us yet again of the importance of working to help Israelis and Palestinians achieve their goal of a peaceful two-state solution that achieves lasting security for Israel and a viable state for the Palestinians. I will work to enable the United Nations to play a constructive role in pursuit of this goal.

The Obama administration will promote democracy, understanding that the foundations of democracy must be grown beyond elections, and those foundations are best seeded from within. We will stand up for human rights around the world mindful of our deep and abiding interest in ensuring strong global mechanisms to defend these rights. Thus, we will work closely with friends, allies, the U.N. Secretariat and others to seek to improve the performance and the prospects of the Human Rights Council, which has strayed far from the principles embodied in the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, and too often undermines the very rights it must defend.

The United States will address all these challenges unencumbered by the old divisions of the 20th century. We cannot afford to be burdened with labels such as “rich” or “poor,” “developed” or “developing,” “North” or “South,” or “the Non Aligned Movement.” In the 21st century, these false divisions rarely serve anyone’s interests. In facing challenges of the scale that lie before us, all peoples and nations should focus on what we have in common: our shared desire to live freely and securely, in health, with hope and with opportunity. Those are the interests and aspirations of the American people, and they are shared by billions around the world.

Strengthening the United Nations

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations must be strengthened to meet 21st century challenges. None of us can be fully satisfied with the performance of the U.N., and too often we have been dismayed. The United States must press for high standards and bring to its dealings with the U.N. high expectations for its performance and accountability, and that’s what I intend to do. In cooperation with other governments, we must pursue substantial and sustained improvements across the full range of management and performance challenges, including financial accountability, efficiency, transparency, ethics and internal oversight, and program effectiveness. Important work on all of these issues has been undertaken, but we have much further to go. Progress and reform are essential to address flaws in the institutions, to meet the unprecedented demands made on it, and to sustain confidence in and support for the U.N. I pledge to you to work tirelessly to see that American taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and effectively.

To lead from a position of strength, the United States must consistently act as a responsible, fully-engaged partner in New York. To do so, we must fulfill our financial obligations while insisting on effective accountability. In the past, our failure to pay all of our dues and to pay them on a timely basis has constrained the U.N.’s performance and deprived us of the ability to use our influence most effectively to promote reform. President-elect Obama believes the U.S. should pay our dues to the U.N. in full and on time. I look forward to working with you and other Members of Congress to ensure that we do so, as well as to pay down our newly

mounting arrears and to support legislation to permanently lift the cap on U.S. payments to the U.N. peacekeeping budget.

Leading USUN

If I am confirmed, I will have the privilege of leading our hardworking and dedicated team at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations. Successful diplomacy requires top-notch people. If confirmed, I intend to work with the Secretary of State to attract and support our best and brightest diplomats to serve at the Mission. Current tax laws and policies make service at the U.S. Mission a comparative financial sacrifice for Foreign Service officers. This is a situation that together, we should review and address to strengthen America's global leadership. In addition, a secure, modern work environment is critical to maximizing performance. The best businesses in America understand this point. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that the new U.S. Mission building is completed as expeditiously as possible and provides our diplomats with the tools they need to be safe, effective and successful.

Early in my career I was a management consultant. I know that strong leadership and sound management supports effective action. We must enhance our capacity to press for a more efficient and effective U.N. Heading a well-run mission will be an important priority for me.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, if I am confirmed, I will work energetically to help renew America's leadership in the world. I will ensure that the United States is represented powerfully and effectively. I will be an unflinching advocate of our interests and values, as I seek to maximize cooperation to address the most serious global challenges we confront. I will listen. I will engage. I will collaborate. I will go to the U.N. convinced that this institution has great current value, even greater potential, and great room still for improvement. I commit to being direct and honest in New York and always forthright with Congress. I will welcome the advice and support of the Members of this committee; I look forward to working closely with all of you; and I invite each of you to come to New York to contribute directly to our shared efforts to strengthen and support this important institution.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, it will be my highest honor to support our country's interest in renewing our global leadership and effecting critical and lasting change. In the 21st Century, we can and we must transcend old barriers, build new bridges, strengthen our common security and invest in our common humanity.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you. It is an important statement, and I want to try to flesh it out a little bit, if we can.

Let me just say to my colleagues we are going to do a 10-minute round so that colleagues can think about being here.

And Dr. Rice, let me just say—I think you know this, but I want to make it part of the record—that we have about five competing nomination hearings today which is why colleagues are coming and going. And I know you understand that and respect it, but I want the record to reflect it.

You talked about building greater capacity. I happen to believe very deeply. We do not have to argue about it here, but if we were not in Iraq or had not made that commitment, I think the options and possibilities might have been considerably different with respect to some of these interventions. But we are where we are.

And so I want to ask you, what shape do you believe that greater capacity takes? Are you talking about blue helmets? Are you talking about joint operations conceivably? Are you talking about in some places, as in eastern Europe, where we have extended the NATO presence and so forth? Give us a sense of how you view that capacity.

Dr. RICE. Well, Senator, that capacity can and should come from various different parts of the world. The bulk of peacekeeping troops now are contributed by a handful of countries in South Asia and Africa. We have largely tapped out the capacity within Africa,

for example, to address the peacekeeping shortfalls in many of the conflicts which are in Africa. African governments have indicated a desire and a willingness to contribute more, but they may not have the equipment or the training or the interoperability to enable them to do so effectively and on short notice.

You may recall that at the G-8 summit a few years ago in Sea Island, Georgia we and other G-8 partners made a commitment to build five regional brigades within Africa, brigades that would be interoperable and equipped and ready to deploy swiftly if national governments made the decision to do so.

Well, we have not quite fulfilled that commitment. We have gotten diverted along the way, as have our European partners. Redoubling our determination to build that sort of capacity with other countries is an example of the sort of support I think we can provide: training, logistics, lift, equipment. We have done some of that, to the Bush administration's credit, in various one-off instances, but we have not achieved a systematic strengthening of global peacekeeping capacity in Africa and beyond.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we wish you well with that. It is going to be an enormous undertaking, but I could not agree more about the importance of the ability to move—and I will come back to it perhaps in another round in a little bit. But I want to go to one other area.

You talked about bringing pressure to bear. And I agree. We have to bring some pressure to bear. Particularly when you look at the U.N. Security Council relationships to see a China or a Russia veto on something that most people believe violates universal principles of behavior and so forth is disappointing.

To what degree, though, does our current economic crisis, the fact that both of those countries have important economic relationships to us—China is one of our bankers of preference, and we are relying on them significantly with respect to the purchase of American debt. To what degree do those interconnected realities condition the level of pressure that you can actually bring in order to get the outcome that we need on some of these other issues? And are you concerned about that as you go forward?

Dr. RICE. It is a very important question and it is a tough challenge. There is no doubt. We have a complex set of interests and relationships with other major countries, notably China and Russia. And there will be instances in which we agree and are able to work together, and there will be instances in which we disagree. And we will stand our ground and stand up for our values.

But I think the challenge is to use effective, sometimes quiet diplomacy to try to maximize their willingness to join with us on issues that are not central to their vital national security or to ours. There is no logical reason why it must remain that Russia and China, for instance, are unable to separate themselves from the regime of Robert Mugabe. China has a long relationship. Russia does as well, going back to the liberation struggle. But those two countries have grown and evolved, and Zimbabwe has evolved to a place where their interests, frankly, no longer coincide.

My view is if, for instance, the countries of southern Africa were to speak strongly with one voice and say to the international community, including Russia and China, with whom they have close

economic ties, that it is now in our shared interest to support a peaceful transition in Zimbabwe to a democratically elected government, that we are no longer going to stand by while great human suffering persists and cholera pours across our shared borders, then I think China and Russia will have more interest in those regional relationships than they will in maintaining strong support for a regime that is clearly not long for this world.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we certainly hope so and wish you well in that effort. And I know the committee will work very closely with you to try to help leverage that.

Senator Lugar?

Senator LUGAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I mentioned in my opening statement, I am concerned that the United Nations is beginning to fail to follow up on the significant progress made by the Procurement Task Force.

Now, specifically, Ms. Rice, in your written response to an earlier question for the record on the list of corrupt companies who have been suspended from further business with the U.N., you indicated that this list is not made public. The list is not even shared with member states. And I would have hoped under Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon's leadership, the obvious sunshine policies would have been enacted.

Now, specifically, you do mention in your response that the list of companies is shared with other U.N. funds and programs. Is the World Health Organization, for example, or UNDP, committed to abstaining from conducting business with those banned companies, as well as their compliance? Or is it just simply voluntary? And what comment do you have really about the entire secrecy or non-transparency of this process?

Dr. RICE. Well, Senator Lugar, I think you are right to point to that as a source of concern. The United States has fought for, and under President-elect Obama will remain committed to, increasing transparency within the United Nations system. Under President Bush, we have pressed for more accountability, and more sharing of information with member states. And this must remain an important point of our discussion and engagement with the Secretary-General and the institution as a whole.

You spoke about the Procurement Task Force. This was a body created in 2006 after the Oil for Food scandal, and it has done a very credible job of highlighting over \$650 million in faulty contracts. Its work now has come to a formal end in its current construct, as it was supposed to do. It wrapped up on schedule.

Now the challenge is ensuring that as it is folded into the Investigative Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, that the people and the institutional knowledge, which have enabled the task force to be effective, are not lost, and that the work can continue until it is completed.

And I, if confirmed, Senator, look forward to getting a full briefing on the internal dynamics on the personnel questions, which I understand are of concern to you and other Members of Congress, and to press for ensuring that our tax dollars are well spent, that the procurement functions continue to be conducted in a more transparent fashion, and that we, as the largest paying member

state, and other member states have the ability to see and know what is going on inside the institution.

Senator LUGAR. Well, I appreciate that answer because, obviously, I would think everyone in the world is concerned about corruption. The monies are being spent in difficult places, but these are factors that we have tried to survey in our own government as with the contracts in Iraq, for example, we have been exploring.

But then I made the point—and I think you agree— that there is an obligation on your part to the American people to report about all of this because taxpayer funds of all Americans are involved. And the idea of transparency, which seems to be hidden behind the doors of the U.N., really will not work. So I challenge your ingenuity and your diplomacy once again to sort of tip the doors open, have a new era, an Ambassador Rice era, in which we really have more confidence on the part of the American public in the business dealings, which are very considerable.

Now, you indicated also in a response for the record that you intend to pursue pragmatic working relationships with other members of the Security Council and cited specifically, of course, the importance of those relationships with Russia and China. How do you believe the United States can be more effective in dealing with Russia and China?

You have already cited one instance in which perhaps you might talk about Zimbabwe with these countries and the coincidence or lack of interest that they may have. And that may be a pragmatic way of prying the door open there too. But frequently the frustration of the rest of the world, quite apart from the United States, comes from vetoes of Russia or China with Security Council resolutions in which action, therefore, is immobilized. So discuss for a moment your thoughts about these pragmatic conversations with the Russian and the Chinese delegates.

Dr. RICE. Well, Senator, thank you.

Part of this is embedded in a larger challenge of trying to renew and refresh these critical bilateral relationships. In some instances, they are relationships that have been very fraught of late. In other instances, we have found ways to cooperate, for example, with China on a number of important issues like North Korea, but we have not yet unlocked the door to sufficient cooperation in other areas.

I, as the U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations, if confirmed, will reach out very early to my Russian and Chinese counterparts. I want good working relationships with them. I want honesty and transparency and I want to minimize surprises. And I am very well aware that there will be times when our interests diverge and when we cannot reach agreement. But I think, frankly, with a new openness, a respect for what these nations' interests are and what their hopes and aspirations are, and a recognition that in many, many spheres we share common concerns and common interests, whether we are talking about nonproliferation, arms control, or dealing with challenges like climate change. Senator, you mentioned the global economy. These are areas where we do have many shared concerns even as we differ, sometimes quite starkly, on issues of human rights and regional security.

The aim must be to try to maximize those areas of cooperation, not to fight every battle with equal vigor, but to pick those which matter most to our interests and values, and to minimize differences where possible. And that is what I will do if I am fortunate to serve our Nation at the United Nations, and that is what, as you heard from Senator Clinton, the Obama administration will do more broadly in the context of our overall bilateral relationships.

Senator LUGAR. In a particularly difficult instance of what you have just discussed, in late December Russia blocked efforts to extend the OSCE's observer mission in Georgia following Georgian and Russian activity in 2008. Now, the U.N. peacekeeping mission in the Abkhazia region of Georgia is now set to expire on February 15th, and that mission of some 450 observers and support staff has proved a useful neutral instrument in the region. And this month, likewise the OSCE, which I have already cited, will begin dismantling 140 observers who have been in place since 1992.

What can you comment about the fate of the U.N. mission with regard to Georgia, South Ossetia, and Abkhazia?

Dr. RICE. Well, Senator, it will be our objective to seek the renewal of those operations which, as you point out, have served a very important function.

As a matter of broad policy, as President-elect Obama has said in many instances, we stand firmly in support of Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity. We think that there is no place in the 21st century for aggression or intimidation of sovereign states, and that is an important principle that we will stand by and uphold, even as we seek improved cooperation with Russia and other countries on a wide range of issues. We hope very much to be able to work with Russia in the Security Council and with others towards agreement to renew this operation and take it off the agenda as a potential point of disagreement between our countries.

Senator LUGAR. Finally, you have mentioned in your questions for the record the issues of Security Council reform, a proposal for change in size, structure. Do you have any general feeling about the Security Council proposition?

Dr. RICE. Well, it is important to be clear that the incoming administration has not taken any specific position on the nature of Security Council reform. President-elect Obama and all of us recognize that the Council of today quite logically ought to be something that looks a little bit different from the Council as it was created 60-plus years ago when the United Nations had only 50 member states. The world has changed. Relationships have changed. We now have an organization of over 190 members. Certainly it is in our interest for the institution to remain fresh and legitimate and representative of the 21st century in which we live.

That said, it is critically important that any Security Council reform not undermine the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the Council. We have a strong stake in that council being able to operate on a timely basis and take swift and meaningful action. So that will guide our approach to U.N. Security Council reform.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Lugar.
Senator Feingold?

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As she well knows, I am very pleased that Dr. Susan Rice has been nominated to be our Ambassador to the United Nations. I have known Susan Rice for a long time and was lucky enough to travel with her and then-United Nations Ambassador Holbrooke to several African countries in 1999, including a particularly memorable long conversation with President Robert Mugabe where we got a little sense of just how disturbing the future might be. And that was a very regrettable thing to watch to start to happen.

But our purpose on the trip actually was to try to bring peace to Eastern Congo and that region. Unfortunately, a decade later, there is still grave instability in central Africa, but Dr. Rice, if you are confirmed, I look forward to working with you again on these efforts.

I am also very pleased that the President-elect has decided to restore the U.N. Ambassador position to a cabinet rank as it was under President Clinton. This decision is an indication of his strong commitment to multilateralism and to collaboration with our friends and our allies.

Dr. Rice, as you well know, efforts to impose stronger multilateral sanctions on Iran at the Security Council have been repeatedly delayed and diluted. I have supported stronger multilateral sanctions on Iran. Unfortunately, the Bush administration's saber rattling has undermined these efforts. I would like to hear your thoughts today on what steps the new administration intends to take at the Security Council with regard to Iran and what you believe to be the greatest challenge you would face in trying to shore up support from other permanent members of the Security Council.

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Senator Feingold, and thank you for your kind words.

The broad challenge, with respect to Iran, is to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and to reduce its destabilizing engagement in neighboring countries and its support for terrorism.

With respect to its efforts to acquire a nuclear weapon, the President-elect has said very forcefully that that is a great threat to the United States, to Israel, and to the region, and Iran's acquisition of a nuclear weapon is not an acceptable outcome. The challenge is how best to prevent it. And the President-elect has said that it is time that we combined tough, direct, robust diplomacy with increased sanctions and pressure to try to elicit a change of course from the Iranian regime. We are interested in seeing what progress can be made from such a new approach.

Now, to buttress those efforts, we will look to the Security Council and, indeed, to our partners and friends outside of the Security Council to consider what package of pressures and incentives would best accomplish that goal. This needs to be a collective effort. We want to continue to work in the context of the EU3 Plus 3 and concert our diplomacy and concert our pressures.

With respect to particular pressures or incentives, Senator, we will conduct and complete a review early on that will inform that choice. It would be premature for me to speculate on the specifics of that here today.

Senator FEINGOLD. Well, another area where that may be occurring in the near future is an area we have discussed, which is So-

malia and the Horn of Africa. I have been, as you know, very critical of the current administration's fragmented and counterproductive approach to Somalia and the Horn, and the situation in Somalia is actually far worse than 2 years ago. Somalis are considered a moderate people, but violent extremists have gained traction in much of the country, posing a potential threat to our own national security.

Now with the Ethiopian forces withdrawing, the current administration is strongly pushing for the authorization of a United Nations peacekeeping force for Somalia. And I support the current AU force, but I do have some worries that authorizing a U.N. force poses real risks without committed troops and a viable and inclusive political process and a comprehensive strategy. If you could give me just your views at this point on the merits of such a peacekeeping force and what you see as the way forward for U.N. action regarding Somalia.

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Senator.

Well, as you well know, having spent so much time working on Africa and having traveled to Djibouti recently and met with many of the Somali players, this is an enormously difficult and important challenge that the international community faces.

We have multiple and important interests in Somalia. First, obviously, we have a deep concern for the humanitarian suffering of the Somali people who are displaced, who are lacking in food, and who are living in the context of complete state collapse and failure. And ensuring that there is the continued flow of humanitarian assistance to those in need is no small challenge.

Secondly, we obviously have an interest in helping to see that there is the sort of political reconciliation and outcome that is necessary for the state, which has all but collapsed, to come together, and that competing factions can unite behind a common central government. That is at risk as well, and our efforts in that regard need to be sustained and high-level.

And thirdly, we face a very serious counterterrorism challenge in Somalia, as you well know, with extremists affiliated with al-Qaeda training and operating in substantial portions of southern Somalia. This has the potential to pose a serious and direct threat to our own national security.

So what we need to fashion, as you suggest, is a multifaceted approach that combines efforts at emergency relief with efforts at political reconciliation and to deal effectively with the terrorism challenge. There is no one-size-fits-all approach, and it needs to be worked in coordination with states in the region and others in the international community.

I will tell you, Senator, that I am skeptical too about the wisdom of a United Nations peacekeeping force in Somalia at this time. I certainly do support elements of the current resolution that is pending in the Council to strengthen the African Union and provide it with the support and resources that it needs to be larger and more effective.

But the new administration will have to take a very careful and close look at this question of whether, in 6 months' time, to in fact support the standing up of a U.N. force against the backdrop our interest, its complexity, the very tragic history of the United Na-

tions in Somalia. And I can assure you that we will give that very, very careful consideration.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Dr. Rice. You have a long record of working on genocide and conflict prevention. In 2001, while discussing the Clinton administration's position on the 1994 Rwanda genocide, you said that if you ever face such a crisis again, you would come down on the side of dramatic action, going down in flames if that was required, you said. I find that to be an important and remarkable statement. So I would like to ask specifically what lessons you have learned from Rwanda that you would consider applicable to your work, if confirmed, as the Obama administration's Ambassador to the United Nations.

Dr. RICE. Well, Senator, in December 1994, 6 months after the genocide in Rwanda ended, I traveled there with other officials of the U.S. Government, the National Security Adviser at the time, and colleagues from various agencies. And I saw firsthand the horrors of the genocide. It was a time when the hundreds of thousands of bodies of innocents were still littered everywhere, in churchyards and schoolyards. It is an experience I will never forget. Among other things, it has made me passionate about the issue of preventing genocide and crimes against humanity.

The specific lessons I have learned are several. First and foremost, we need to ensure that we have adequate information and early warning so that we are better able to distinguish between a recurrent spasm of violence and something of a far greater magnitude that is or can become massive crimes or genocide.

Second, we need to be more adept with the United Nations and others in the international community at preventing conflict in the first place and preventing conflict that exists from evolving into something much worse. Too often our prevention has been belated, haphazard, unsustainable, and has not recognized that we not only have a diplomatic challenge at hand in prevention but a long-term economic challenge because there is a strong relationship between persistent and deep poverty and the outbreak of civil conflict.

I have also learned that when best efforts fail and it is necessary to act, that we have more than one means of doing so. It is not only a question of the U.S. acting alone or not at all. There are multilateral opportunities, and the U.S. cannot act in the face of crimes and atrocities in every instance. But we can never rule out such action, and we need to be prepared to build the sort of international support and consensus that is necessary to challenge the international community so that we see no more Rwandas and no more Darfurs and, God forbid, what may come in the future.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Doctor.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks very much, Senator Feingold.

Senator DeMint?

Senator DEMINT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I have some questions I would like to submit for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Absolutely. They will be submitted.

Senator DEMINT. Dr. Rice, I enjoyed our meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just say with respect to the questions for the record, because of the timing here, we have to have them in

by 12:00 noon tomorrow because Monday is a holiday and Tuesday we want to be prepared to go forward.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you. Sorry about that.

Thank you for the courtesy of your meeting. I enjoyed our conversation.

Your opening statement, as well as that of the chairman and ranking member, really drew a clear picture of what the United Nations needs to be, what it could be, as well as concerns about what it really is.

One of the things that you said when we met that encouraged me the most is while certainly we want to cooperate with the world, help people around the world, that your job is to do what is best for America and serve the interests of the American people. And I appreciate that perspective.

I appreciate the concerns about us being behind in our payments, but I do believe those payments need to be tied to reforms that everyone has agreed to. We cannot be obligated to comply with the U.N. when they are not complying with their own rules, resolutions, and their commitments to reform.

As I expressed to you, the perception of the United Nations maybe that I have and many of my constituents is more that they are ineffective, they have been wasteful, there is corruption. And there is deep concern that there is a lot of anti-American sentiment within the United Nations, which I think undermines the trust and confidence that many Americans have with the United Nations and our role there.

And I appreciated what Senator Lugar said that not only do we hope that you can help to shape the United Nations in a way that will work for the world, but also be an advocate to Congress and the American people about those things that are working and that we are changing and the improvements that are being made because if the American people do not trust the United Nations, then it is going to be increasingly difficult for Congress to make the commitments it needs to be supportive there.

As you know, many nations that belong to the United Nations do not share our values. They are not democratic, and human rights are not respected in their own countries. There is not religious freedom, freedom of speech, of the press. Yet, many times these countries are pooling their votes to direct the actions and the resources of the United States. This is a concern to me, and that is why your statement that in the end we need to do what is best for our country is very important.

There are many, many needs around the world, as you have talked about, very difficult challenges. But the United States is no longer the rich nation that we think of ourselves as being. In fact, we are a debtor nation, and if you count what every American family owes as part of our national debt, we owe more than we own. And our role in paying a disproportionate share of the United Nations activities is something that we need to consider. We are limited. We cannot continue to borrow money to do activities all around the world.

There's a tendency of governments to continue to centralize authority. We see that here in Washington for our domestic issues, increasing spending, increasing taxes, and there seems to be—at

least, in some corners in the United Nation—a move towards more centralization and a type of global governance on—and even legislating. These things are of tremendous concern to the Americans that call our office, and write, and email us that we would in some way, in some ways, undermine our own national sovereignty and allow the United Nations to, in effect, direct our own governance in some area, whether it be how we deal with climate change or other issues, that's concern that I know a lot of people listening to today would like to hear you speak of.

And I know we talked about that a little bit, so if I could just ask you maybe to just speak in generalities about how you see that role of the United Nations, and how that fits into the sovereignty of the United States.

Dr. RICE. Well, Senator, I appreciate that question, because it does reflect the anxieties and concerns of some Americans. And it's important, as you acknowledged and as Senator Lugar acknowledged, to communicate the strengths and the weaknesses, but the rationale for United States' engagement and commitment to the United Nations.

As I said to you when we met the other day, I will always, on behalf of President-elect Obama and in cooperation with Secretary-designate Clinton, stand up for and serve United States' national interest at the United Nations. As we discussed the other day, no U.S. administration will ever and could ever cede sovereignty to an international body or indeed to any other institution. We must do what we must, acting in our interests. But our interests are to a great extent served by the United Nations when it is operating effectively. And as we discussed the other day, and as I alluded to in my testimony, we often face a very unpleasant choice between three kinds of options.

Doing nothing in the face of violence, or atrocities, or conflict, letting things fester, which frankly has been our approach since the mid-90s in Somalia, to a large extent. And we have seen with piracy, and terrorism, and all the manifestations of state collapse that what happens even in a very distant part of the world is not of no relevance to our own national security.

We have another option, which is to act unilaterally, as we have done in some instances at great cost in lives and treasure to the American people. And sometimes, that may be necessary.

But there is a third choice, which is also imperfect, and that is joining together with allies and partners in other nations in sharing the burden of collective action and dealing with these collective challenges. That is what the United Nations offers us: An imperfect, but indispensable vehicle to share those burdens.

Yes, we do pay a great deal to the United Nations. We are the largest contributor, at 22 percent of the regular budget and 27 percent of the peacekeeping budget; but know, and the American people need to know, that it costs the United Nations 12 cents for every dollar that we would spend if we acted unilaterally in a peacekeeping context. And while 12 cents can add up if you spend enough dollars, in fact that is a pretty good deal.

And given that the costs of inaction or unilateral action are so high, it is in our national security interest, Senator, I would sub-

mit, for us to strengthen and work to make more effective this tool to share burdens and share costs of collective global challenges.

Senator DEMINT. Excellent. Well, I'll do something very unusual and yield back my time before it's over. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. That is unusual and welcome. Senator Menendez?

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Rice, congratulations on your nomination, and I look forward to supporting you and this nomination.

I want to applaud your stand that you have taken concerning genocide in the Darfur region of the Sudan, and I want you to know that, as one Senator, we're looking forward to working with you to try to change the course of events there. It's one of the top priorities I have. It's what—outside of Iraq and Afghanistan—what I hear most from my constituency about. I feel very passionately about this, and I think we should. And if we are to have any meaning to never again being something of import, then we must do more than just simply stand by the sidelines and look as things unfold in a way in which we have the ability to make a difference.

In this case, that ability is not by direct intervention of the United States, but by assisting the hybrid African Union-U.N. forces that will do the critical work to make sure that more people aren't slaughtered at the end of the day. So I know that in the paper you wrote for the Brookings Institution, you said that the U.S. responses, quote "coupled your generous humanitarian assistance with unfulfilled threats and feckless diplomacy."

And I am wondering, with that in mind, how do we go beyond the words? How do we get the U.N. to move forward in a more significant way? What are the major obstacles to transforming the U.N. resolutions into effective protection for innocent civilians in Darfur? You know, this area well, and you have a passion for it, but now you will more than passion; you will have power. And the question is: How are you going to use that power to make a difference?

Dr. RICE. Thank you very much, Senator Menendez. You have been outspoken in championing, as so many on this committee have, far more effective and robust action on Darfur, and I applaud your leadership on this.

Senator, as you pointed out, we are at a point in time where the approximate challenge is in fact somewhat different than when I wrote that piece and I last testified before this committee on Darfur. We do now have authorized the United Nations/African Union hybrid peacekeeping force known as UNAMID.

It's supposed to get up to a strength of 26,000 troops. More than a year after it was authorized, it's barely at half-strength and is still lacking the equipment, and the helicopters, and the mobility it needs to be maximally effective. That is the most proximate way that we can increase protection for vulnerable civilians. And so, in my mind, Senator, the most urgent task is to get that force swiftly up to full strength, and to ensure with other member states of the United Nations that the peacekeeping force has the equipment, the mobility, and the night capability that it needs to be able to effectively protect civilians.

Now, within the last couple of weeks, the administration, after much internal deliberation and back and forth with the United Nations, moved to try to lift in equipment and support for an incoming African battalion. That's important, but it's not sufficient. There is more we can and should do to press the United Nations to move as swiftly as it can, to support their efforts as best we can, and to clear out what has been, frankly, bureaucratic blockage in both New York and Washington on this issue. We can do more to actively recruit, train, prepare, and equip troops that have expressed a willingness to go into Darfur and serve in UNAMID.

And we need to be absolutely clear with the Government of Sudan that the United Nations and the international community will not stand for its continued obstructing, delaying, and prevaricating about the deployment of the U.N. The Government needs to make its facilities available, allow equipment to move, and basically get out of the way of effective deployment.

If it requires further sanctions or pressure of other means to make that happen, then that is what we must contemplate. And most importantly, we need to put adequate collective pressure on the Government of Sudan to stop killing civilians. It is continuing aerial bombardments, and support for Janjuweed raids of internally-displaced camps. This genocide continues.

And so, it is time to look at the kinds of robust action that you and others, such as the President-elect, have long suggested; for example, economic pressure, and contemplation of other mechanisms, such as preventing continued aerial bombardments and flights that are designed to attack civilians. We will look at the full range of steps that we can take to strengthen UNAMID, to ensure that the Government of Sudan is not in a position to block its effective operation, and to press for a negotiated resolution of the underlying conflicts, which are at the base of this fighting and these atrocities.

There will be, I am quite certain, and early close look inside the new administration at this whole set of issues. And we will give due consideration to the full range of steps that we can take, because President-elect Obama, Vice President-elect Biden, Security-Designate Clinton, and many others, including myself, feel passionately that we can and we must do more to end the genocide in Darfur.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you for your answer. I really look for a proactive effort, and I have the expectation that we will see that with the President-elect, upon taking office. Let me ask you about Iran. It poses a major challenge for the United States and its allies. It is a leading state sponsor of terrorism. It openly threatens the existence of U.N. member states. And it is working to achieve a nuclear weapons capability.

And even though the Security Council has passed a series of resolutions imposing sanctions on Iran for its refusal to suspend its enrichment activity, these resolutions have not dissuaded the Iranians, and efforts to move it along have been delayed or watered down by Russia and China. Given the current circumstances, what course of action should the U.S. take of the Security Council regarding the Iranian nuclear threat, and what approach would you take to Russia and China to gain better cooperation from them in this process?

Dr. RICE. Senator, this is an urgent and pressing challenge. As the President-elect has said on numerous occasions, it is unacceptable that Iran acquire a nuclear weapon. And international efforts to date have not prevented progress in that regard. And thus, we face a very serious threat to our own national security, to the security of Israel, and indeed to the security of the broader region.

The President-elect has been clear that we need to forge a different approach, one that combines tough, direct, and effective diplomacy with incentives and increased pressure on the regime in Iran, to give up its nuclear weapons activities, its nuclear weapons program, and indeed to halt its efforts to destabilize neighboring states and support terrorism. What we do in the United Nations Security Council will be designed to complement that strategy. It's a strategy that we will finalize and begin to implement in the early stages of the administration. It would be premature for me to speculate on what the elements of additional sanctions and pressures might be, or the elements of an incentives package.

But the principles are clear: we must work urgently to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and indeed we must inject into those efforts tough, direct, and sustained diplomacy backed by pressure as needed.

Now, with respect to Russia and China, this is a crucial part of the challenge, and the irony is that both Russia and China have stated that they do not want to see Iran become a nuclear weapons state, and have taken some initial steps somewhat grudgingly. But the fact is, we need to work to highlight our areas of common interest with respect to Russia and China on the Iranian challenge, as well as other challenges, rather than allow ourselves to be bogged down in those differences.

It's not going to be easy. They have their interests and we have ours, but the President-elect's view and my view is that we need to work to test the proposition of whether we can't bring them, and their interests, along with us in designing a more effective approach to the Iranians that brings both pressures and diplomacy together in service of our shared objectives.

Senator MENENDEZ. My time is expired. I just want to note two others things. We've talked about it, so I won't belabor it here, but certainly the question of human rights, and how that council works, and what role we're taking, and I'd like to continue to work with you on that after you're confirmed. And also, the U.N. process on the Reunification of Cyprus is something that is very important to me, as well, so I look forward to working with you. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for—

Dr. RICE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks a lot, Senator Menendez. I appreciate it. Thank you. Senator Isakson?

Senator ISAKSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Rice, welcome. You know, I was just sitting here thinking, you'll be the second woman with the last name of Rice to represent the United States on the world stage.

Condoleezza Rice, with whom I have been tremendously impressed of her capacity and ability and knowledge, but having sat with you for about an hour the other day and talked, I'm equally impressed with the depth and breadth of your knowledge, and I

know you will represent the United States well, and I know your parents are over there beaming. I met them earlier today, and your father hasn't stopped grinning since he got in the room, so he's very proud of you.

But one—two things. One thing Georgians are very concerned about, when you bring up the subject of the U.N., the first thing that comes up is what appears to be the disproportionate investment of U.S. money in the U.N. versus many of the countries that are participating members, and you and I had talked about that. You brought up one aspect of the benefit that comes back from that investment in the form of the peacekeeping missions that the U.N. has around the world, making the point I think that if it weren't for that investment and the U.N. doing it, we'd probably have most of the burden on our back as the Leader of the Free World. Would you expand on that for a second?

Dr. RICE. Yes. Thank you, Senator, and thank you for our meeting. I enjoyed it, and want to say, for the record, that I had the great privilege to leave with a nice big bag of Georgia peanuts which were widely shared back at Transition Headquarters.

Senator ISAKSON. Good.

Dr. RICE. We face a world in which there are so many complex and dangerous challenges and threats—terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, conflict, climate change, disease—all of which have the potential to do great damage to our nation and our people. We have to make choices, even with our comparatively wealthy resources, as to what we can do.

We can't do everything by ourselves. And even if we had the resources to do it, we don't have the ability to do it, because by definition, these are challenges that often transcend national borders and that require maximum effective cooperation by as many states as possible.

The cost to the U.S. of inaction by us or others can often be enormous. Where there is the potential for a deadly pathogen to create a pandemic, and there's no capacity to stop it, that's our problem. This we can't solve alone. Where there are terrorist havens in various countries around the world, we need the cooperation of others to root them out and secure their borders.

And when there is deadly conflict of the sort that not only steals innocent lives, but can spill over and destabilize whole regions, if there is no action, that ultimately becomes our problem, as well.

So we pay a cost from inaction. And we pay a cost if we have to act alone. And so, the challenge is to seek alternatives to doing nothing or doing it by ourselves. And that is the essential benefit of institutions like the United Nations, which are global in scope, and through which the burdens and costs are shared.

As I said to Senator DeMint, yes, indeed we do contribute the largest share, 22 percent of the U.N. regular budget, and 27 percent of the peacekeeping budget. Yet, most days, that's a deal, because compared to what it would cost us if we acted alone, the U.N. can do the same job in peacekeeping for about 12 cents on the dollar. And given that binary choice between inaction and doing it ourselves, that often is an imperfect but preferred outcome to the alternatives.

And so, our challenge now, and my commitment if I am confirmed as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, is to work with other member states to increase the efficiency, the management, and the accountability of the United Nations, but also to increase its effectiveness in performing the tasks that we ask of it. It's not enough for every dollar to be spent cleanly and without corruption; it has to be spent well, so that it serves the purpose for which it's intended.

I'm particularly interested, as I mentioned in my opening statement, in playing a leadership role in partnership with other member states, to help the U.N. as it takes on this extraordinary set of challenges with more than 90,000 peacekeepers in the field, to build its own capacity to do those missions more effectively, and more swiftly, and to improve our own capacity and that of other countries to support the United Nations when it undertakes these efforts.

Senator ISAKSON. I think you make a good case and a good point. I do hope you will do—I think I heard at the end of Senator DeMint's question, you affirmed a willingness to leverage what we contribute to the U.N. to be a leader of reform in the U.N., because there are some areas of U.N. reform that are important in its operation and in its structure.

Second, I really respect the amount of knowledge you have on Africa and the engagement that you have had there, and I share the concern I've heard expressed by other members with regard to Darfur and what has happened there, and I am ready, as the ranking member of the Africa Subcommittee, to work with you in any way possible. What's going on in Darfur is unacceptable, and we need to get from UN—is it UNMUS?

Dr. RICE. UNAMID.

Senator ISAKSON. UNAMID. We need to get that fully operational and working, or we're going to have a disaster of immense proportion on our hands. Former U.N. Ambassador Andy Young is a close, personal friend of mine, and a neighbor in Atlanta, so we talk all the time. He has opened an operation called Good Works International, which is an outreach onto that continent. I think that continent will be in the 21st century, in terms of U.S. engagement, what the continent of Asia was in the 20th century, and I think it's very important that we focus on that, and focus clearly on it.

Lastly, we are sort of the only, or at the least the last spokesman, for the State of Israel at the U.N. oftentimes when resolutions come forward to the Security Council in some of the conflicts that we are in, and I really appreciate what past administrations have done to use either the right to abstain or the right to veto resolutions when they are disproportionately weighted to the disinterest of the State of Israel and the Israeli people.

As much as I worry about is happening in Gaza now, and what's happening with missiles coming both out of Lebanon and from Hezbollah, and out of Gaza from Hamas. Hopefully, this may be the opportunity that the U.N. can be strong in forging a meaningful cease fire, with consequential commitments in advance on behalf of Hamas, and Hezbollah, and Iran. So we stop the flow of weaponry and all the things that go through the Philadelphia cor-

ridor out of Egypt, into Gaza, and into Lebanon that are fueling the tragedies that are taking place on the Israeli people.

So I hope you will—you will, as past administrations have, remain committed to ensuring that the Palestinian state we are willing to recognize, we will recognize right after the State of Israel is recognized and we have a lasting commitment, and an enforceable commitment, to see to it the violence ends against those people.

Dr. RICE. Thank you.

Senator ISAKSON. I know that was more of a speech than a question, but we have got—

Dr. RICE. An eloquent speech.

Senator ISAKSON. No. I know better than that.

Dr. RICE. No, Senator, thank you. First of all, I want to commend you for your leadership on Africa. I very much enjoyed our conversation the other day about Africa. We share a deep belief in its potential, and its importance to the United States. I do very much look forward to working with you on those issues.

With respect to the United States and support for Israel, as the President-elect has said on many occasions, Israel is a stalwart ally and friend of the United States, and we will, as we have in the past, act in our interests in recognition of and support of that relationship. And at the same time, I certainly share your deep concern about the ongoing situation. In Gaza, it's something the President-elect and Secretary-designate Clinton have each spoken about.

There needs to be a durable cease fire, but a durable cease fire has to entail the halting of Hamas rocket attacks against Israel and the Israeli people. It has to entail effective efforts to halt the smuggling of weapons and supplies, and very effective border control mechanisms. And when that durable cease fire is achieved, which we all hope will be very soon, we in the international community need to mount a very swift and robust effort to attend to the dire humanitarian needs inside Gaza. The President-elect has spoken to that, as well, and to look longer-term at ways to support reconstruction, and longer-term development in support of the legitimate Palestinian authorities.

The President-elect has also said that he is deeply committed and will act from the earliest days of his administration to support the diplomacy that's necessary to help to try to bring about a two-state solution with the Jewish State of Israel living side-by-side in peace and security with a viable Palestinian state. That very much remains our objective.

Senator ISAKSON. Well, I appreciate very much your commitment on that, and I wish you the very best, and pledge my support and help if I can ever be of help to you.

Dr. RICE. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Isakson. We appreciate that. Senator Boxer?

Senator BOXER. Thank you. Let me apologize for my absence. I wanted to hear Senator Biden, our former chairman, give his farewell address to the Senate, our former chairman, and it was quite beautiful, but I missed being here. So I hope I'm not treading on ground that's been covered, but I will be brief, Mr. Chairman.

I am strongly supporting your nomination. You're ready for this. There's a lot of debate about the U.N. It falls short in so many

ways. But clearly, we need to make it stronger, make it better, make it more relevant, make it a place that's fair. It is better for us to debate our differences with other nations than to tackle problems alone. Look at what happened: We really abandoned the United Nations route when we went into Iraq.

We were on that course with the inspectors, and I've long believed that was the turning point. We decided to go it alone, a disastrous decision, and one I probably voted against because I felt the opportunity was there to work with the world. That's the past, and now here we sit.

There are so many issues. We went over them with Senator Clinton, our future Secretary of State, we all hope, so I'm not going to repeat them all, because the list is long and depressing. I do want to pick up on the question of Israel and Gaza. I think we're all heartbroken, and frightened, and disturbed about what has happened, and what the situation is on the ground. Personally, I don't think any nation—I don't care how large or small, weak, strong, or rich you are—could live with rockets coming across. That's just not possible.

So until the decision is made to stop the rockets, this is going to go on, and that is very unfortunate. So naturally, my plea for today, which probably won't fall on anyone's ears, is that we can have not just a 24-hour cease fire, or a two-day, or a 4-day cease fire—although every hour of quiet is good—we'd want a seriously long cease fire that leads us somewhere, not leads us around the corner to more rocket attacks and more responses.

I am sure you share that view. I guess what I want to ask you is: How do you convince people at the U.N. to open their eyes to these rocket attacks from Hamas? The Human Rights Commission writes a resolution but doesn't even mention the fact that all of this trouble, I believe, started with the rockets or certainly continues because of the rockets. How do you reach out to people? I—you have so much going for you. What tools will you use to say to the U.N., "You're not fair if you're not looking at the whole picture?"

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Senator Boxer, and thank you for the passion with which you speak on this issue. I was privileged to travel Sderot last summer with President-elect Obama, with Foreign Minister Livni and Defense Minister Barack. We flew from Jerusalem out over, as you know, the very narrow territory that is between Jerusalem and the coast, and down in close proximity to Gaza. I stood in the house of a family that had lost everything due to a Hamas rocket attack. And I saw the empty Qassam shells in the police station there in Sderot, scores and scores and scores of shells that had fallen on the heads of innocents. And it was there that the President-elect said very plainly that any American—any human being—would not be able to sleep with rockets raining down on their children's heads.

So we all understand that threat and that risk to civilians every day, and we're all clear that the end to rocket attacks by Hamas into Israel is an absolute necessity for any durable cease fire. As I said earlier, we also are gravely concerned about the suffering now of innocents in Gaza.

Senator BOXER. Of course.

Dr. RICE. And so, that only redoubles our desire to end the suffering in both Israel and of the Palestinians to see this durable cease fire and to ensure that any cease fire has the elements that will make it sustainable: preventing the rocket fire, preventing additional smuggling, ensuring real border patrols.

Senator BOXER. Let me just say, my question to you was—

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, could I just interrupt you for once second.

Senator BOXER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Rice, will you excuse me, because I need to go to the floor to speak about Senator Biden for a minute.

Dr. RICE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I'm going to try and get back, depending on the timeframe. Senator Lugar is going to just show you the bipartisanship of this committee. He's going to preside in my absence, and I think we only have two other questions at this point, so we're really moving very expeditiously and positively. So if you will forgive me, and I am sorry because I wanted to say "hello" to your parents personally, and I hope to get back here to be able to do that, but thank you so much.

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Boxer, you were going to remind me that—

Senator BOXER. Yes, I—

Dr. Rice:—you wanted to ask how—

Senator BOXER. Well, I'm not going to ask it again. I just— I guess I'm going to make it in the form of some advice, unsolicited though it may be. I'm very interested in the U.N., and I was a representative from this committee and the Senate to the U.N. I traveled to New York several times, and I think one of the things that Joe Biden was saying on the floor, which was so interesting, Senators, is that the personal relationships that he was able to garner in the United States Senate changed the course of many issues.

And I'm looking to you as someone who is very dynamic. So rather than ask you the question, I hope you will use that dynamic personality, your intelligence, and your experience, to get people to understand that in order to have a long-range solution, not only in this part of the world but in any part of the world where we need to work together and bring people together, and not approach problems in a way that isn't fair, because if you approach them that way, it will never work. So I want you to do that.

Now, I have a couple of quick questions. Two days ago, I had an amazing exchange with Senator Clinton, our future Secretary of State, we all hope, about the plight of women in the world and their struggle against violence. And, you know, I held up some photos that I will not show again today, and I was very pleased with her commitment. And I think that, again, this is where personal relationships come in. I'll never forget when I went in to see the Ambassador to the U.N. from Sudan, that was not pleasant. But the fact that I was able to look in his eyes and say, "You're just not saying the truth," it is very powerful.

There are countries all over the world that are closing their eyes to what is happening to women—I don't care if it's Cambodia or Afghanistan, You name it, it's all over the world. I hope that not just because of your gender, but because of your passion for equality,

that you will take this task on. Now, this committee, this Senate, we haven't passed or ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Let me say it again, because I just butchered it.

CEDAW, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. I am so embarrassed, Senator Lugar, that we have not done that. Now, when we raise the issue of CEDAW, some of the people who were very ideological said, "Well, does that mean that women will have a right to an abortion?" No, of course not. It had nothing to do with it. But it was used as an excuse to stop us from passing this.

Now, it's embarrassing, I would think for anyone doing diplomacy, seeing some of the things that are done to women. How can you go up to these countries and say, "This is criminal activity; go after these people," when we haven't ratified CEDAW? And the irony is some of them have ratified CEDAW, and they are completely ignoring CEDAW. So I hope that this committee will move, and I hope that this administration supports the ratification of CEDAW, so I would like to ask you that question.

Dr. RICE. Yes, indeed, Senator. Thank you for your leadership on this issue and on behalf of women and children here and the world over. I share your passion and commitment to the broad set of issues, but in particular I share your passion for the ratification of CEDAW, and it will be an important priority for this administration.

Senator BOXER. Excellent.

Dr. RICE. It's past time.

Senator BOXER. Excellent. And what—

Dr. RICE. And may I just also say—

Senator BOXER. Yes?

Dr. RICE. You spoke about the importance of personal relationships and engaging with those with whom we agree and disagree in service of our shared values and interests. I will be very energetic in doing so.

Senator BOXER. Good.

Dr. RICE. And I take very much to heart your advice in that regard.

Senator BOXER. Yes. I mean, I see it here in the Senate all the time, and people are people. And they like to have attention paid. And they can be convinced.

My last question is on the Convention on the Rights of the Child, again, a treaty the United States has failed to ratify—the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. And like the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, how can we be proud of our country when we haven't ratified it? In this case, the only other country, as I understand it, that hasn't ratified is Somalia. Okay? Excuse me. This is America. We're standing with Somalia? What is happening? What has happened?

And, you know, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works (EPW), I said that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reminds me of the case of Sleeping Beauty. They have such a great set of laws, they have such a great

mandate to protect the health of people, and they've been sleeping for eight years. And we need to wake them up.

And I just feel that, in this case, children deserve basic human rights, the right to survive, to develop to the fullest, to be protect from harmful influences and from abuse and exploitation, to participate in family, cultural, and social life. And the Convention protects children's rights by setting some standards here so that the most vulnerable people of society will be protected.

Now, all you have to do is look around the world and see that young girls are having acid thrown in their faces. They're children. Why are they being attacked for going to school where adults say, "Go to school?" You know, why are children being recruited for wars and learning how to kill, and shoot, and be killed, and be disfigured? It's beyond belief that we would stand with Somalia.

So here's this hardball question: Do you agree with organizations, such as the American Bar Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, Save the Children, and Mercy Corps International that the United States should ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child?

Dr. RICE. Senator, I certainly agree with you that this is a very important treaty and a noble cause, having been ratified by 193 countries, and it is a shame—there's no other word for it—when the only country with which we're keeping company is Somalia, which is not even capable of ratifying anything. So we will review this treaty and others to ensure that the United States resumes its global leadership role in human rights. I look forward to working to that end on this particularly important set of issues.

This is a complicated treaty in many respects, more than some others given our system of federalism, and so we need to take a close look at how we manage the challenges of domestic implementation and what reservations and understandings might be appropriate in the context of ratification. But there can be no doubt that the President-elect and Secretary Clinton and I share a commitment to the objectives of this treaty and will take it up as an early question.

Senator BOXER. Mr. Chairman, just in 20 seconds of conclusion, thank you. Can I have your commitment that within, let's just say 60 days, you could let us know either through the chairman, the ranking member, what reservations might be appropriate because I don't object to that. Clearly, a document has to go along with everything we believe in this country. I'm not asking us to give up any rights in order to protect children, but if you could get back to us.

You said CEDAW is something there wasn't any qualification on, so I'm going to take you at your word and talk to the chairman about moving that. But on the rights of the child, if you would get back to us within 60 days with whatever reservations you might have.

Dr. RICE. Senator, I'd like to be able to give you that ironclad commitment, but I can't, because I don't have a sense of how long it will take us, in light of the many different things on our plate, to do that legal review, which will inevitably be an interagency re-

view, and will come under the purview of the Secretary of State. And I really need to—

Senator BOXER. Is there a timeframe—

Dr. Rice:—confer with her on that.

Senator BOXER. —that—a timeframe you could put forward?

Dr. RICE. I honestly must—

Senator BOXER. Okay.

Dr. Rice:—defer to the Secretary of State designate on that.

Senator BOXER. I—we will take it up with the new Secretary of State, but thank you very much. I strongly support you.

Dr. RICE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Uh-huh.

Dr. RICE. I appreciate your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not want to interfere with this important dialogue, but we are probably 12 minutes from a roll call vote, and we have three Senators, so I'm going to recognize Senator Barrasso, and I know each of you will be respectful of the time. You've been waiting for a long time, and we may be delayed with the vote, but I make that point that we still have the ten-minute rule, and Senator Barrasso, you're recognized.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, and congratulations, Dr. Rice. You had wonderful introductions by Senator Bayh and Senator Collins. It must be just wonderful to have your parents here, and your family, Jake and Maris have been very patient. And Jake is still here; Maris—

Dr. RICE. Maris, I think, decided to go back to school.

Senator BARRASSO. Well, Jake has been very patient. I have heard people extend great compliments about your critical thinking, you're always learning, your strong intellect, and your collegiality. Senator Boxer talked about the importance of working with others earlier. It appears that with the personal relationships that you have, that you're going to do very well at this endeavor.

There are a couple of issues that I'd like to address briefly, because there are also principles that come into play beyond the collegiality and working with others. The people of my home state in Wyoming, they have concerns about the United Nations, and putting our troops in harm's way. Do you support ever placing U.S. troops under U.N. control?

Dr. RICE. Senator, as you probably know, this is something of a technical issue. In the past, U.S. presidents have decided in certain circumstances when it serves our interest not to cede command authority to the United Nations, but has placed U.S. forces under the operational control of international and sometimes U.N. commanders. Most of the time we've done that has been in small quantities—military observers, small units—and while this is not a subject that we have had the opportunity to consider in any depth or with any specific contingency in mind, I imagine that President-elect Obama will follow the same policy as his predecessors and reserve that right to place U.S. forces or U.S. personnel more likely under the temporary operational control of a United Nations commander if and when he determines that serves our interests.

Senator BARRASSO. There was an United Nations arms trade treaty this past year, that passed 145 to 2. We were one of the two that voted against it. In the buildup to the vote and the discussions

documented in a lengthy paper, the report indicated that if such a treaty comes about, there is a need to respect any State's constitutional protections for people in terms of their right to bear arms.

When the treaty was brought forward and approved by 145 to 2 with us opposing, they left all of those important parts of protecting our own rights to bear arms and our Second Amendment out of the treaty. So my question would be: Would you support our position for that vote, even though 145 nations voted one way and only two of us voted to protect our rights as American citizens to own and bear arms consistent with the Second Amendment?

Dr. RICE. Senator, the right to bear arms, as you know very well, is embedded in our Constitution. And the actions and decisions of an international body will never and do never override our own Constitution and national law. So while it's unfortunate that we persist in this kind of debate and discussion at the U.N. where we are voting as we are in a small minority on an issue which is, I think, primarily intended to deal with the challenge of illicit weapons traffic that is a problem in many conflict zones around the country, we will not find ourselves in a situation where we are allowing international prerogatives to ever override our Constitution.

Senator BARRASSO. And keeping along the same lines with our own sovereignty, in the past there's been talk of the United Nations wanting to implement global taxes to raise revenue to use for a number of different things. The authority to tax, again, is not a sovereign right of an international body. Taxation is a function of our sovereign Nation. Will the Obama administration oppose any attempt by the United Nations to tax U.S. citizens?

Dr. RICE. I'm going to take that question and get back to you on it as we submit our other questions, but my understanding is I don't think the United Nations can tax American citizens without the consent of Congress, who has the constitutional authority to tax.

[Dr. Rice's response to Senator Barrasso's question follows:]

The United States has in the past opposed proposals for global taxation. Any such future proposal would require the consent of Congress, which has the Constitutional authority to tax American citizens.

Senator BARRASSO. Mr. Chairman, in light of the upcoming vote, let me just relinquish back the rest of my time to the other members of the panel. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, thank you.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you very much, and congratulations—
Dr. RICE. Thank you.

Senator BARRASSO. —Dr. Rice.

Mr. Chairman: I thank the Senator for his questions, and likewise for his thoughtfulness with regard to colleagues. Senator Nelson?

Senator NELSON. Dr. Rice, we've talked about Haiti. What do you think the U.N. can do to help Haiti on some of these natural disasters, and develop economically, and continue to struggle toward a democracy? And I say this with the backdrop that earlier this year there was a callout for \$100 million to assist Haiti in the international community after it got hit by four hurricanes. And the

international community has only responded with half that amount.

Dr. RICE. Well, Senator, I share your deep concern about the grave humanitarian situation in Haiti, made worse only in recent months by natural disasters which have pounded the island repeatedly.

The United States has a very significant interest in helping Haiti to become a more stable democracy that can provide more effectively for its people, and to ensure that Haiti is a place in the future where Haitians choose to stay and build their nation, rather than leave, often in dangerous circumstances.

After many fits and starts, the United Nations has built up a substantial peacekeeping presence in Haiti, in the form of MINUSTAH, which I know you've seen firsthand, and it is doing an important task not only in helping to bolster peace and security, and assist in counter-narcotics efforts, but also to support improved governance in Haiti. But, frankly, it's a challenge that will persist.

Our effort and attention in the United States, and that of others in the hemisphere who have played a leadership role in MINUSTAH, will need to be intensified and sustained, because as you well know, the challenges in Haiti are not new, and they're not going to be easily met. It's going to require a significant and sustained effort on the part of us and others.

Senator NELSON. And President Préval is really trying. I want to give plenty of time for my colleagues here, the Senator from Maryland. Let me just ask you, what do you think, in your position in the U.N., you can do to pressure Russia and China to stop the arm shipments to Sudan?

Dr. RICE. Senator, thank you. We need more effective sanctions, and we need more effective enforcement. And where we have robust and effective sanctions regimes, we at least have the ability through sanctions monitoring committees to investigate and document evidence of violations. In the case of Sudan, that mechanism is not well-developed, and indeed, we're not in a position, as we should be, to place under the spotlight those in various countries who are fueling this conflict and supporting those committing genocide.

I think that's an important element of what we must look at in the context as we review our policy towards Darfur and seek a range of more effective mechanisms, to act with real efficacy to address the genocide in Darfur.

Senator NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. And let me just say, Senator, because I think this is going to be your last appearance the Foreign Relations Committee, how much we have appreciated your work here. He's going over to the Finance Committee, and we're going to lose his services to this committee. But as a member of the Finance Committee, I understand the tension on eight committees, it's difficult. But we want to thank you for your service to this committee. You've been a terrific member of the committee. You've contributed a lot of thinking on a lot of different topics, and I know you've been very passionate about many of them.

So I am confident that just as a Senator you're going to continue to be part of this committee and follow its work and be a contributor to it, and we thank you.

Senator LUGAR. And I want to join you, Mr. Chairman, in thanking Senator Nelson. A real contributor.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Senator Cardin, you've been very patient. Thank you, sir.

Senator CARDIN. And I also wanted to say—

The CHAIRMAN. Can I just give you all a head's up that there is a vote that's going to start at 12:10?

Senator CARDIN. Yeah.

The CHAIRMAN. But we ought to be able to fit everybody in.

Senator CARDIN. I also wanted to thank Senator Nelson. Because he's leaving, I'm going to move up one more in seniority, so we just want to point that out.

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to know, though, Senator—

Senator CARDIN. I'll get the question earlier next time, so the—

The CHAIRMAN. I just want to warn you, it was not so long ago that at these particular hearings in Hart, I sat on that corner, and it's really dangerous.

Senator CARDIN. I could see. Dr. Rice, thank you for being willing to serve our country in this very important position, and I thank your family for the sacrifices that they make for your public service. I just want to follow up on some of the comments that have been made.

I fully support and appreciate the importance of cooperating and working with the international community. The United Nations should be a very important part of our foreign policy, and I strongly support your mission. I wanted to just follow up on a point that Senator Boxer made, and Senator Menendez was going to get to but didn't have the time, and that is the effectiveness of the United Nations as it relates to the human rights agenda.

In my office, you and I talked about the fact that I have spent a lot of time in the House now, in the Senate, and on the Helsinki Commission, which deals with a lot of issues. Human rights, however, is one of our principal objectives. There are a lot of common areas of concern between the United Nations and OSCE as it relates to trafficking of women and girls, and as it relates to the refugees issues. But I want to talk about the Human Rights Council. Senator Boxer mentioned the vote just three days ago in the Human Rights Council that was anything but helpful in dealing with the human rights issues in the Middle East. We've seen it over and over again, such as how the Durban Conference got sidetracked on attacking Israel rather than dealing with human rights.

So I want to hear from you as to what the United States position is going to be within the United Nations. I want the Human Rights Council to succeed. I want the United Nations to be effective in dealing with human rights. But if it becomes a tool to beat up on one of our allies, or if it becomes an objective to undermine U.S. policy, I think we have to be prepared to take necessary steps in regards to the United States' participation in the United Nations.

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Senator. I share your passion for human rights and your dismay and anger at the failure of some of the U.N.'s human rights instruments to live up to their expectations

and requirements. And the example you just raised of the resolution passed in the Human Rights Council just a few days ago on Gaza is a classic example of the utterly imbalanced and reprehensible kinds of resolutions that have too often emerged from the Human Rights Council. There was no mention in that resolution of Hamas attacks on Israel; it was entirely one-sided.

It was interesting to note the breakdown of the vote on that resolution. There was one country that voted against it: Canada. There were almost 20 or so countries, many of whom are our close allies in Europe and Asia, who abstained, which I find curious, at best. And while I want to be clear that there has been no decision taken by the incoming administration yet as to whether or when to seek membership of the Human Rights Council, President-elect Obama, and Secretary-designate Clinton, and I, and others share a deep commitment to seeing United Nations human rights instruments be effective and live up to the principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other seminal documents.

This particular resolution and the breakdown of the vote, begs the question regarding what might have been different with U.S. participation and leadership? It seems to me hard to imagine that we would not have sought to work with, and indeed prevail upon, many of our allies to stand with Canada and with us in opposition to such a resolution. But that's an issue that we will take up in the early days of the administration, and we will give consideration as to how best the United States can play a leadership role so that the instruments for international human rights are strengthened and we see fewer of the frustrating outcomes that we witnessed over the last few days.

Senator CARDIN. I thank you for that answer, and it's comforting to hear those comments. I want to mention one other area. Many of my colleagues have talked about Sudan and the problems in Sudan. I want to add just one additional part to that. I strongly support the statements that you've made in regards to ending that genocide, but there are also war crimes that have been committed. The United States has been one of the leaders in making sure that those who commit war crimes are held accountable. We have not yet finished the international tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. We still have an indicted war criminal who has yet to be apprehended.

I would hope that you will be a strong voice within the United Nations for completing the work of the current tribunal, and looking at whether it is appropriate to hold those who have committed genocidal acts in Sudan responsible for their actions criminally.

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Senator. I certainly fully share your desire to see the existing tribunals and international mechanisms that are dealing with atrocities complete their work, and do so credibly. Sudan obviously is a place where the atrocities and crimes against humanity are manifest every day, and President-elect Obama and Vice President-elect Biden have been very clear about the absolute importance of there being accountability and justice for those crimes.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I will yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator. Appreciate it. Senator Casey?

Senator CASEY. Mr. Chairman, thank you. And I thank you for the way you've conducted this hearing. It's been a busy morning for us, and we appreciate the way this has transpired. I know I'm the only thing standing between most people and a break or lunch right now, so I want to be cognizant of that. But, Dr. Rice, I want to first of all to commend you and to salute you for what you've already done up to this point in your life. It's been already a life of service, a life of scholarship and achievement, and I think it's a good forecaster of the kind of administration that we're about to see. And we're grateful for that service.

I was looking at your stellar, sterling—there are probably other adjectives—academic record, and I have great respect for that. And we have, I think, the opportunity now to change the course of American history on a lot of fronts, and I'm just grateful that President-elect Obama and Vice President-elect Biden have the kind of talent that people like you bring to that team. So we're grateful for your service.

I wanted to explore a couple of areas, one which I know you addressed, beginning on page 5 of your prepared statement. And I wasn't here for your opening statement, so this may be an area you've covered, but I wanted to reiterate some points of it, which is the gravest threat that we face, and that's the threat of nuclear terrorism. I, and others, and many before me, including the ranking member, Senator Lugar, have worked on this issue for many, any years, and we've made progress, but there's much more to do.

I'm noting that in 2004, with the passage of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1540, we've made progress, but the concern now with that is the follow-up. And I, and others, and I think you understand this better than I do, have seen little in the way of enforcement and steps to ensure that member states are in compliance with that resolution. The recent report by the Commission on Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism only highlights the urgency of this problem.

So I wanted to have you just address that not only from the perspective of the administration, but also in your role at the United Nations, because I think you're going to be there, certainly with the support of this committee and the Senate. But just how you see that as a priority and what kind of progress you think we can make.

Dr. RICE. Well, thank you, Senator. Thank you for your leadership on this issue and, of course, thank you to Senator Lugar, who also has led with great distinction on this for many years.

President-elect Obama, as you know, has from his earliest days in the Senate taken a great interest in the challenges of non-proliferation and arms control. As I mentioned in my opening statement, this is a priority area that I will work on to support the larger objectives of the administration with respect to nonproliferation. Resolution 1540 is an important milestone in international law to set a bar for member states regarding their own responsibilities to act effectively within their territory to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, whether nuclear, chemical, or biological.

The practical challenge, though, as you know, is that many of these United Nations member states lack the capacity and the wherewithal to be able to implement the resolution effectively. These are fragile states that lack adequate law enforcement capacity, adequate resources, or are struggling with poor and corrupt governance. And even good governance and good intentions, some lack the resources and the capacity to take on this and other critical challenges of statehood. Therefore, we in the international community face a continuing problem.

And so, part of the challenge, and indeed part of our responsibility, along with other U.N. member states, is to seek and to build mechanisms that can help to grow the capacity of these more vulnerable states to be able to take on these responsibilities not only in name, but in fact. I'm very interested in exploring, if confirmed, what we and other states can do to set up support and mechanisms that can be meaningful in building that capacity, not only to deal with the challenges of nonproliferation, but frankly, many of these things—border security, adequate law enforcement—that are essential to these more fragile states to being effective partners in a whole range of transnational security challenges, including countering terrorism, controlling disease, and many of the other things that matter to all of us in the 21st century.

Senator CASEY. Thank you very much, and I will pose some more questions in written form, but I do want to get to at least one more issue, and maybe two. This is something we've talked about briefly when you came by my office to talk about your confirmation hearing.

In December, the U.N. General Assembly voted on a nonbinding resolution to condemn discrimination and persecution based upon sexual orientation and gender identity. The resolution aimed to encourage U.N. member states to outlaw violence, hate crimes, and discrimination by ending the use of the death penalty or extra judicial executions in arbitrary arrests of individuals on those grounds.

As you know, the resolution failed, and the United States voted "no" at that time. I just wanted to get your perspective on that resolution. And were it to come before the United Nations again, how would you approach it, as the permanent representative to the U.N.?

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Senator. I think it's important to highlight the process behind this declaration in the general assembly. It's not actually a formal resolution, but one that sought to give voice to something that is very fundamental to President-elect Obama's worldview, and indeed to all of us in his incoming administration, and that is the absolute necessity to prevent discrimination in any and all forms against any person or people on the basis of race, gender, sexual orientation, or any other basis.

The President-elect has spoken frequently and eloquently about his profoundly-held view that we are all human beings of equal worth and equal value, and the corollary to that is that, therefore, discrimination in any form is absolutely unacceptable. While I can't comment on what resolutions might come before the general assembly in the future, I am confident that we will bring this principle to bear in our contemplation and deliberation of any such declaration that comes before the general assembly.

Senator CASEY. Thank you. And I know—I'm going to wrap up, even though I have some more time. We have a vote. And Senator Shaheen, former governor of state, is waiting to ask her questions, and I always defer to governors. But let me just say this in conclusion, Dr. Rice. There's a statement attributed to Martin Luther King on service, where he said "everyone can be great, because everyone can serve." And I think, in your own life, up to this point, and certainly I know it'll be true in the future, as well, if that is the measure of a kind of greatness, you've achieved a good bit of that already, and we're grateful for your service.

Dr. RICE. That's very kind.

Senator CASEY. Thank you.

Dr. RICE. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Casey. Senator Shaheen, we're anticipating the vote, but the floor is yours.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator Casey. If only everyone held the sentiments and deferred to governors, we would be very lucky. I want to add my congratulations, Dr. Rice, to everyone's this morning on your nomination. And also, my sentiments that have been expressed by so many this morning about how important I think it is that President-elect Obama is planning to elevate the post of ambassador to the U.N. to a cabinet-level post within his administration. I think that's an indication of the high regard with which he holds you, and it shows how important he thinks it is to reengage with the international community in a new way, and also the potential role that the U.N. can play in doing that.

In past years, the United States, along with a few others, has had to publicly oppose the activities of certain U.N. agencies because of their agendas, we're clearly distasteful, and in some cases unwise, or they were led by individuals who were opposed to legitimate and widely-respected values.

I think an example of that is the UNESCO, which for a time seemed dedicated to justifying the ending of press freedoms and other important principles. In more recent years, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights has been chaired by nations that have had very questionable human rights records. So my question is, how should the United States respond when a nation is voted into a U.N. leadership position that has internal practices that are incompatible with the role of that U.N. position and the widely-respected international values that we would hope every nation would hold?

Dr. RICE. Senator, first of all, congratulations on joining this committee. It's very nice to see you here.

You ask an important question, and I think that we ought to start in dealing with the challenge that you pose, and it does arise from time to time, to need to work energetically in diplomatic channels to prevent the ascension of candidates whose orientations or values or perspectives would actually undermine the institution to which they are seeking service.

We have done this with some success in the past. I recall that during the Clinton administration working with Secretary Albright, Ambassador Holbrook, and others from many African nations, to effectively prevent Sudan from attaining a seat on the United Nations Security Council, because they and we understood that Africa

would not be well-represented by the most egregious abuser of human rights on the continent.

There is an opportunity and a role for diplomacy to get ahead of such outcomes, but it's hard to do so if we're not engaged, and if we're not operating effectively, and firing on all cylinders from within. While there will be times when we must simply say, "We cannot abide a particular outcome," my strong preference, and I believe that of the President-elect and the Secretary of State-designate, will be for the United States to work energetically using all of the elements in our power, in particular active and effective diplomacy, to support candidates who we believe will serve these institutions well, and where necessary to oppose the candidacies who would undermine these institutions.

That's the day-to-day elbow grease of diplomacy, and I look forward to doing my utmost in service of those objectives if I'm confirmed.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much Senator Shaheen. Dr. Rice, that was pretty easy, wasn't it?

Dr. RICE. No, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. You did a great job.

Dr. RICE. It was an honor, though.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just take advantage of the moment before the vote starts to say one thing as we close up, and I want the people who are at the United Nations following this, and those who follow United Nations activities closely, to hear this. A number of colleagues raised the issue of reform at the U.N. In the 25 years that I've now had the privilege of serving on this committee, and Senator Lugar has been here longer than that, we've both seen the ebb and flow in this committee of reform efforts at the U.N.

I led some of them at one point, and together with Senator Pressler we put in place some very strict requirements for dues and reform. And subsequently, as we fell behind, and other problems arose, we made a different judgment about the wisdom of trying to get up to speed on the money, because it was becoming self-defeating; we were undoing the ability of the institution to do what we wanted it to, and reform became even more complicated.

But I think it's really important for the folks involved in the leadership with the U.N. to recognize that this is a new moment with a new administration. And the excuses that I have heard over 25 years for some people's behavior, which they choose over reform, sort of to stick it in the eye of the U.S. or to kind of send a message, has got to change. And I am convinced that your—this administration, that you, Dr. Rice, and your initiatives at the U.N., and Secretary Clinton, and the president are going to present a very different foreign policy, and a very different level of diplomacy and listening, and outreach, and give people ample opportunity to be heard and to be part of the formation of many of these global efforts.

That said, there's going to be a lot less patience, and they need to know this, with the procrastination and the excuses, and the using of some of these very valuable institutions as a means of somehow sending a message. The United Nations is too valuable. Our time is too urgent now. The issues are too pressing. And we

need to come together, and I want to emphasize that as chairman of the committee, I will do everything in my power to leverage a bipartisan effort here to hold that process accountable.

We want it to succeed, but we want to be met fairly in the middle in the effort to have it succeed. And too many lives are lost, and too many dangers are augmented, and too many opportunities are bypassed because of that sort of business as usual attitude. We just can't afford it.

And so, Senator DeMint's questions, and the other concerns expressed by members of the committee are going to be taken seriously by the committee as a whole, and we look forward to really pressuring, cajoling, working, and nobody's going to come in there with an arrogant overbearing, do this or else, my way or the highway attitude. But we are going to look for legitimate cooperative, rational, commonsense ways of trying to do these things better.

And I hope the folks who you're going to work with are on notice about that. Senator Lugar?

Senator LUGAR. The vote has begun. Dr. Rice, you're being saved by the Senate even as you're being grilled by the Senate. Thanks so much. I think you've acquitted yourself splendidly today. We really look forward to working with you. Our hope is to proceed forward on your nomination in a business meeting on Wednesday morning, at the latest, Thursday, and have you on the job and hopefully sworn in by the end of that day.

Dr. RICE. Thank you very much. Thank you both, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Dr. RICE. Senator Lugar, I'm grateful.

The CHAIRMAN. With that, the record is open until 12 noon tomorrow. We expect any questions and answers to have been submitted appropriately so that we can do the filing. And we thank you very much. We stand adjourned. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:23 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

Responses to Additional Questions Submitted for the Record by Members of the Committee to Susan E. Rice

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO SUSAN E. RICE
BY SENATOR JOHN F. KERRY

Question. Please describe your thoughts on the appropriate role of the United Nations (U.N.) in world affairs. What should be the main priorities of the U.N.? How would you like to see those roles evolve? What comparative advantages do you believe the U.N. provides? In what instances is it preferable to work through the U.N. instead of through a regional organization or bilateral channels?

Answer. The President-elect believes that the United Nations is an indispensable, if imperfect, global mechanism in which to advance our interests in combating common threats and meeting global challenges ranging from global terrorism to proliferation, poverty, climate change, and disease. These are matters that directly affect the security and prosperity of the United States and they are matters that can only be effectively resolved by acting collectively. The United Nations offers an important vehicle for doing so and renewed American leadership will be critical to achieving progress.

It is in our interests to make the U.N. maximally effective in this regard. That means not only an agenda of management reform but also investing to strengthen its program capacities and effectiveness, most notably in the realm of peacekeeping where we are asking the United Nations now to do more than ever and yet we have not aligned resources and capabilities with the mandates that we have given U.N. missions. There may be other instances when we will want to make use of other mechanisms, or mechanisms that are regionally based, and which complement efforts of the U.N. or other existing institutions. We have to look at this on a case-by-case basis. Different approaches can be mutually reinforcing, not mutually exclusive.

Question. U.N. member-states hold differing views on its role in world affairs. Developed countries, for example, often view the U.N. as an organization whose role is to foster international peace and security. Conversely, many developing countries maintain that the primary role of the U.N. should be enhancing and facilitating international development efforts. How would you address these diverging perspectives?

Answer. The President-elect and I believe that the defining 21st century challenges of today require common action based on a common purpose and vision of shared security. Differences in perspective are a reality that we must recognize as a starting point of multilateral diplomacy at the United Nations and all multilateral fora. Differences in perspectives do not mean that interests of different U.N. member states are therefore mutually exclusive. One of the core challenges of multilateral diplomacy, particularly at the U.N., is to identify the shared interests and use them as the basis to build a basis for consultation and cooperation. It is also important to recognize that the principle threats of the 21st century are global and that the United States has a national security interest in alleviating poverty, disease, and hunger in developing states. Programs and policies that enhance the security, stability, and prosperity of developing states are in the self-interest of the United States, as well as the developing countries themselves.

Question. Some observers view the U.N. as a forum in which to facilitate collective action in response to shared problems and codify salutary norms of international behavior, while others view it as unduly constraining the U.S.'s ability to act and a

forum in which other countries can frustrate U.S. objectives. What is your view of the relationship between the U.N. and our national interests? How might the United States work to advance our national interests more effectively through the United Nations?

Answer. The President-elect has said that the United Nations is an indispensable, if imperfect, institution for advancing America's security. In the 21st century, our goal should be to make the United Nations a more effective mechanism to effectively address our most pressing challenges. From preventing terrorist attacks and the spread of weapons of mass destruction to halting climate change, reducing poverty, and eradicating deadly disease, these are shared challenges that no single nation can tackle alone. They require common action based on a common purpose and vision of shared security. The task of diplomacy is to expand the will and ability of the international community to respond effectively to the great challenges of our time. At the United Nations, the United States must carry out sustained, concerted, and strategic multilateral diplomacy. We need to be prepared to listen, to understand, and to recognize different perspectives. We must convey the depth and breadth of the challenges that we face in the 21st century even as we appreciate and are willing to act on those threats most pressing to others.

Question. Some past U.S. representatives to the U.N. adopted a vocal and forceful style in order to foster reforms and achieve policy objectives. While this approach had certain benefits, at times it also isolated the United States during key votes and meetings. How will the new administration engage differently with the U.N. than the past one? What type of approach would you bring to the job? What do you believe is the appropriate balance between strongly advocating for U.S. interests while acknowledging the necessity of building consensus?

Answer. The task of our diplomacy at the U.N. will be to expand the will and ability of the international community to respond effectively to the great challenges of our time. This will require sustained, concerted, and strategic multilateral diplomacy. We need to be prepared to listen, to consult, to understand, and to recognize different perspectives. If confirmed, I will be a staunch advocate and defender of our principles, ideals and interests, even as I seek to maximize cooperation on the most serious global problems the world now confronts. I will go to the U.N. with the perspective that the U.N. has great current value, great potential, and still great need for improvement. And, I will welcome the advice and counsel of Members of this Committee, who have deep experience regarding international affairs, America's interests, and multilateral institutions.

Question. What is your assessment of the ability of the U.N. Security Council (UNSC) to fulfill its mandate under the U.N. Charter to "maintain international peace and security?" What, if any, additional steps should the United States take to enable the UNC to more effectively fulfill this mandate? What suggestions would you make to the U.N. Secretary-General and member-states to improve the work of the U.N. in maintaining international peace and security?

Answer. The President-elect and I believe that it is important for the United States to lead in strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations, in modernizing it, so that it can be more capable of meeting the challenges of the 21st Century. We believe that in light of the global challenges we face in the new century, the value and potential of the U.N. is as great if not more so today, than at its founding 60 years ago. Clearly, cooperation at the Security Council to strengthen its central mission of maintaining international peace and security must be at the center of our efforts.

That is why working intensively and aggressively to secure Security Council cooperation is critical. We must both build pragmatic working relationships, while making our priorities clear. If confirmed, I look forward to working on the basis of the principle that the Security Council should help to advance critical foreign policy goals and interests, and not be an obstacle to meeting its core objectives. In this regard, I look forward to working with Secretary-designate Clinton, who I know shares the same goals. For me to be successful, it will be essential that our efforts in New York are reinforced by the full weight of American diplomacy, including the support of my colleagues at the Department of State in Washington and our Missions overseas.

Question. The UNC has taken a number of steps to improve its work procedures, thereby enabling non-Council member states access to the Council and its work. What role has the United States played in promoting a more open, accessible, and transparent UNC? What additional steps should be taken?

Answer. The United States should play an important role in a number of initiatives to improve the efficiency and transparency of Security Council operations. The U.S. has actively participated in the informal working group which reviews and implements proposals for improving Security Council working methods. These efforts have included:

- Intensified efforts to publicize Security Council decisions and other relevant Council information (reports are circulated to all Council members and participants in Council meetings at least 4 days prior to their consideration);
- Enhanced use of informal consultations with interested member states, where appropriate. For example, the Council President has facilitated interaction by inviting any participant in consultations to speak at any time during meeting; and
- Reaffirmed commitment to the use of open meetings, particularly during the early stages of consideration of an issue.

If confirmed, I will pursue active consultation with a broad range of other member states. Promoting sustained, informal engagement with non-Council members can be as important as pursuing more formal proposals to improve this process. I will also work with the U.S. Mission to consider appropriate additional measures to promote greater Council efficiency consistent with our broader foreign policy objectives.

Question. One of the most discussed issues in the U.N. reform debate is the possibility of modifying the composition and size of the Security Council so that it more adequately reflects present-day political and economic realities. What is the status of negotiations within the U.N. General Assembly toward enlargement of the membership of the UNC? Under what circumstances, if any, would the United States support expanding the number of permanent members on the Security Council? What criteria will you consider when determining which countries should qualify under a potential Security Council expansion? Will Security Council reform be a high priority during your tenure?

Answer. For more than ten years, informal discussions have taken place at the U.N. in the Open-Ended Working Group, which includes all member states. In September 2008, the General Assembly agreed to commence a process of “intergovernmental negotiations” that might reach agreement on a framework and modalities for enlargement. These negotiations will commence by the end of February 2009 in informal plenary sessions of the U.N. General Assembly.

The President-elect and I recognize that the Security Council was created many years ago at a time when there were very different international realities and that there is a strongly felt sentiment among many member states that the Security Council should better reflect 21st century circumstances. The administration will support expansion of the Security Council in ways that would not impede its effectiveness and its efficiency. We would also consider how to enhance the standing of the Council in the eyes of those nations that seek a greater voice in international fora. The Obama administration will need to make a serious, deliberate effort, consulting closely with key allies and capitals to find a way forward. This will not happen overnight.

Question. Since the U.N. was established, the role of U.N. peacekeeping has evolved significantly. While traditionally conceived as unarmed military observers who monitor and report on adherence to truces or cease-fire arrangements, U.N. peacekeeping personnel have, in recent years, been asked to protect delivery of humanitarian assistance, enforce zones of protection, and disarm combatants. What are your views on the purposes and possibilities of U.N. peacekeeping operations? In general, how would you assess the effectiveness of U.N. peacekeeping operations? What specific reforms would you advocate?

Answer. United Nations peace operations play an important role in promoting peace and stability, preventing and resolving conflict, and stabilizing conflict zones once war has ended. The United Nations has approximately 90,000 troops and police deployed worldwide, including in such critical hotspots as Haiti, Kosovo, Lebanon, Liberia, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan. These missions serve the interests of the United States. As a case in point, the General Accounting Office has cited U.N. peacekeeping as costing 12 cents on the dollar compared to unilateral U.S. military intervention. At the same time, however, the international community is asking the United Nations to do more than ever and yet has not aligned resources and capabilities with the mandates that U.N. missions have been given.

Though steps have been taken to strengthen U.N. peacekeeping capacity, more needs to be done. For example, we should consider greater focus on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the peacekeeping deployment process, including ex-

panded training, improved information and communications systems, and additional resources.

Question. The United States continues to rely upon the U.N. to implement a robust peacekeeping program, especially from executive branch commitments made in the UNC. Will you urge Congress to ensure the United States pays its peacekeeping assessments in full and on time?

Answer. Yes, the President-elect, Secretary-designate Clinton and I believe that the United States should pay its peacekeeping assessments on time and in full. When we fail to do so, we undermine the efforts of the United Nations to undertake tasks that we want to see performed. Furthermore, we undermine our credibility and effectiveness to work with other Member States to achieve our objectives at the U.N. If confirmed, I intend to work within the administration to ensure that funding requests for the U.N. are consistent with our obligations and with Congress to appropriate funds so that the United States pays its dues to the U.N. on time and in full.

Question. In May 1994, the UNC issued a Presidential Statement listing a number of factors the Council might consider when deciding to establish a new peacekeeping operation. Examples of factors include: whether a situation is a threat to international peace and security; if regional entities are ready and able to assist; if there is a cease-fire among parties who are committed to a peace process; and if there are clear political goals reflected in a mandate. What are your views on this Presidential Statement? How, if at all, would you like these criteria to be amended?

Answer. The May 1994 Presidential Statement in the Security Council was based largely on the criteria developed by the Clinton administration in Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD-25)—an issue I worked on extensively during my time on the National Security Council. PDD-25 was the result of more than year-long inter-agency policy review and extensive consultations with the U.S. Congress to focus on greater selectivity and effectiveness of U.N. peacekeeping. It marked the first comprehensive framework for U.S. decision-making on issues of U.N. peacekeeping. Fifteen years later, the U.S. still has an enduring interest in ensuring that the U.N. peacekeeping capacity is improved and sustained, in the context of the even more complex demands on that capacity in the 21st century.

Question. A major area of concern for the United States and many other member-states has been the continuing disclosure of allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse committed by U.N. peacekeepers. The U.N. has taken a number of steps aimed at preventing this activity, providing for the investigation of allegations, and securing prosecutions by troop-contributing countries. Ultimately, however, troop-contributing countries are responsible for the conduct of their U.N. peacekeeping personnel. What can be done to ensure that troop-contributing countries take the necessary measures to screen and to train personnel and, if an individual does engage in improper conduct, to prosecute those personnel?

Answer. These abuses are totally reprehensible and unacceptable. These scandals strike at the heart of the purpose and value of the United Nations. I believe the U.N.'s top leaders understand the magnitude of this threat. They are right to adopt a policy of zero tolerance. A range of steps have been taken, including disciplinary measures, a new model Memorandum of Understanding between the U.N. and troop-contributing countries covering standards, and the waiving of immunity, but more needs to be done. The U.S. will continue to work with other member states to follow up on actions taken by troop- or police-contributing governments against personnel dismissed from U.N. missions for engaging in inappropriate or abusive behavior. As a woman and a mother, I take this issue personally and will follow it closely, if confirmed. Unless we make every effort to end this problem, the legitimacy and credibility of the United Nations in the eyes of the very peoples that the U.N. is supposed to protect will erode dangerously.

Question. In 2007, in response to recommendations made by U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, the U.N. General Assembly (UNGA) approved the creation of a new Department of Field Support and the reorganization of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. What are your views on this restructuring? Is there a timetable for completing this restructuring? How long will it take to see any results in improved capacities?

Answer. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's efforts to reorient and restructure the Department of Peacekeeping Operations were intended to strengthen the Secretariat's capacity to manage and support U.N. peace operations. I support these goals. The task now is to continue efforts to improve planning, deployment and the support of the many U.N. peacekeepers in the field.

The General Assembly (GA) in 2007 responded to Secretary-General Ban's proposals by approving 284 new positions and 137 new contract positions, as well as revisions in contracting and procurement procedures designed to streamline work, improve performance, and reduce the need for further additional positions. In June 2008, the Fifth (Budget) Committee approved an additional 45 positions for the Department of Peacekeeping Operations' Office of Military Affairs (OMA), in order to improve its capacity for planning operations. Both the positions approved in 2007 and those approved in 2008 are being filled as rapidly as possible.

The restructuring has moved administrative and logistic support into the newly-created Department of Field Support (DFS), with military, police and stabilization planning done by DPKO. The goal is to improve communications between missions in the field and headquarters to produce faster and more effective deployments. DPKO and DFS are now working in integrated teams.

Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the peacekeeping deployment process as well as the peacekeeping missions themselves has only become more vital as the number of scope of peacekeeping operations has increased. Key issues include expanded training, improved information and communications systems, and additional resources.

Question. Recent controversies, such as corruption of the Iraq Oil-For-Food Program, allegations of sexual abuse by U.N. peacekeepers, and instances of waste, fraud and abuse by U.N. staff, have focused renewed attention on the need for change and improvement at the U.N. The past administration pushed a rigorous reform agenda, often with mixed results. In what areas has the U.N. successfully implemented reforms, and what areas have not been successfully addressed? What would you identify as the top priorities for U.N. reform going forward? How would you embark on this reform program and solicit support for the effort? Do you think that linking payment of U.S. assessments to progress on U.N. reform is an effective way to promote necessary reforms?

Answer. If I am confirmed, I will be committed to working to ensure that the U.N. is maximally effective and efficient. The United Nations has made some notable progress on reform, beginning in 1994 with the establishment of the Office of Internal Oversight Services to strengthen its capacity to ensure that money being spent is being well accounted for. To date, OIOS recommendations have saved the U.N. and the taxpayer an estimated \$200 million. The U.N. has developed an internal audit and an inspector general capability, strengthened whistleblower protections, and enhanced financial disclosure requirements for U.N. staff. More recently we have seen efforts to reorient and restructure the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and to establish a Peacebuilding Commission to deal with the challenges of post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. The procurement task force has substantially improved the U.N.'s procurement operations. So there have been important steps taken. But more must be done.

My top priorities for U.N. reform would be financial accountability, management efficiency, transparency, ethics and internal oversight, and program effectiveness in areas such as peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and mediation. A key challenge now is ensuring effective implementation of ongoing initiatives and preventing them from being watered down or weakened, even as we consider what further steps should be taken to improve U.N. effectiveness and accountability.

I do not believe that the U.S. should, as a general practice, condition its dues to the U.N. on specific reforms. The United States should pay its dues on time and in full.

Question. U.N. member-states have been unable to achieve consensus on how to implement certain elements of management reform. These disagreements have emerged in the U.N. A and other fora—particularly between developing countries and developed countries. Please discuss how these disagreements impact U.N. reform efforts. What steps can be taken to overcome these differences and achieve the reforms agreed to at the 2005 U.N. World Summit?

Answer. As with many issues related to the U.N., the ability to achieve U.N. management reform objectives depends on agreement among many member states. When there are divisions among member states, as there have been on some reform issues, this has limited the ability of the U.N. to move forward on reform objectives. Sustained, intensive diplomacy by the U.S. and like-minded member states will continue to be essential in pursuit of U.N. reform objectives as well as our broader set of policy interests at the U.N. It will be important to reach out to the broadest possible range of countries to actively expand the base of support. It is in the interests of all U.N. member states to ensure that the U.N. is as effective, efficient, and transparent as possible.

Question. A significant area of concern for Congress has been reform of the U.N. internal oversight system. What has the United Nations done to improve oversight, particularly in the U.N. Office of Internal Oversight Services? What has the United States done to facilitate these improvements?

Answer. The creation of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) continues to be one of the most important U.N. management reforms. In previous years, the U.S. has pressed for the release of OIOS' audits to U.N. members upon request—a reform that has made it possible to have greater insight into the management of U.N. resources. The U.S. has pushed for the creation of the independent U.N. Ethics Office and a strengthened financial disclosure program administered by the Ethics Office. The U.S. was a leading advocate of the creation of the Independent Audit Advisory Committee (IAAC), which advises Member States on oversight issues and helps ensure the operational independence of OIOS. Finally, the United States strongly supported the efforts by the OIOS Procurement Task Force to uncover fraud, misconduct, and corruption. To date, OIOS efforts have helped save the U.N. over \$200 million.

Question. Do you think the U.N. has taken appropriate steps to reform its procurement practices? What steps, if any, can it take to further improve the U.N. procurement system?

Answer. The United States is a leading advocate for efforts to strengthen and improve the U.N.'s procurement practices. Working with the U.S., the U.N. established a procurement task force and an Ethics Office. The steps have yielded results, including identifying over \$600 million in faulty contracts. These efforts should continue, and it will be important to ensure that budget support for this work remains. There may also be opportunities to expand the mandate of these oversight entities to a broader range of U.N. organizations. The U.S. will continue to encourage transparency in contracting.

Question. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, threats to international peace and security have come from some of the world's weakest states. You have written extensively on the correlation between poverty and terror and created an index that ranks the world's developing nations to measure how they meet the core functions of statehood. According to that index, 60 U.N. member-countries fail to meet the basic requirements of statehood. What role do you see for the U.N. in strengthening these weak and failing states?

Answer. A common characteristic of the world's weak states is lack of the capacity to fulfill essential government functions, particularly providing security from violent conflict, basic human needs of their population, and legitimate governance with the acceptance of the majority of their population. These are the areas that require the world's focus and attention in these states. The United Nations can be an invaluable contributor in this regard. The U.N. can help mobilize global resources and capacity in ways that no single country can. The U.N. can elevate the focus and attention on the challenges and threats that are manifest in these states. And, the U.N. has developed, over the last six decades, substantial expertise in governance, conflict prevention and resolution, poverty reduction, peacebuilding, and many other critical areas. This body of U.N. knowledge and expertise can and should be applied to the most fragile states.

Question. The UNC and U.N. established the U.N. Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 to advise and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict recovery. What is the position of the United States on the work of the Peacebuilding Commission thus far? Does the United States plan to make a contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund?

Answer. The United States is a member of the U.N. Peacebuilding Commission and supports its work—as well as the work of Assistant-Secretary-General Jane Holl Lute. The U.N. Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is an important pillar of U.N. reform that will enhance the U.N.'s capacity to address post-conflict stability, reconstruction, and governance challenges. The issue of a U.S. contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund is part of a larger discussion that will take place with respect to budget matters and funding priorities. As a general matter, the U.S. maximizes its influence and leverage when it leads by example.

Question. More generally, what are your views of the U.N. role in post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization? What lessons have you taken away from the U.N. role in Afghanistan and Iraq?

Answer. The United Nations can play an important, instrumental, and, in some cases indispensable, role in post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization. A U.N. presence is a key mechanism to employ resources from around the world that, in

the absence of the United Nations, would not otherwise be available to assist in such circumstances. The U.N. can provide a mechanism for prioritization, coordination, and rationalization of resources. The U.N. can also apply decades of experience in operating in post-conflict situations to pursue reconstruction, stabilization, development and establishment of governance institutions.

In this regard, and in light of the ongoing U.N. role in both Iraq and Afghanistan, a key factor in the effectiveness and ability of the United Nations in these circumstances is ensuring that member states provide the U.N. the mandate, resources, and leadership appropriate to the task at hand. The lack of a consensus among U.N. member states regarding the purpose, methods, and resources for a U.N. role can substantially constrain the U.N.'s capacity under most circumstances.

Question. In your view, should the UNC more consistently address the health impacts of conflict situations, especially those involving cholera, measles, and malaria that may be exacerbated by conflict? Please explain.

Answer. In 2000, the Security Council held an unprecedented meeting on the impact of AIDS on peace and security in Africa, and this represented important recognition by the Council that health issues can be the appropriate focus of Council concern and action. While the Council cannot and should not replace the role of U.N. agencies focused on delivery of humanitarian assistance and health care, appropriate Council recognition of the connections between health and security can help to focus attention and resources on interventions that will be most effective in both addressing critical health requirements and preventing conflict.

Question. The Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change (IPCC), a scientific intergovernmental body, was created to provide policymakers with an objective, fact-based source of information about climate change. IPCC has released four Assessment Reports that describe the state of knowledge on climate change. What have you taken away from those reports?

Answer. The Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, released in 2007, states that warming of the climate system is "unequivocal" and that this increase in observed temperatures is "very likely" due to human activities. The IPCC projects that global average temperatures during the next century will increase from 2 to 11.5 degrees F, accompanied by sea level rise, more heat waves, more severe storms and the spread of tropical disease. The IPCC said that "The last time the polar regions were significantly warmer than present for an extended period (about 125,000 years ago), reductions in polar ice volume lead to 4 to 6 meters of sea level rise." Beyond these conclusions, the IPCC has consistently provided policymakers with peer-reviewed information about climate science, impacts and mitigation.

In my view, the science is beyond dispute and the facts are clear. Few, if any, challenges facing the world are more urgent or important than combating climate change.

Question. UNC Resolution 1540 obliges all states to refrain from "supporting by any means non-State actors that attempt to develop, acquire, manufacture, possess, transport, transfer or use nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and their means of delivery." It imposes a binding obligation on all states to establish "appropriate effective" controls to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, including by establishing controls over related materials. In April 2008, the UNC extended for three years the mandate of a committee established to monitor implementation of this resolution. At that time the UNC also encouraged all states to prepare summary action plans to map out their priorities and plans for implementing key provisions of the resolution. Should the UNC be doing more to ensure that the obligations imposed on states by Resolution 1540 are being carried out? What steps do you envision taking to ensure that all states introduce and enforce "appropriate effective" controls of materials that could enable the use by non-state actors of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons? Should the United States do more to detail minimum standards to meet the "appropriate effective" obligation set out in Resolution 1540?

Answer. U.N. Security Council Resolution 1540 is a potentially powerful tool to fight the spread of weapons of mass destruction. The President-elect has expressed support for a comprehensive strategy to seek agreement among all countries that possess nuclear weapons or weapons-usable material on a set of global nuclear security standards, consistent with their obligation to comply with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540. He has also indicated that the United States should play a leadership role in mobilizing international financial support to help states meet their obligations. The 1540 Committee is an important forum in which to develop such global standards, measure progress toward implementation and, where necessary, identify areas where assistance is appropriate. In particular as we move

toward the 2010 Review Conference of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, strengthening the international consensus for global adherence to the international non-proliferation regime, including implementation of Resolution 1540, will be a key priority of mine, should I be confirmed.

Question. How would you characterize ongoing counterterrorism efforts at the U.N.? To what degree, and in what manner, is the Counter-terrorism Committee (CTC) fulfilling its mandates set forth in UNC Resolution 1373? What steps will you take to leverage the efforts of the CTC through effective coordination with the State Department's Office of the Coordinator on Counterterrorism?

Answer. The General Assembly and the Security Council have taken action both to require States to enact and implement measures to deter the activities and to constrain the mobility of terrorists and their supporters. A resolution adopted in the wake of 9/11 requires all U.N. Member States to implement a sweeping range of counter-terrorism measures against terrorists and their supporters, including asset freezes and measures to prevent the movement of terrorists across international borders and to eliminate the supply of weapons to terrorists. A key challenge is sustaining this effort, including by ensuring that the U.N.'s consolidated al-Qaida/Taliban list of sanctioned individuals and entities remains up to date, as well as by improving coordination of U.N. counterterrorism programs to reduce redundancy.

The Security Council's actions also created the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) to monitor States' compliance with the resolution. The CTC should be a forum where the countries can provide as well as receive assistance to improve implementation of U.N. resolutions. The United States should look to help strengthen them.

Question. Why do you believe that U.N. member-states have been unable to reach agreement on a final text for a comprehensive convention on international terrorism? Do you think that the entry into force of such a convention would significantly impact international efforts to address terrorism?

Answer. I understand that since 2001, the negotiations have focused on two important questions: (1) whether actions by state military forces, which are governed by other branches of international law, constitute "terrorism," and (2) whether violent actions of "national liberation movements" constitute "terrorism." Our goal for the Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism is to strengthen the international legal framework for counterterrorism, which can improve international efforts to combat terrorism.

Question. What is your position on the concept of the responsibility to protect (R2P), as it was set forth in the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document? What do you consider to be its principal strengths and weaknesses? What obligations, if any, did U.N. member-states accept when they agreed to the R2P paragraphs?

Answer. The Responsibility to Protect is a norm that was supported by the United States, by the 2005 U.N. General Assembly World Summit, and subsequently by the United Nations Security Council. I support the "R2P" doctrine. However, there has been a gap between the expectations that the norm created and the realities on the ground. R2P is a multi-faceted doctrine that begins with prevention and encompasses the entire range of policy options up to, and including, the use of force, to encourage and enable countries to act in a fashion that protects their citizens and prevent them from being attacked and harmed. The core issue is—for each particular circumstance—what does the international community actually do? This is not a simple question of whether to use military means or not, though we cannot rule out the use of force, if other options fail. In many instances, there is far greater scope for preventive diplomacy, sanctions than often has been employed to date as well as far greater scope for collective and regional action to change their behavior and fulfill the responsibility to protect.

Question. What is the likelihood that the Chapter VII language regarding the R2P, as set forth in the World Summit Outcome Document, will ever be applied by the UNC? What criteria should U.S. policymakers apply in determining possible UNC action?

Answer. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine does encompass the full range of policy options, including and up to the use of force. As a general principle, all other policy options should be explored and exhausted before the use of military force is contemplated. Beyond this principle, it is difficult to enumerate all possible, hypothetical scenarios, which might constitute grounds to consider possible action by the U.N. Security Council. In more immediate terms, a key focus of the U.N. Security Council should be on building global capacity for peacekeeping, which is one of the key policy tools necessary for an effective international response to protect civilians from mass atrocities.

Question. Do you believe the R2P concept should apply to victims of natural disasters, and specifically, do you think the situation in Burma triggered a responsibility to protect? Would it have been productive for the United States to press the UNC to intervene with an international response in the areas affected by Cyclone Nargis, with or without the approval of the Burmese authorities? Do you support the adoption of such an interventionist approach in the Darfur region of Sudan and/or in Zimbabwe?

Answer. In the face of natural disasters, stolen elections, or mass atrocities, the United States has a range of tools to draw upon. There is no “one size fits all” solution to preventing human suffering, and we should not reduce our choice to one between doing nothing and using unilateral U.S. military force. There may be circumstances when diplomatic action fails to secure consensus at the U.N. Security Council, but where the limited use of military power could be effective in saving a large number of lives. In any set of circumstances, we must also evaluate the collateral costs of war and the likely consequences of military action—on the victims or country in question and on U.S. interests. I do not want to speculate about which circumstances might warrant such action.

Question. The U.N. has a broad range of mechanisms available to address human rights violations. In your view, how important is the U.N. in the overall effort to protect human rights? What are its main strengths and weaknesses in addressing human rights issues?

Answer. Promoting and encouraging respect for human rights is among the core principles of the United Nations, and has been a priority for both the United States and other member states since the founding of the organization. The body of international human rights standards that are now widely acknowledged (if not always respected) by nearly all the governments were in great measure developed within the United Nations system. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which the United States is a party, were developed by the Human Rights Commission. These and other instruments have been important tools used to press for an end to violations of human dignity and for the promotion of civil and political rights. Similarly, the United Nations has played a key role in the development of treaties signed or ratified by the United States and relating to labor rights, the rights of women, racial discrimination, the rights of children in conflict, and many other issues.

In addition, the U.N. plays an important role in the promotion and protection of human rights in the field, including through human rights monitoring and electoral assistance. Beyond that, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights deploys several different kinds of standing human rights missions that help to ensure respect for human rights and the rule of law: these include human rights country offices and/or advisors providing advice and assistance to governments and civil society; human rights advisors in United Nations peace operations; and regional offices and centers providing advice and assistance in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa.

Of course, this good work of the Secretariat has not been matched by the intergovernmental human rights organs of the U.N. In the new Human Rights Council, for example, some member states have sought to shield from scrutiny the worst perpetrators of abuses, while providing distorted and disproportionate criticisms on Israel. The challenge for the United States and its partners, friends, and allies is to bring the full weight of sustained diplomacy, shared values, and power to improve the Human Rights Council by building broad and deep coalitions in support of universal human rights at the United Nations.

Question. The U.N. Human Rights Council (the Council) was formed in 2006 to replace the U.N. Human Rights Commission, which had been criticized for not holding its members accountable for human rights abuses. Since its creation, the Bush administration has declined to be named to the 47-seat Council, citing in part its disproportionate focus on Israel. How do you approach the Council? How might the United States’ presence or absence on the Council influence its effectiveness? Do you think the United States should seek to become a member?

Answer. We have a deep interest in ensuring strong global mechanisms to uphold the respect for human rights. The President-elect is committed to enforcing respect for human rights. There is no question that the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) has been seriously flawed and a major disappointment. Rather than focus on its efforts and energies on most egregious instances of human rights abuses around the world, in places like Burma, Zimbabwe, Sudan and elsewhere, the HRC has devoted an inordinate amount of attention, and a very counterproductive focus, on Israel, one of our closest allies.

The Obama administration intends to work to strengthen the United Nations human rights mechanisms so that they focus on the world's most egregious human rights abusers. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the President-elect—and consulting with this Committee—as we review whether and when to run for election to a seat on the Council. Whether or not we seek election, our basic orientation will be that our ability to effect change is far greater if we are engaged diplomatically with friends and partners around the world to build a broad-based understanding of the need to use these mechanisms for the purpose they were designed, and not allow them to be hijacked for other purposes.

Question. If the United States decided to run for membership on the Council and was elected, what challenges do you think it would face as a new Council member, and how would you work to overcome these challenges? If the United States decides not to run, how will it pursue its human rights agenda in U.N. fora?

Answer. No decision has been made yet about whether and when to pursue membership in the Human Rights Council. Whether or not the United States is a member of Human Rights Council, the U.S. will use all available policy tools at its disposal and the full weight of its diplomacy to defend and advocate for broader and stronger support for human rights around the world. The Obama administration will undertake early consideration of how the United States can achieve this objective most effectively and with the widest possible international support.

Question. The recently released report of the Genocide Prevention Task Force, co-chaired by former Secretaries Albright and Cohen, concluded that preventing genocide must be a national priority. The task force concluded that the United States and the international community currently lack critical tools to identify the early warning signs of impending mass atrocities and respond to them to prevent the escalation of violence: “Gaps remain in the strategic understanding of the challenges that genocide and mass atrocities pose and in developing appropriate ways to anticipate and address civilian protection.” What steps do you believe the United States and U.N. should take to prevent or stop acts of mass atrocity or genocide?

Answer. President-elect Obama has spoken often of the importance of drawing on a range of US foreign policy tools to prevent genocide. I have also been outspoken on this issue. The President-elect has already sent strong political signals to his incoming administration, to the American people of his commitment to combat genocide. In terms of the bureaucratic and operational steps that need to be taken, I look forward, if confirmed, to working with my colleagues in the White House, the Pentagon, the CIA and State Department to review these issues, including the report prepared by the genocide task force, and deciding how best to operationalize the President-elect's objective. And I look forward to consulting with the Committee and other Members of Congress as we consider how best to organize to address this challenge so that there is a process in place to anticipate and address any concerns as early as possible.

Question. In April 2009, U.N. member-states will convene in Geneva, Switzerland for the U.N. Durban Review Conference Against Racism (Review Conference) to examine possible progress made since the 2001 U.N. World Conference Against Racism (WCAR) held in Durban, South Africa. The United States withdrew from WCAR because of what was appropriately deemed to be a disproportionate focus on Israel as an alleged perpetrator of racism and intolerance in the Middle East. Do you think the United States should participate in the upcoming Durban Review Conference? Why or why not?

Answer. Racism is and remains a serious global challenge that merits our sustained effort, attention, and involvement. It is appropriate to convene an international conference on this subject. The problem is that in the past, and potentially now as we head towards the conference in April, rather than focus on racism, some member states and some non-governmental organizations have instead sought to equate Israel's actions with racism and promote an atmosphere of hate and anti-Semitism. This is highly offensive and a distortion of the meaning of the term racism. It merits our strongest objections.

The question is how to proceed. The President-elect believes that we should make early and significant efforts to determine whether our efforts could enable the upcoming conference and its draft document to be improved, refocused on racism, and stripped of the offensive language that we find abhorrent. If this is not possible, then we—as well as other member states that respect basic principles of justice and equity—should not participate in April and dignify that gathering with our presence.

Question. In recent years, there have been some signs that the U.N. is getting serious about tackling anti-Semitism. However, it is not yet close to achieving a fair and balanced approach towards Israel. For example, at least three bureaucracies created several decades ago with the mandate of singling out Israel as a violator of human rights continue to receive regular U.N. funding. Between 2001 and 2006, more than 120 U.N. A plenary and committee resolutions were adopted against Israel, compared with just ten during the same period against North Korea, Burma, and Sudan. What, if anything, can be done to address the anti-Israeli bias at the United Nations? What other countries are committed to addressing this imbalance?

Answer. The United Nations at its best is a forum where all nations and people are treated with respect in the spirit of working together to solve the world's problems. Unfortunately, we know that some have used various forums at the United Nations to espouse various forms of prejudice, and in particular, harsh and unfair sentiments against the State of Israel. Anti-Israel bias, anti-Semitism, and discrimination of any kind denigrate the integrity of the U.N. and will be not be tolerated by the Obama administration. Whenever they arise, the United States needs to speak out forcefully against them, and encourage all others to do the same. And as part of our efforts to improve the United Nations, we need to work to ensure that its forums are not used or hijacked for this unacceptable agenda. We have support for these efforts from many countries, particularly, but not exclusively, in Europe and Canada. But we need to expand the ranks of those countries willing to stand up with us to end these practices.

Question. More than four years after then-Secretary of State Powell's declaration that genocide was taking place in Darfur, the death toll has climbed still higher, the camps for displaced persons have grown more crowded, and humanitarian access to help people in need has diminished in many areas. The United Nations has pledged to send 26,000 peacekeepers to Darfur, but has sent barely 60 percent of that number and has not provided them with the helicopters, vehicles, and other tools to fulfill their mission. Why has this process been so slow to date? In recent months, Khartoum's obstruction has significantly diminished, but that change has only highlighted the U.N.'s own difficulties in equipping and deploying the UNMID force. What can be done both in Darfur and generally to address these insufficiencies?

Answer. President-elect Obama, Vice President-elect Biden, Secretary-designate Clinton and I have been very clear and forceful in their condemnation of the genocide in Sudan and in their commitment to far more robust actions to try and end it. The pace of UNMID's deployment needs to be accelerated, combined with sufficient logistical support to protect civilians on the ground. We need to send a clear message to Khartoum that they must end obstruction of the U.N. force (UNAMID), including through endless bureaucratic hurdles and delays. We also need to address some of the U.N.'s own requirements that have inadvertently slowed UNMID's deployment thus far. The Obama administration will take steps to help move needed troops and equipment into place on an urgent basis.

Question. One of the critical gaps that peacekeepers face is the lack of attack and utility helicopters that are desperately needed to cover vast stretches of roadless territory in Darfur. What would you do to help secure these badly needed helicopters?

Answer. If I am confirmed, I will work to support the Secretary-General's efforts to secure the helicopters necessary for UNMID. As to whether the U.S. may provide some helicopters, I look forward to considering this question in the context of an early policy review. We will look at all of the steps that can most effectively and urgently maximize protection for civilians.

Question. In April 2008, President-elect Obama said that "the U.S. needs to work with the International Criminal Court (ICC) to ramp up the pace of indictments of those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity, while Khartoum must feel increased pressure to hand over those individuals already indicted by the Court." On July 14, 2008, the ICC requested a warrant for the arrest of Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir for his role in the genocide in Darfur. Many observers expect the ICC to formally indict President Bashir on genocide and possibly other charges in early 2009. Does the administration intend to support the ICC's efforts to hold Bashir and others in Sudan accountable for genocide and other heinous crimes, and, if so, how?

Answer. Yes. Without prejudging the outcome of the ICC prosecutor's recommendation to indict President Bashir, the President-elect believes, as do I, that we should support the ICC's investigations, including its pursuit of perpetrators of genocide in Darfur. The Bush administration has indicated publicly a willingness

to cooperate with the ICC in the Darfur investigation. I commend them for this position, which we also support. We can provide assistance in the investigation; we can and should work with our allies, in this effort. This is important because it would send a sign of seriousness about Darfur and our determination to end the killings and bring those responsible for war crimes to justice.

Question. Many in the Bush administration and elsewhere have called for a U.N. peacekeeping mission in Somalia. What is your position on such a mission? How many peacekeepers would be needed and what would their mission be in such a violent setting? With the U.N. so overtaxed, as recently spelled out in a GAO report, from where would these additional peacekeeping forces come?

Answer. This issue is very important and complicated, and there are no good solutions. It is not clear that a U.N. peacekeeping operation can address the problems in Somalia and we will need to consider very carefully the risks and benefits of any potential U.N. mission before authorizing its deployment.

Question. On December 31, 2008, the UNC mandate authorizing the multinational force in Iraq will end. How will the United Nations Assistance Mission to Iraq (UNAMI) change at the mandate's conclusion? What role do you see for the U.N. in Iraq in 2009 and beyond?

Answer. The United Nations has been playing an important role to develop and promote a stable political process in Iraq. The importance of this U.N. role should increase as the United States draws down its presence in Iraq. The U.N. Security Council has authorized UNMI's current mandate until August 10, 2009. In particular, the U.N. will continue its significant work to support preparations for national and provincial elections in Iraq in 2009, assist Iraqis in helping to resolve the status of disputed territories, including Kirkuk, strengthen institutions for representative government, and provide assistance to internally displaced Iraqis. The United Nations can play a more active role in support of a regional diplomatic process that is needed to stabilize Iraq for the long term.

Question. The U.N. is one of the partners in the International Compact with Iraq. What have been the main accomplishments of the compact since its launch in 2007? What are the biggest impediments to progress?

Answer. The International Compact with Iraq (ICI) has sought to provide a framework for Iraq's political and economic development with the assistance and support of the international community. Since the adoption of the ICI, the U.N. has served as a co-chair of the Executive Committee charged with the ICI's implementation. The role of the U.N. in this process is an example of the significant assistance and support that the U.N. has applied through its efforts in Iraq. Regionally, under the ICI's framework, many of Iraq's international partners have taken steps to reduce Iraq's Saddam-era debts by more than \$25 billion, committed more than \$2.4 billion in new soft loan assistance, and provided extensive programs to help combat corruption, assist refugees and displaced persons, foster the rule of law, and build the capabilities and effectiveness of Iraq's ministries and provinces. Additional efforts remain to address Iraq's debt with its regional neighbors. Several of the key challenges that Iraq faces today, many of which are integrated in the goals and objectives of the ICI, call for significantly enhanced Iraqi governance capacity and decision-making that has not yet been achieved. That is why the U.N. also continues to provide technical, humanitarian, and other expertise to the Iraqi Government.

Question. President-elect Obama has made clear his intention to engage in tough, direct diplomacy with Iran over its nuclear program and has emphasized the need for a stronger package of incentive and disincentives. What do you assess as the prospects for the UNC imposing tougher sanctions against Iran? How should the United States proceed if Iran continues its illicit nuclear activities and consensus in favor of tougher UNC sanctions continues to prove elusive? Under what circumstances, if any, would you be willing to engage with Iran's permanent representative to the U.N., Mohammad Khazaee?

Answer. The President-elect has said that the prospect of an Iran armed with nuclear weapons poses a great threat to our national security, and to the security and stability of the region and the world. The President-elect believes that the U.S. should pursue a strategy that employs all policy tools at our disposal, first and foremost direct, vigorous, and principled diplomacy integrated with effective pressure, including sanctions, and close cooperation with our "P-5 plus 1" partners, other members of the U.N. Security Council, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other partners around the world. It is this kind of comprehensive, integrated strategy that will improve the prospects of more unified action by the U.N. Security Council to enforce existing resolutions on Iran and consider additional sanctions fa-

vorably. Direct, bilateral diplomacy with Iran could include a range of channels for dialogue, including possibly at the United Nations. The Obama administration will consider its preferred diplomatic mechanisms in the context of an early policy review.

Question. President-elect Obama has urged the Southern African Development Community, the African Union, and the U.N. to implement “a carefully crafted regime of targeted sanctions against Zimbabwean officials who continue to thwart democracy and undermine the rule of law.” Last July, China and Russia vetoed a U.S.-sponsored UNC resolution proposing sanctions against Robert Mugabe and thirteen officials. Some of Zimbabwe’s neighbors, including South Africa, have also opted against a forceful response to the political violence. While the international community temporizes, conditions in Zimbabwe continue to deteriorate. The power-sharing deal negotiated in September has stalled with the United States and Britain now saying that Mugabe must go. What steps should the United States take to rally meaningful international pressure against Mugabe at the U.N. and through influential regional organizations?

Answer. Zimbabwe continues to be gripped by a man-made catastrophe that has all but destroyed the country economically and politically. President Mugabe lost the election last March and has no legitimate claim to power. But he continues to rule the country through violence, intimidation, and corruption. The spill-over effects of Zimbabwe’s crisis have long been apparent in the vast numbers of desperate citizens pouring across Zimbabwe’s borders, and the potential of this implosion to affect the region has been made plain most recently and tragically by a cholera outbreak.

We must continue to speak the truth about Zimbabwe, and to support those in the region and elsewhere who do the same. The inaction at U.N. on the matter of Zimbabwe illustrates the reality that the U.N. is only as strong and capable as its member states. More needs to be done. Widened U.S. sanctions are appropriate. It was the right policy to have supported a U.N. Security Council resolution calling for targeted sanctions and an arms embargo. The United States should continue to work diplomatically at the U.N., the AU, and SADC not only to encourage more multilateral pressure on the Mugabe regime, including an arms embargo and greater participation in a regime of targeted sanctions, but also to ensure that humanitarian assistance is available to suffering Zimbabweans and to plan for a well-coordinated recovery effort once sound governance is in place in Harare.

Question. The U.N. is reportedly considering a new approach in Burma given that existing strategies have not led Burma’s generals to ease their repression. U.N. special envoy Ibrahim Gambari has allegedly proposed that member countries offer Burma financial incentives to release political prisoners and open the country to democratic reform. Critics consider such a strategy to be a desperate attempt to salvage a deteriorating diplomatic process. What are your views on this reportedly new U.N. approach?

Answer. I have not seen the specific strategy U.N. Special Envoy Gambari outlined in a confidential paper he presented last month to U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon. Based on press reports, it is my understanding that Mr. Gambari proposes building on the relations Burma established with the outside world after Cyclone Nargis struck the country in May. He also reportedly calls for an increase in development assistance to Burma and proposes that wealthy countries expand the nation’s access to foreign investment. If confirmed, I will examine this proposal closely.

Burma, and its reclusive and repressive regime, may represent one of the most intractable challenges for the global community. While I strongly believe that democratic reforms and freedoms must come to Burma, it is far from clear that financial incentives such as development aid and foreign investment will provide the leverage necessary to force the Burmese government to change.

This is as much, if not more, a challenge for key regional countries particularly China, India, Russia and the ASEAN countries, several of whom sit on the U.N. Security Council and have in the past limited the U.N.’s ability to do more. I believe that there is scope for greater regional and international action to pressure Burma’s dictators, including by ASEAN countries.

I do agree with Mr. Gambari who believes in urging countries with influence over Burma, especially China and India, to lean on the Burmese government to release political prisoners and to provide a political opening for the opposition in upcoming elections.

If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Committee and other interested Members to develop initiatives and strategies to address the situation in Burma.

Question. President-elect Obama has said the United States should support the implementation of UNC resolutions that reinforce Lebanon’s sovereignty, in par-

ticular resolution 1701 banning provision of arms to Hezbollah, which is violated by Iran and Syria. What steps would you take, if confirmed, to support the implementation of applicable UNC resolutions with respect to Lebanon?

Answer. President-elect Obama is committed to implementing U.N. Security Council Resolutions that reinforce Lebanon's sovereignty. Syria and Iran are in flagrant violation of Resolution 1701, as they continue to supply advanced weaponry to Hezbollah in Lebanon, which undermines Lebanese sovereignty and threatens to drag the region into another round of violence. We need to work with our partners on the Security Council to consider additional measures to toughen penalties for violators, and strengthen enforcement tools. Additionally, the United States and others should work to strengthen the institutions of the Lebanese government to help it exercise its sovereignty throughout the country.

Question. The Secretary General of the U.N., Ban Ki-Moon, recently announced that the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, which was established by the U.N. to try suspects in the assassinations of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and other Lebanese politicians, would begin operations on March 1, 2009. What role do you see for the United States in supporting the work of the tribunal? How much funding has been pledged and how much has been received? How much funding has the United States provided to date?

Answer. I am encouraged to see that the Tribunal will officially begin operations on March 1st, but as the head prosecutor recently stated, it is unclear when the Tribunal will bring indictments. The Security Council established various safeguards to ensure an objective and expeditious judicial process. First, it includes provisions on enhanced powers, so the Tribunal may take independent measures prevent unreasonable delays. Second, it mandated a transparent appointment process of international officials, including the judges and prosecutor. Third, it includes provisions on the rights of victims to present their views. The Security Council explicitly requested that the Tribunal be based on "the highest international standards of criminal justice," and I will work with our international allies to ensure this pledge is fulfilled. The Tribunal has sufficient funding, approximately \$51 million, for its first year of operation, and additional funds will need to be raised for years two and three.

Question. President-elect Obama has said that the United States should cooperate with the International Criminal Court (ICC) on many activities. He has not, however, indicated that he will sign the Rome Treaty and join the ICC. Questions linger over the scope of the ICC's activities and, in particular, whether U.S. service members would have the necessary legal protections given their disproportionate burden in preserving international peace and security. What concerns, if any, need to be resolved before the administration would consider supporting ratification of the Rome Statute?

Answer. The President-elect believes strongly that it is in the U.S. national interest to have effective mechanisms of international justice. Now that the ICC has been operational for some years, we are learning more about how the ICC functions. Thus far, the ICC has acted with professionalism and fairness, pursuing perpetrators of truly serious crimes, like genocide in Darfur, and atrocities in the Congo and Uganda.

The President-elect intends for the United States to continue to support the ICC's investigations of perpetrators of genocide in Darfur and, working with our allies, to shape the court. The United States will be a leader in bringing war criminals to justice, consistent with U.S. policy interests and with U.S. law.

The United States has more troops deployed overseas than any nation. As commander in chief, the President-elect will want to make sure that they have maximum protection. We intend to consult thoroughly with military commanders and other experts, and examine full track record of the ICC, before reaching a decision on joining the ICC.

How we move forward from here is a key issue that the President-elect and his national security team will address—and, if confirmed, I look forward to participating in those discussions. And a very important element of this evaluation will be engaging with, and understanding the views of, Congress, particularly this Committee.

Question. Many members are pushing for a renewed focus, led by the United States, on achieving the U.N. Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). At the same time, there is broad acknowledgement that fulfilling the MDGs by the stated timeframe of 2015 is becoming increasingly difficult, especially given the global financial environment. How should we approach the MDGs? Should they become an integral

part of the U.S. development platform? Do we need to revise their timeframe? What role can they play for U.S. policy?

Answer. The President-elect has made clear that the United States will embrace the Millennium Development Goals, which provide a framework for global action on economic empowerment and advancing human well-being. They imbed important concepts such as private-public partnerships in global development strategies. Last September, a mix of public and private donors pledged \$16 billion towards meeting the MDGs.

The President-elect has articulated goals that are consistent with the global effort to meet the MDGS including ending malaria deaths by 2015 and closing the gap in primary education. Some development efforts need funding, but some need sound organization and international commitment by many countries, not just the U.S.

The administration must be mindful of today's harsh economic realities, but should be creative in pursuing worthy goals in a time of budget constraints.

Question. In 2006, a high-level panel convened by former U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan issued a report providing reform recommendations for development, humanitarian assistance and the environment. Which of these reforms do you feel are the most important to prioritize? Do you feel progress has been made towards some of the reforms laid out in the report? What do you consider to be the appropriate U.N. role in development and humanitarian assistance?

Answer. In the development and humanitarian assistance realm, some progress has been made in streamlining U.N. missions. This initiative appears to have reduced duplication and reinforced the importance of national ownership and leadership "One U.N." programs have been consolidated in such countries as Albania, Pakistan, and Rwanda.

The effective administration of humanitarian and development aid is an important priority of the Obama administration, and we will study the lessons learned and continuing concerns within the U.N. Along with bilateral donors, the U.N. has an essential role to play in emergency and long-term development situations, and, in consultation with Congress, I look forward to developing and advancing constructive proposals for further reform. I applaud the panel's recommendation to the SG that he commission an independent assessment of international environmental governance within the U.N. system and hope that this can be undertaken. Working with our allies to forge an international agreement on climate change is a matter of great strategic urgency and import.

Question. The inability or failure of the U.N. to take, and/or authorize, whatever action may be necessary in natural or man-made disasters has raised questions about the degree to which it can respond to developments that may require immediate action. What do you see as the major successes and weaknesses of the U.N. response in humanitarian assistance? What can be done to improve these capabilities?

Answer. In general, the United Nations and its agencies—UNHCR, the World Food Program, UNICEF and many others—respond effectively to humanitarian emergencies caused by natural hazards and man-made conflict, though there are several areas for improvement. Over the past decade or so, the U.N.'s Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs has enhanced its capacity to coordinate rapid responses to emergencies. OCHA's management of flash appeals, as well as the Central Emergency Response Fund, has been important in promoting coherence in humanitarian response. Moreover, in recent years, the U.N. has implemented the so-called "cluster approach" to humanitarian assistance, in which specific agencies have standing responsibilities for functional areas (such as health and shelter) in the case of humanitarian emergencies. To be sure, the cluster approach is still a work in progress, but this kind of coordination effort is a step in the right direction. Finally, the existence of U.N. country teams throughout regions that are prone to disasters has further enhanced response capabilities. There are several areas for possible improvement; allow me to mention three:

First, the U.N., other international organizations, and member states must increase the focus on disaster risk reduction, by supporting efforts to build national and local government capabilities in this critical area. We have witnessed an increase in death and destruction from natural hazards in recent years, caused largely by environmental degradation, poverty, urban growth, conflict and migration of populations to coastal areas. And while the 2004 Asian tsunami helped to put risk reduction on the agenda, much more needs to be done. We must ensure that an adequate share of humanitarian assistance monies are devoted to risk reduction, and must also encourage disaster prevention and mitigation in development planning,

including through incentives for insurance, strong building codes and community education.

Second, progress in international disaster response has not been matched by the effective management of the transition between relief and development. Supporting more effective and better resourced transition assistance—through UNP, through the Peacebuilding Commission, or other mechanisms—is a critical objective, and one to which I will be strongly committed.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, we must remember that delivery of humanitarian assistance and recovery and reconstruction efforts are most effective when there is a modicum of political stability. This means that our commitment to improve the U.N.'s capacity to deliver humanitarian assistance must be matched by a commitment to strengthen the conflict prevention and mediation functions of the organization.

Question. What is your assessment of the U.N. Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)? What is the status of U.S. contributions already pledged to the CERF? How do you assess decision-making regarding the use of funds? Have they been effective? Has there been adequate transparency and oversight? How would you assess the U.S. government's ability to help coordinate humanitarian efforts through this kind of mechanism? Should the United States take a lead role in its further development?

Answer. The CERF has received contributions from more than 55 donors and has exceeded the \$1 billion mark in pledges. While the U.S. financial contribution to the Central Emergency Response Fund is relatively modest (\$15 million to date), it has supported the CERF's creation and continuing development. The CERF serves as a timely and flexible mechanism for funding international aid organizations when global emergencies strike. The CERF has been effective in two main ways: it facilitates the quick mobilization of funds for U.N. agencies' rapid response to sudden onset disasters, and it assists in directing funds to interventions linked to long-term complex emergencies.

In 2007, USAID participated on the CERF Advisory Board and may do so again in the future. Whether the United States will increase its contribution will depend on the Obama administration's review of U.S. humanitarian assistance, where the U.S. remains the world's largest donor through its contributions to WFP and UNCR.

Question. What do you see as the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees' major successes and weaknesses? What do you see as the major weaknesses of the overall U.N. response in the area of refugee and internally displaced person assistance?

Answer. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees operates in challenging environments and performs critical work to aid vulnerable refugees. The U.S. has traditionally been and will continue to be a strong partner of the organization. UNCR has recently undertaken various structural and management reforms with the goals of increasing the efficiency and improving the services of the organization. I support these goals, and I believe that UNCR has done important work in such areas as seeking to increase its protection efforts on behalf of stateless persons and working to increase access to third-country resettlement. All member States need to work with UNCR to build on the organization's strengths and continue to improve the organization's efficiency. If confirmed, I would work to have a productive dialogue on these issues with High Commissioner António Guterres.

Question. What role should the U.N. play in combating violence against women overseas? What steps has the United States taken to address this issue at the U.N.?

Answer. The U.N. should play an important role to elevate the issue of violence against women in order to encourage countries to combat these horrific abuses. The U.N. can provide a powerful voice and a unique forum in this regard, and there have been recent developments in this regard. Last spring, the U.N. Secretary-General commenced a campaign with the aim of mobilizing public opinion to ensure that senior policy makers work to prevent and eradicate violence against women. Violence against women has come up repeatedly as a topic at the U.N. General Assembly (UNGA), Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), Human Rights Council (HRC), and Security Council. U.N. resolutions, formal debates, and side events have focused on violence against women in general and during armed conflict, as well as specific forms of violence including female genital mutilation, honour crimes, and the spread of HIV/AIDS among women and girls because of sexual violence. And, the U.N. has an official policy of zero tolerance of sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeeping personnel and has taken measures to prevent such abuse.

The United States has and will continue to assume a leadership position across the venues and mechanisms at the U.N. The Obama administration will look actively for opportunities to ensure a sustained focus on combating violence against

women, including by building on U.N. Security Council resolution 1820, which emphasized the integral importance of this issue, including as it relates to international peace and security.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO SUSAN E. RICE
BY SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR

Osama Bin Laden/Sudan

Question. Please comment on various articles in the press that suggest that, during your time in the Clinton administration, the government of Sudan offered to provide the U.S. with information regarding Bin Laden. Were there in fact such offers and, if so, what was the Clinton administration's response?

Answer. No. This is a false suggestion, and there is no truth to it. The Clinton administration, including and up to the cabinet level, regularly met with officials from the government of Sudan. At no time was there an offer for documents or information, nor were documents or information provided. The 9/11 Commission investigated this allegation, which originated with the Sudanese and those sympathetic to the Sudanese. The Congressional investigation of the 9/11 attack did the same. Both concluded there is no basis for this allegation.

Sierra Leone in the 1990s

Question. Please explain your comment in a November 21, 2001, interview with Charles Cobb of AllAfrica.com, regarding press criticisms of the Clinton administration's handling of Sierra Leone.

Q: The other region for which there has been specific criticism of the Clinton administration is Sierra Leone in West Africa. You're familiar with that *New Republic* article that came out a year or so ago.

A: I think there was more than one, and they were distinguished by being a pack of lies, most of them.

Answer. My comments reflected my view that this article did not accurately represent the facts on the ground in Sierra Leone and the context within which decisions were made. The Lomé Agreement was the result of regional peace negotiations sponsored by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and received broad international support, including from the U.N. and the Organization of African Unity. The accord is emblematic of the difficult task of balancing lasting peace and security with accountability and justice in post-conflict situations.

Rwandan Genocide

Question. Based on the quote below from the September 2001 Atlantic Monthly magazine, please comment on what lessons and conclusions you drew from the events in Rwanda in 1994, as well as how you believe the United States and the international community could have acted differently.

There was such a huge disconnect between the logic of each of the decisions we took along the way during the genocide and the moral consequences of the decisions taken collectively. I swore to myself that if I ever faced such a crisis again, I would come down on the side of dramatic action, going down in flames if that was required."

Answer. In December 1994, I went to Rwanda, and saw firsthand what happens when the international community fails to act to prevent genocide. I will never forget the horror I witnessed.

I believe that our nation and the international community have a strong security interest and a moral obligation to work to prevent genocide. If we stand by in the face of genocide, we are all diminished. At the same time, we are not going to be able to be everywhere all the time. That's why it's so important for us to be able to work in concert with other nations and to strengthen multinational and international capacities both to prevent and, if that fails, respond to halt genocide.

In retrospect, I believe that the failure to prevent genocide in Rwanda came less from a considered decision not to act, but more from a failure to seriously contemplate the question about whether action should be taken. The United States had just removed remaining forces from Somalia. It's possible that our experience in Somalia narrowed our collective capacity to contemplate robust action in Rwanda.

I was a director at the NSC during the Rwandan genocide. My responsibilities were the U.N. and peacekeeping. In that position, I was not involved in high-level decision-making, but I did learn valuable lessons that I carry with me today: the importance of having accurate information about what is happening on the ground

so a move toward genocide isn't misconstrued as a spasm of violence; the importance of engaging before a situation becomes a crisis; the importance of the United States and the international community having a reliable process for assessing risk and providing early warning; and the importance of direct action to prevent or halt genocide. That direct action can take many forms. I do not believe that the United States can and should intervene directly in every situation but we should take no option off the table. Our power as a nation can be deployed in many ways—through our leadership at the United Nations, through our work with other multilateral organizations, and through our work with allies and other nations to intervene to prevent, and if that fails, to halt genocide.

President-elect Obama is committed to strengthening the capacity of the U.N. and regional organizations to prevent and respond to deadly violence by:

- Strengthening United Nations and regional peace operations, to help bring stable peace to war-torn regions; to establish the rule of law and to help prevent state failure; to address threats that are not easily contained by borders and boundaries; and to halt atrocities and genocide. It is essential to provide the political leadership so that U.N. missions are backed by workable political strategies. Our expectations of the U.N. have often not been met—because obstructionist member states have blocked timely action (as on Darfur and in the U.N. Human Rights Council) and because corruption and management failures have undermined the U.N.'s effectiveness.
- Working with other multinational actors that deploy peacekeeping forces like the African Union, the European Union, the Economic Community of West African States, and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to help strengthen their capacity to conduct such missions.
- Strengthening the U.S. government's capacity to assess the risk of conflict in developing countries, to act quickly to prevent and forestall violence, and to spear-head efforts to stabilize countries in the aftermath of conflict.

Somalia 1993

Question. In 2007 you wrote that, "Somalia's legacy in the American consciousness was to raise a crippling caution against the armed defense of human rights abroad." Some fifteen and a half years after these incidents took place; do you believe that U.S. foreign policy is still afflicted by a "crippling caution?" If this is no longer the case, to what do you attribute the change?

Answer. Caution in the use of military force is entirely appropriate. I do believe there are occasions when human rights abuses abroad may require a military response—because injustice can breed extremely destabilizing resentment and lead to insecurity, and because we become less than the country we wish to be when we turn away in the face of genocide or other extreme abuses. The United States will proceed with prudence in this regard. Generally, all policies, including the question of human rights, evolve over time—witness the adoption by the world community in 2005 of the "Responsibility to Protect" concept regarding the protection of populations around the world.

Sudan-NATO

In a 2007 Brookings Institution paper entitled "The Genocide in Darfur: America must do more to fulfill the responsibility to protect" you made a series of recommendations for U.S. policy on Darfur. As one of five recommendations you wrote:

"The United States and NATO should immediately impose and enforce a no-fly zone over Darfur. This will have the immediate impact of providing innocent civilians in the area with protection from Sudanese Air Force attacks. It will also demonstrate to the Sudanese government that the international community is resolved to take tough action. To protect the no-fly area would require disabling or shooting down any aircraft that take off in the zone. It would mean shutting down Sudanese airfields in and near Darfur to all but humanitarian traffic.

"The administration should also signal its readiness to strike Sudanese military and intelligence assets, including aircraft and airfields, if the government of Sudan continues to attack civilians before, during, or after the U.N.-AU force deploys or if its deployment or operations are thwarted. In the likely event that Khartoum reneges on its acquiescence to the hybrid force or harasses the international forces as they deploy, the United States must be prepared to respond quickly and credibly by striking the country's high-value military and intelligence targets."

Question. Is it the position of the Obama administration that the United States and NATO should immediately impose and enforce a no-fly zone over Darfur?

Answer. President-elect Obama, Vice President-elect Biden, Secretary-designate Clinton and I have advocated the implementation of a no-fly zone as well as far more robust sanctions on the government of Sudan, both of which Congress has also endorsed. The Obama administration has made no final decision with respect to seeking to establish a no-fly zone over Darfur or on the possibility of NATO deployments to Darfur. I anticipate that the questions of Sudan and Darfur would be subject to early policy review of all steps to most effectively and urgently maximize protection for civilians.

Question. Does the Obama administration believe that U.S. and NATO forces could play such a role without diminishing the effectiveness of ongoing U.S. and NATO operations in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Answer. The Obama administration has made no final decision with respect to seeking to establish a no-fly zone over Darfur or on the possibility of NATO deployments to Darfur. I would anticipate that the questions of Sudan and Darfur would be subject to early policy review of all steps to most effectively and urgently maximize protection for civilians. This policy review would include consideration of the broader implications of policy options for Darfur, including the potential impact on the U.S. efforts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere.

Question. Does the Obama administration intend to seek legislation from Congress authorizing U.S. military action in Darfur?

Answer. The Obama administration has made no final decision with respect to seeking to establish a no-fly zone over Darfur or other policy options for Darfur. I would anticipate that the questions of Sudan and Darfur would be subject to early policy review of all steps to most effectively and urgently maximize protection for civilians.

Question. Does the Obama administration intend to seek a U.N. Security Council resolution authorizing the United States and NATO to impose a no-fly zone and take other military action in Darfur? Do you believe that the other permanent members of the Security Council will support such a resolution?

Answer. The Obama administration has made no final decision with respect to seeking to establish a no-fly zone over Darfur. I would anticipate that the questions of Sudan and Darfur would be subject to early policy review of all steps to most effectively and urgently maximize protection for civilians. The U.S. will seek to build the maximum international support for any foreign policy strategy, including as it related to matters such as Darfur.

Question. In the same article, you advocated that the United States should “Couple unilateral sanctions with a sustained push for [additional] U.N. sanctions, daring China or Russia to veto effective action to halt genocide. The United States should stop allowing the possibility of a veto to suspend U.N. deliberations.”

If confirmed, what specific steps would you take to gain Chinese and Russian support for more effective action in Darfur?

Answer. The President-elect and I believe that it is important for the United States to lead in strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations, in modernizing it, so that it can be more capable of meeting the challenges of the 21st Century. We believe that in light of the global challenges we face in the new century, the value and potential of the U.N. is as great if not more so today, than at its founding 60 years ago. Cooperation in the Security Council must be at the center of our efforts to build an effective and responsive U.N. The Council’s capacity to effectively address key issues derives directly from the ability of its members to identify shared objectives and build pragmatic working relationships, particularly among the Security Council’s Permanent Members. Prospects for such collaboration on the Council improve when there are effective, sustained, direct, and serious consultations and negotiations among the Council Members. This will be particularly true with respect to China and Russia. There are, and will continue to be, instances when, despite best efforts, effective Council action is not possible.

Question. What effect do you believe “daring” other permanent members of the Security Council to veto measures related to Sudan will have on the likelihood of passing such measures and on the ability of the United States to gain cooperation on other matters of priority in the Council?

Answer. This article expressed my personal view in 2007 in an academic context and does not reflect the view of the Obama administration. Cooperation in the Security Council must be at the center of our efforts to build an effective and responsive

U.N. If confirmed, I will pursue effective, pragmatic working relationships with other members of the Security Council, particularly with Russia and China. Developing shared objectives and common strategies requires sustained, direct and serious dialogue. This means ensuring that other countries understand the objectives of the United States and that we do not shy from pressing our positions and challenging those of others when we believe they run counter to our interests and values.

Responsibility to Protect

You have advocated greater action by the international community to implement the doctrine of the “Responsibility to Protect” which was endorsed at the 2005 U.N. World Summit. As endorsed by the World Summit, that doctrine provides, *inter alia*, that—

The international community, through the United Nations, has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter, to help to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In this context, we are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII, on a case-by-case basis and in cooperation with relevant regional organizations as appropriate, should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities are manifestly failing to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

Question. Please indicate in what countries you believe national authorities are currently “manifestly failing” to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity. Please indicate what steps you would advocate the international community taking in each case, and what actions you intend to take in this regard at the United Nations, if confirmed.

Answer. Action at the World Summit was an important reaffirmation that the international community should act to protect populations at risk of grave and widespread violations of human rights. The most prominent case that raises concerns about genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity is Sudan, and the Security Council has referred the situation in Darfur to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for investigation, which the Obama administration supports. In addition, the United States should continue to take active measures to increase the capacity of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Mission in Darfur, so that it can better safeguard the lives of those at risk. Finally, the United States and the international community must continue to bring strong pressure to bear on Sudanese authorities to put an end to atrocities. The new administration will be actively considering appropriate actions in the days and weeks following the inauguration, which could include additional measures through the United Nations. There are other cases around the world where genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity have merited international concern and action, including cases in which the authorities themselves have sought the assistance of the international community—and, in particular, the ICC—such as in Uganda, the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Finally, there are cases of grave and widespread abuses of human rights that have not been referred to the ICC or other tribunals, but which also should be of utmost concern to the United States and the international community, such as the human rights situations in Burma, Zimbabwe, and North Korea. In all such cases, the specific actions taken by the administration will vary, but we will remain steadfast in our overall commitment to safeguard human lives and bring an end to abuses of human rights.

The Evolution of Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect

You co-authored a chapter entitled “The Evolution of Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect” in a book entitled *Beyond Preemption*, (Ivo Daalder, ed., 2007). Your article contains the following passage:

At present the international community has no agreed normative framework for halting genocide or massive crimes against humanity when the Security Council fails to do so. This is the case in Darfur where international action has been authorized but not implemented due to lack of resolve to deploy without Sudanese agreement. The following procedures and alternatives should be adopted as the international standard in such instances:

- The Permanent Five members of the U.N. Security Council should forswear the use of the veto to halt international intervention for humanitarian reasons, un-

less they publicly articulate a compelling case that their vital national interests are at stake. This is by no means a fail-safe solution since countries can claim that their vital interests are at stake, and no multilateral body has the authority to rule on the validity of those claims. However, it would raise the political bar, help dissipate the constant but ambiguous cloud of a veto threat against humanitarian interventions, open recalcitrant nations to international scrutiny, and increase transparency.

- The U.N. General Assembly could be convoked in emergency session to vote on “Uniting for Peace” action when the Security Council is deadlocked.
- Decisions to support intervention by relevant or concerned regional bodies should be deemed sufficient to legitimize action by their members when Security Council authorization is sought but not forthcoming.
- When all else fails, a member state or coalition of members may intervene to save lives at their own risk and expense and seek retroactive U.N. or regional support. In this instance the gravity of the humanitarian crisis, the purity of humanitarian motives, and the efficacy and proportionality of the military action should be critical considerations in the achievement of *ex post facto* legitimization. Member states that take such action should be prepared to have their intervention formally condemned and penalties assessed if it fails to meet the above criteria. In addition, member states that take such action should be prepared to shoulder the costs of the post-intervention responsibilities.”

I have the following questions in connection with this passage:

Question. If confirmed, would you support a policy of forswearing the use of the United States veto in the Security Council in some category of future cases involving proposals for humanitarian intervention?

Answer. This article expressed my personal opinion in 2007 in an academic context. The Obama administration has not taken a position on this issue. In general, our clear preference is to obtain Security Council approval for an action. I believe that Security Council members should ensure that responsible efforts to end the killings are not obstructed.

Question. If so, would such a position preclude the United States from vetoing a hypothetical proposal for intervention in Gaza if some Council members asserted that such intervention was required for humanitarian reasons?

Answer. No. The United States maintains an unwavering commitment to Israel and will exercise its right and authority as a Permanent Member of the U.N. Security Council based on our national interests and objectives.

Question. Are there any other categories of cases for which you intend, if confirmed, to announce a policy of forswearing the use of the United States veto in the Security Council? If so, please specify them.

Answer. It is unrealistic to attempt to identify all possible future hypothetical scenarios in an evaluation of the use of the Security Council veto.

Question. If confirmed, do you intend to advocate for an expanded role for the General Assembly in authorizing humanitarian interventions or other uses of force?

Answer. President-elect Obama’s overarching objective is to advance America’s interests, protect our security, and ensure our prosperity. I believe the United States should pursue those avenues, opportunities, and strategies that represent the best possibility of achieving our national objectives. While the Security Council is the principal U.N. organ for matters relating to international peace and security, I would not rule out using the General Assembly if that is in the U.S. national interest. The U.S. has done so in the past when others blocked effective UNC action—including authorizing the Korean War.

Question. Do you believe generally that United States interests would be well served by greater involvement by the General Assembly in matters of peace and security?

Answer. No. Under the U.N. Charter, the U.N. Security Council is the U.N. entity with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. I believe that this structure remains the most appropriate.

Question. If confirmed, do you intend to pursue an international agreement on a “normative framework for halting genocide or massive crimes against humanity when the Security Council fails to do so?” Do you believe implementing such a framework would require amending the U.N. Charter?

Answer. When genocide or other massive crimes against civilians are taking place, I believe that Security Council members should ensure that responsible efforts to end the killings are not obstructed. The new administration would have to consider how to translate this and related objectives into expressions of policy. I do not think that movement toward this kind of goal would require a Charter Amendment.

Question. Do you believe that each of the other permanent members of the Security Council would agree with the framework proposed in the quoted passage? What impact do you believe pursuit of such a framework by the United States would have on your working relationships with your P-5 colleagues, and the ability of the United States to achieve P-5 consensus on other pressing matters?

Answer. Our clear preference is to obtain Security Council approval for an action because such approval enhances our ability to bring others along with us, shares the cost of the burdens, and increases legitimacy. If confirmed, I will work toward developing constructive and pragmatic working relationships with my U.N. Security Council colleagues. I would not want to speculate regarding the views of other Security Council member on decision that the U.S. has not taken.

United Nations—General

Question. How will the Obama administration differentiate its policies toward the United Nations from those of the Bush administration?

Answer. First, it is important to note that there are important views shared by both the outgoing Bush administration and the incoming Obama administration about the importance, and the valuable contributions, of the United Nations. As Ambassador Khalilzad indicated in his confirmation hearings in 2007, “[n]o other such organization has been able to undertake peace enforcement actions comparable to the one in Korea in 1950, to lead scores of peacekeeping missions over the course of decades, to achieve consensus on endorsing such strong actions as the liberation of Kuwait in 1991 or the toppling of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan in 2001.” And I agree with the current administration’s statement, expressed by Ambassador Khalilzad, that it is “vital for the United States to enable this institution to make the greatest possible contribution to advance those founding objectives.” We will continue and deepen efforts to enhance U.N. capacity in a range of areas. At the same time, there will also be changes of direction. On many key policy issues, from climate change, to non-proliferation, to development issues and the role of the Millennium Development Goals, to human rights and the rule of law, President-elect Obama has articulated policy perspectives that are different from those of Bush administration, and our efforts in the U.N.—which serves as a critical forum for the development of common approaches on these and other issues—will reflect the new administration’s perspectives and priorities.

Question. What do you see as the most crucial role for the United Nations in the 21st century? How would you enhance U.N. effectiveness in that role?

Answer. The President-elect believes the United Nations is an indispensable, if imperfect, global mechanism by which to advance our interests in combating common threats and meeting global challenges ranging from global terrorism to proliferation, poverty, climate change, and disease. These are matters that directly affect the security and prosperity of the United States, and they are matters that can be effectively resolved only by acting collectively. The United Nations offers an important vehicle for doing so and renewed American leadership will be critical to achieving progress.

It is in our interests to make the U.N. maximally effective in this regard. That means not only an agenda of management reform, but also investing to strengthen its program capacities and effectiveness, most notably in the realm of peacekeeping, where we are asking the United Nations now to do more than ever and yet we have not aligned resources and capabilities with the mandates that we have given U.N. missions.

Question. Do you believe that the Millennium Development Goals should be a major focus of the U.N. system?

Answer. The United Nations system seeks to address related goals including international peace and security, human rights, environmental protection and development. The Millennium Development goals represent an important effort by countries around the globe to work together on development issues. The President-elect has made clear that the United States will embrace the Millennium Development Goals, which provide a framework for global action on economic empowerment and advancing human well-being. They imbed important concepts such as private-public partnerships in global development strategies. Advancing development goals is in the U.S. national interest. The President-elect has articulated goals consistent with

the global effort to meet the MDGs including ending malaria deaths by 2015 and closing the gap in primary education.

Question. What steps would you take to improve the standing of the United States in the General Assembly and decrease the frequency with which the majority of the General Assembly votes against the U.S. position?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to reach out to other U.N. member states to listen, to understand, and to appreciate different perspectives, even as I defend and promote U.S. interests and values. I will focus on building pragmatic working relationships across the full range of U.N. member states. I will also direct the U.S. Mission to approach diplomacy at the U.N. in a similar fashion so that, at all levels, the United States pursues its interests at the U.N. in a sustained and focused manner, working within the U.N. with our partners, friends, and allies to build a broader and deeper shared understanding of our common interests.

Security Council Issues

Question. What do you believe are the most pressing matters currently on the agenda of the Security Council and what will be your highest priorities in the Council, if confirmed?

Answer. As the worldwide body charged with addressing international peace and security issues, the Council has no shortage of matters that are very pressing, from Africa to the Middle East to South Asia. If confirmed, I will certainly actively attend to those issues, but also seek Council action in other areas where there are strong benefits to common approaches, such as non-proliferation and counter-terrorism. In terms of direct influence on peace and security issues, the Council's most important role may be in the authorization and monitoring of the nearly 20 U.N. peace operations around the world. I am concerned about accountability of the Council in this area, particularly ensuring that Council mandates in this area are matched by the resources and political will to realize critical policy objectives. I expect to devote much of my energy to this issue in the months and years to come.

Question. What issues not currently on the Council's agenda do you believe merit attention by the Council?

Answer. In recent years, the Council has expanded its focus, for example, by recognizing the role of HIV/AIDS on security in Africa, and the impact of repression in Burma on regional peace and security issues. I welcome this willingness to consider security issues expansively, and will be prepared to involve the Council in these and other non-traditional areas if such involvement might provide a means for progress.

Question. The U.N. Security Council has, over the past several years, taken a number of steps to improve its work procedures, thereby enabling non-Council member States access to the Council and its work. What role has the United States played in promoting a more open, accessible, and transparent Council? What additional steps should be taken?

Answer. The United States should play an important role in a number of initiatives to improve the efficiency and transparency of Security Council operations. The U.S. has actively participated in the informal working group which reviews and implements proposals for improving Security Council working methods. These efforts have included:

- Intensified efforts to publicize Security Council decisions and other relevant Council information (reports are circulated to all Council members and participants in Council meetings at least 4 days prior to their consideration);
- Enhanced use of informal consultations with interested member states, where appropriate. For example, the Council President has facilitated interaction by inviting any participant in consultations to speak at any time during meeting; and
- Reaffirmed commitment to the use of open meetings, particularly during the early stages of consideration of an issue.

If confirmed, I will pursue active consultation with a broad range of other member states. Promoting sustained, informal engagement with non-Council members can be as important as pursuing more formal proposals to improve this process. I will also work with the U.S. Mission to consider appropriate additional measures to promote greater Council efficiency consistent with our broader foreign policy objectives.

Question. There have been a number of proposals to increase the size of the U.N. Security Council and to expand the number of permanent members of the Council.

How do you believe U.S. interests would be affected by the expansion of the Council's size or by the addition of more permanent members?

Answer. Long-term legitimacy of the UNC depends on it representing the full membership of the U.N. We recognize that the Council was created many years ago at a time when there were very different international realities and that there is a strongly felt sentiment among many member states that the Security Council should better reflect 21st century circumstances. Our administration will make a serious, deliberate effort, consulting with key allies and capitals, to find a way forward that enhances the ability of the Security Council to carry out its mandate and effectively meet the challenges of the new century. Obviously, this will not happen overnight.

Question. What factors do you believe most important in evaluating any such proposals?

Answer. The administration will support expansion of the Security Council in ways that would not impede its effectiveness and its efficiency. We would also consider how to enhance the standing of the Council in the eyes of those nations that seek a greater voice in international fora.

Question. The Bush administration supported only Japanese aspirations to the Council. Will the Obama administration continue this policy, or will it advocate for the inclusion of other countries; if so, which? What criteria will the Obama administration use to promote other nations?

Answer. At this stage, the Obama administration has not made a determination about any particular configuration of SC reform.

U.N. Sanctions

Some countries have criticized U.N. Security Council's targeted sanctions regimes for failing to provide sufficient due process rights for individuals who are targeted for sanctions. In September, the European Court of Justice in the Kadi case invalidated European Community regulations implementing UNC sanctions against al-Qaeda and the Taliban as applied to two individuals on the ground that the process for adopting the sanctions failed to respect the individuals' fundamental due process rights.

Question. Do you believe the ability to employ targeted economic sanctions is important to the Security Council's ability to address threats to international peace and security? If confirmed, will you work to preserve the Council's ability to employ such sanctions?

Answer. Yes. I believe that the Council must retain the ability to use targeted sanctions to address such threats, and I will work to ensure the Council's ability to do so effectively.

Question. Do you believe the U.N. Security Council's existing sanctions regimes fail to provide adequate protections for the due process rights of targeted individuals? Do you believe that the Council could afford additional due process rights to targeted individuals without undermining the Council's ability to employ sanctions effectively?

Answer. I believe that there is no incompatibility between sanctions regimes and appropriate due process safeguards. There will inevitably be challenging issues relating to implementation of international sanctions in a manner that is compatible with regional and national procedures, but those need not frustrate the intent or implementation of sanctions.

Question. Do you believe that decisions by individual states not to implement binding sanctions adopted by the U.N. Security Council would serve to undermine the effectiveness of such sanctions? If confirmed, what steps would you take to address this issue within the United Nations?

Answer. To ensure their effectiveness, binding sanctions must be implemented by member states, and the Council and the Secretariat should be prepared to press governments to meet their obligations in this regard. In addition, Council members and the Secretariat should also be prepared to provide technical assistance to governments that are willing to put sanctions measures in place but could benefit from help in doing so.

ECOSOC

Question. The 54-member United Nations Economic and Social Council receives scant attention in the media, and some believe it is under-valued by our government. What have been recent ECOSOC initiatives that have advanced U.S. foreign

policy goals? What are the most contentious issues confronting the United States in ECOSOC?

Answer. ECOSOC is the principal organ charged with coordination of the U.N.'s work across the full range of economic, social and related issues. It works under the "broad authority" of the GA but is the body to which the U.N.'s 14 specialized agencies, functional commissions, and 5 regional commissions relate; as do also the 11 U.N. Funds and Programmes. ECOSOC is responsible for formulating policy recommendations to member states and the U.N. System, but its principal authority lies in being able to initiate studies and reports, and prepare major international conferences and their follow-up. One of ECOSOC's recent reforms supported by the U.S. is the inclusion of an Annual Ministerial Review and a Development Cooperation Forum to put more focused attention on the Millennium Development Goals and related commitments. In the upcoming year, ECOSOC is expected to focus on the review of the conference on Financing for Development, the impact of the financial crisis on development, and climate change—all of which will require strong U.S. engagement to ensure successful outcomes.

U.N Budget

Question. Some have suggested that the United Nations should be funded solely by voluntary contributions rather than by assessed dues. They argue that such a mechanism would create the financial pressures necessary to bring about greater budgetary and personnel reforms. Does the Obama administration support this approach?

Answer. No. The United States should pay its commitments to the United Nations on time and in full. While voluntary contributions can be used to leverage reforms, I do not believe that switching to a solely voluntary system for funding the United Nations would be an effective strategy. Such an action would undercut U.S. arguments for burden-sharing in areas where the U.S. has strong national interests, such as peacekeeping, and undermine the U.N.'s ability to tackle pressing global challenges that require support from all 192 member states, such as climate change, counter-terrorism, and global health.

Question. For several years now, Congress has consistently received budget requests for U.N. peacekeeping operations in the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account that were considerably lower than known requirements. For example, In FY2007, the administration requested \$1.135B and the CIPA requirement for that fiscal year was approximately \$1.534B. In FY2008, the administration requested \$1.107B and the CIPA requirement for that fiscal year was approximately \$2.34B. Missing funding was then requested as part of "emergency" supplemental funding, even though most, if not all, of these needs were known well in advance. Funding via supplemental appropriations suggests an unwillingness to acknowledge the cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations even though the Government Accountability Office has documented that such operations cost our taxpayers roughly one-eighth of a unilateral operation (\$116 million for 14 months of the U.N. operation in Haiti [MINUSTAH] vice \$876 million for the same operation if the US had gone in alone).

Does the Obama administration intend to submit CIPA requests that honestly reflect our international commitments to operations approved by the United States in the Security Council?

Answer. Yes. The United States should pay its dues on time and in full. The Obama administration intends to submit funding requests to Congress that represent the most accurate expectation of our financial commitments to the United Nations. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Congress and this Committee to help ensure that the U.S. pays its U.N. dues on time and in full.

Question. One of the biggest complaints about the United States at the United Nations is our failure to pay our Regular Budget dues on time. This is a result of a 1980s decision to shift our payments from the start of the U.N.'s fiscal year, which starts in January, to our own. As a result, and in part because of Congressional difficulty in passing budgets in a timely manner, our payments to the United Nations are often delayed till late December and sometimes not fully funded till the following fiscal year. As such, any attempts by our diplomats in New York to push for greater U.N. fiscal discipline are encumbered as other member states point to our own fiscal difficulties in meeting our obligations.

Will the Obama administration seek to re-synchronize our payments over time to end this cycle? Does the Obama administration intend to request sufficient resources from the Congress to do so?

Answer. Yes. It is the intent of the Obama administration to work to address this payment issue, within the financial constraints of our budget. We are actively reviewing this issue now to develop a strategy to resolve this issue. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Congress and this Committee this and other matters regarding U.S. dues to the United Nations.

Question. Are there any specific steps you believe the United Nations should take to reduce the overall size of the U.N. peacekeeping budget? If so, what are they?

Answer. Over the last several years, U.N. peacekeeping has seen its greatest growth both in numbers and scales. A large portion of the U.N.'s budget is devoted to peacekeeping. It will be important that, as peacekeeping mandates come up for renewal, we appropriately scrutinize the objectives, mandate, and deployment of these peacekeeping forces. Any new peacekeeping mandate must also be evaluated to ensure that the U.N. has the capacity and resources to fulfill the added responsibility.

Question. Are there any specific U.N. peacekeeping missions that you believe should be downsized or terminated to reduce the costs of U.N. peacekeeping?

Answer. The administration will review each peacekeeping operation as it comes up for renewal at the Security Council. The administration does not have a position about reducing supporting or terminating specific peacekeeping operations at this time.

Question. U.N. General Assembly resolution 58/318 provides that the United Nations must be fully reimbursed for the costs of any services facilities, cooperation and any other support rendered by the United Nations to the International Criminal Court or the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. If confirmed, will you work to ensure that this reimbursement requirement is fully implemented and that the United Nations provides transparency to member states about the assistance it provides and the reimbursements it receives?

Answer. The United Nations and the International Criminal Court are two separate and independent institutions. As a non-party to the International Criminal Court, the U.S. should continue to press for reimbursements for costs associated with the ICC and the Assembly of States Parties, as well as transparency regarding any U.N. assistance. At the same time, we should maintain the flexibility so that requirements for reimbursements do not undercut ICC activities that are in our national interests, supported by the U.S., and endorsed by the Security Council, such as the ICC's ongoing investigations regarding genocide in Darfur.

Question. Some in Congress believe that the only way to enact needed reforms at the United Nations is to enact legislation that links U.S. dues to various conditions or benchmarks. Does the Obama administration support this approach?

Answer. No. The U.S. should not, as a general practice, condition its dues to the U.N. on specific reforms. The United States should pay its dues on time and in full. The U.S. is calling on the U.N. every day to undertake tasks that we want to see performed but do not wish to or cannot perform ourselves. When the U.S. is a nation that does not pay its bills, we undermine our credibility to call on other nations to meet their obligations. We undermine our ability to build support from other Member states to achieve needed changes at the U.N. We also deprive the institution of resources it needs to function effectively.

Question. On December 24, 2008, the General Assembly approved an almost 17 percent increase in the current United Nations budget for the 2008/2009 period to \$4.87 billion from \$4.17 billion, including nearly \$500 million for the next six months for peacekeeping operations in Sudan's war-ravaged Darfur region. What is the impact of this action on our own contributions? Is the increase in funding covered in the current FY09 budget request; if not where will the money come from?

Answer. Current U.S. legislation caps the U.S. peacekeeping contribution at 25 percent. Of the \$500 million for peacekeeping operations in Darfur, the U.S. would be accessed \$125 million. I understand that the existing FY 2009 budget request by the Bush administration falls short for the operations anticipated in 2008. The Obama administration will examine the FY 2010 budget closely but will also consider other emergency funding vehicles should UNMID require urgent assistance.

Human Rights

Question. In 1994, the United States strongly supported establishment of a U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights. How effective has the High Commissioner been in ensuring that human rights considerations are included in U.N. activities?

Specifically what has the Commissioner done to further human rights? Does the Commissioner have the resources—financing, staffing, political clout -to carry out her duties?

Answer. Since its creation, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) has advocated to provide greater integration of human rights into U.N. peace, security, and humanitarian activities. Its effectiveness has varied depending on the particular issue or country. Important aspects of this work include engagement with the Secretary-General, his Special Representatives, the U.N.'s Resident and Humanitarian Coordinators in the field, and the various U.N. human rights treaty bodies. Furthermore, OHCHR works with governments, national institutions, and civil society groups to strengthen capacity at the national level for the protection of human rights in accordance with international norms. While OHCHR relies heavily on voluntary funding—of which, the United States is a major donor—world leaders in 2005 agreed to double its regular budget over a five-year period. This has allowed OHCHR to increase its field presence and improve its capacity to deploy human rights monitors on short notice. The High Commissioner's ability to carry out her mandate relies heavily on the cooperation of member states. To that end, the United States has repeatedly supported OHCHR's work to identify, highlight, and respond to today's human rights challenges.

Democracy Fund

Question. In his September 2004 speech at the United Nations President Bush called for the establishment of a Democracy Fund at the United Nations. To date, some thirty-five nations have contributed more than \$91 million, including \$25 million by the United States. What have been the Fund's most successful efforts and what have been its greatest challenges? Does the Obama administration believe the Fund appropriately and effectively funds relevant projects, and if so, does it intend to seek further appropriations in FY2010?

Answer. The U.S. has a deep interest in effective efforts to promote democracy worldwide. The U.N. Democracy Fund (UNDEF) is one of the principle ways that the U.N. supports democracy internationally. UNDEF has helped highlight the importance of democracy to the mission of the U.N. If confirmed, I would review the work of UNDEF as part of preparing recommendations for the FY2010 budget request. The Obama administration will work with international institutions and NGOs to ensure that not simply money but expertise is available to transitional societies in the time of their greatest promise, but also often their greatest vulnerability.

U.N. Peacebuilding Commission

Question. Please provide your assessment of the Peacebuilding Commission's work to date. How does the Commission's work differ from UNP's traditional programming? According to U.N. documents, some 40 nations have contributed \$250 million to the fund. The United States has apparently not contributed to the Commission. Will the Obama administration reverse this trend?

Answer. The United States is a member of the U.N. Peacebuilding Commission and supports its work—as well as the work of Assistant-Secretary-General Jane Holl Lute. The U.N. Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is an important pillar of U.N. reform that will enhance the U.N.'s capacity to address post-conflict stability, reconstruction, and governance challenges. The issue of a U.S. contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund is part of a larger discussion that will take place with respect to budget matters and funding priorities. As a general matter, the U.S. maximizes its influence and leverage when it leads by example.

Peacekeeping

Question. As the Darfur peacekeeping mission (UNAMID) demonstrates, there are limits to the number of troops that nations are willing to send to dangerous and challenging locales. Do you believe that the member states of the United Nations fully appreciate the finite capacity of the world's militaries and the current financial limitations resulting from the global economic downturn? How will these realities impact your decisions regarding any future peacekeeping operations? Do you believe that there will now be greater pressure to close long-running operations in order to fund newer, more pressing needs?

Answer. The ability of member states to provide sufficient resources is and will remain a key factor in the effectiveness of U.N. peacekeeping operations, especially at a time when the world is levying more requirements and mandates on the U.N. than ever before. This issue will figure directly in my consultations with other member states, if I am confirmed, as new mandates and renewal of existing mandates are considered. The U.S. also needs to sure that all member states, including the

United States, meet their commitments to provide the needed resources to support U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Question. A recent joint operation of the U.N. peacekeepers in Haiti (MINUSTAH) and the Haitian National Police broke up a major drug smuggling operation in the country. This is the first time that MINUSTAH has carried out a special operation of this magnitude. Does the Obama administration support a permanent expanded role for MINUSTAH in Haiti that includes drug interdiction activities?

Answer. Ensuring security from violence, drugs, gang activity, and organized crime in Latin America and the Caribbean is critical for long-term peace and stability in the region. Haiti is a fragile country with a history of political instability. The United Nations peacekeeping mission is helping to achieve Haiti's security. The continued presence of the U.N. peacekeeping force (MINUSTAH) is essential to assure adequate security for reconstruction and development programs. MINUSTAH can help create conditions that reduce drug smuggling and gang violence in Haiti. The peacekeeping force provides police training and assists with maritime and border patrol activities as well as humanitarian relief and development work. The Obama administration would want to be sure that MINUSTAH is able to carry out its range of missions. The U.N. and the international community can help improve Haiti's economic prospects over the long-term by providing more technical assistance and job training. And we must always be clear and consistent in supporting freedom and democracy. The U.N., U.S., and the entire international community have a responsibility to continue helping Haiti along a path to a better future.

Question. Do you believe the consent of the parties is a necessary precondition to effective peacekeeping? Do you believe there are situations where U.N. peacekeepers should be authorized to deploy to a country without the consent of the host government?

Answer. There are many different kinds of peacekeeping operations. The simplest and preferred circumstance is when the parties consent to the deployment of the peacekeeping mission. But there are times when the Security Council must consider authorizing the use of force under Chapter VII of the U.N. charter when the parties do not consent or oppose outside intervention, and civilians are at grave risk. One thing we can no longer tolerate, however, is a circumstance such as in Sudan, when the government, in an effort to block full deployment of the African Union-U.N. mission, picks and chooses which troop contributions it is prepared to accept.

Question. The Bush administration has advocated the establishment of a U.N. peacekeeping mission in Somalia. Do you support this idea? If so, what do you believe the appropriate size and mandate for such a mission would be? Given the inability of the U.N. to staff fully the troops for the mission in Darfur, what confidence do we have that there are additional troops available for this mission?

Answer. This issue is very important and complicated, and there are no good solutions. It is not clear that a U.N. peacekeeping operation can address the problems in Somalia, and we will need to consider very carefully the risks and benefits of any potential U.N. mission before authorizing its deployment.

Question. Some argue that the peacekeeping operation in Morocco that began in 1991—the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO)—has allowed both the POLISARIO and the government in Rabat to avoid the difficult political choices required to bring this conflict to a close. Others believe that the costs of the operation, though minor by comparison to operations in DRC and Sudan, are disproportionate to the benefits of the mission. Does the Obama administration support a continuation of MINURSO?

Answer. MINURSO has helped maintain the ceasefire between the Government of Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO. The Obama administration will support efforts that could lead to peaceful resolutions of conflict. The administration will examine U.N. peacekeeping operations, including MINURSO, closely when considering mandate renewals.

Reform

Question. On December 31, 2008, the United Nations Procurement Task Force expired when the General Assembly refused to extend its mandate. According to press reports in the Washington Post and Wall Street Journal, Russian diplomats also attempted to ban for three years any member of the Task Force from further U.N. employment, apparently in retribution for other, un-related, U.N. investigations into corrupt Russian U.N. officials. There has even been speculation that the Secretary General is seeking to bring the investigative portion of U.N. Office for Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) directly under his office. Would the Obama administra-

tion support any attempts to either reduce the staffing or responsibilities of the OIOS? Would the administration oppose any attempts to bring any portion of the OIOS under the direct responsibility of the Secretary General?

Answer. The United States strongly supports the independent authority of an OIOS that is fully staffed and retains its robust mandate. A stronger and more effective U.N. requires a greater focus on accountability and transparency. It is essential that OIOS have the capacity to undertake professional investigations. We will evaluate any proposals regarding OIOS based on these principles.

Question. Please provide for the Committee a list of all companies, and the country where they are headquartered, that the Procurement Taskforce added to the U.N.'s "Watch List" of companies who can no longer do business with the U.N. What percentage of these companies are from G-8 nations and what percentage are from G-77 countries? Are all the other entities within the U.N. system bound by the List? If not, which are exempt and why? Please list all known cases of other U.N. entities signing contracts with or using List companies.

Answer. A number of companies have been suspended from working with the U.N. due to the investigations into contracting irregularities. The U.N. maintains this list of suspended companies internally and, while the list is circulated among all U.N. entities, it is not a public document and is also not shared with member states.

The list of vendors that are barred from conducting business (the so-called "watch list") is maintained by the U.N. Procurement Division, which shares this list with the principal and subsidiary bodies of the U.N., including the Funds and Programs (e.g., United Nations Development Program and United Nations Children's Fund). The procurement division also oversees the United Nations Global Marketplace, which is the primary mechanism through which the U.N., including the Specialized Agencies, conducts procurement activity. There is a single roster for approved Global Marketplace suppliers, from which "watch list" companies are precluded.

Question. What conclusions have you drawn from the Oil-for-Food scandal that allowed corrupt U.N. and Iraqi officials to siphon off millions of dollars intended for humanitarian aid for the Iraqi people? What role did the United States play in allowing many of these contracts to be approved? Do you believe the United Nations fully appreciates the damage to the institution the scandal caused?

Answer. The Oil-for-Food scandal underscored the need for institutional reform in the U.N. system to ensure greater transparency and accountability. In the aftermath of the scandal, the United States vigorously supported the U.N. Oil-for-Food investigation led by Paul Volcker and the subsequent criminal prosecution of both individuals and corporations. These investigations and prosecutions served as a wake up call across the U.N. system and prompted more robust efforts to address corruption and mismanagement. In 2007, the United States launched its United Nations Transparency and Accountability Initiative (UNTAI) in New York and throughout the larger U.N. system to address widespread management weaknesses. If I am confirmed, I intend to pursue improvements to U.N. transparency, oversight, effectiveness, and efficiency with a clear focus and purpose, and I look forward to working with this Committee on these important issues.

Question. Sexual exploitation by U.N. peacekeepers and officials remains a stain on the U.N.'s reputation. What actions have been taken to combat this? Are they sufficient, and if not, what more can be done to prosecute the guilty and prevent future cases? How many peacekeepers and U.N. officials have been punished, from which missions? Which nations have been particularly helpful in addressing this important matter?

Answer. These abuses are totally reprehensible and unacceptable. These scandals strike at the heart of the purpose and value of the United Nations. I believe the U.N.'s top leaders understand the magnitude of this threat. They are right to adopt a policy of zero tolerance. A range of steps have been taken, including disciplinary measures, a new model Memorandum of Understanding between the U.N. and troop-contributing countries covering standards, and the waiving of immunity, but more needs to be done. As a woman and a mother, I take this issue personally and will follow it closely, if confirmed. Unless we make every effort to end this problem, the legitimacy and credibility of the United Nations in the eyes of the very peoples that the U.N. is supposed to protect will erode dangerously.

I understand that between January 1 and November 30, 2008 there were 71 allegations of sexual misconduct made against U.N. peacekeeping personnel. I also understand that the U.N. has limited ability to follow-up on cases once personnel have been repatriated. The United States has also followed up in a number of cases with demarches in capitals and meetings with Embassies in Washington to press for dis-

ciplinary or legal action, and have generally found governments to be very aware of their responsibilities to discipline personnel found to have engaged in sexual misconduct. The U.S. will continue to work with other member states to follow up on actions taken by troop- or police-contributing governments against personnel dismissed from U.N. missions for engaging in inappropriate or abusive behavior.

Question. The 2000 U.N. Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations—the “Brahimi Report”—remains a guiding principle for much of U.N. peacekeeping. What reforms that have been enacted as a result of the report have been particularly useful and which suggested changes still require further enactment? Are there additional measures that you believe the U.N. should take to implement recommendations from the Brahimi report?

Answer. The U.N. Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, known as the “Brahimi Report,” is a milestone in the development of U.N. peacekeeping policy. The careful analysis and thoughtful proposals underscore the important contributions that the U.N. makes to international peace and security. The report explained the need for well thought-out strategies and well-planned operations in U.N. peacekeeping. The report expressed the importance of conflict prevention and led to creation of the Peacebuilding Commission. The report noted the complementary role that civilian police and rule of law elements can play in peacekeeping operations. Among other topics, the report calls for adapting to the information age. Technological developments since 2000 may offer more options for innovation.

Question. In June 2005 the U.S. Institute for Peace produced the so “Gingrich-Mitchell” report on U.N. reform. Which of the reforms discussed in the document, and its December 2005 update do you feel have been fully and successfully implemented and which have not? Are there any recommendations that you disagree with; if so why?

Answer. The U.S. Institute for Peace’s report was central to the development of bipartisan U.S. thinking about the U.N., particularly by emphasizing that “the American people want an effective United Nations that can fulfill the goals of its Charter in building a safer, freer, and more prosperous world.” The report contains many helpful recommendations, among them calling on the U.N. to affirm the responsibility to protect. The Responsibility to Protect is a norm that was supported by the United States, by the 2005 World Summit, and subsequently by the United Nations Security Council. The President-elect supports the “R2P” doctrine. The report also called for the replacement of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, but the successor Human Rights Council has performed far below expectations. The report also called for a range of U.N. management reforms, such as the Office of Personnel Ethics, a number of which have been accomplished. The Obama administration will consider many ways to improve the U.N. system. Thoughtful reports by informed groups make an important contribution.

Hiring of Americans in U.N. System

Question. United States nationals have experienced difficulty securing jobs within the lower and middle ranks of the U.N. Secretariat. According to the most recent report by the State Department on the hiring and employment of US citizens in the United Nations, 328 out of 2742 positions subject to geographic distribution were filled by Americans—12.0 percent. While this is within the 11.7 percent–15.8 percent range established by the U.N. Secretariat, it is at the low end of the range. The report concludes, “. . . the United States is very close to the bottom of its desired range which is a concern to us.” To what do you attribute this low percentage, and what steps will you take to increase it?

Answer. A strong American presence at the U.N. serves our nation’s best interests—it strengthens relations with the U.N., demonstrates a deeper U.S. commitment to the U.N., and helps to build understanding of American perspectives. We should want Americans in U.N. positions at all levels and across the range of U.N. programs and activities, both in New York and around the world. The U.S. Mission should play a critical role, providing strategic support and a sustained focus on ensuring a maximal American presence. If I am confirmed, this will be a management priority for me; I intend to evaluate closely the current situation of Americans employed in the U.N. system; and, I will use the U.S. Mission to advocate for a strong American presence at the U.N.

Capital Master Plan

Question. What is the status of the renovation to the U.N.’s New York headquarters? What is the current total anticipated cost, and what is the U.S. portion of the cost, by percentage and total? Has the U.S. portion been fully funded or will

this be paid over several years? Does the Obama administration believe this cost is justified? What savings are possible given the current economic downturn? New York developer Donald Trump has asserted that he could complete the project for less than the cost estimated by the U.N.; did Mr. Trump ever follow-up by bidding on the project?

Answer. I understand that the United States is being assessed 22 percent of the project costs based on our rate of assessment under the current U.N. scale of assessments—roughly totaling \$415 million. As the U.N.'s largest contributor and host country, the United States has a direct interest in ensuring that the CMP is implemented in the most cost effective and transparent manner possible. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has completed four reports on the CMP, reporting that the processes are consistent with industry best practices, noting that challenges remain. With regard to the impact of the economic downturn, as the project is being bid on in multiple parts, we would expect contractor proposals to reflect current economic conditions. To the best of our knowledge, Mr. Trump has not bid on any part of the project that has been competed thus far.

UNDP

Question. Much of the last two years was devoted to the UNP's operation in North Korea which resulted in UNP pulling out of the DPRK over charges of North Korean abuse of the program. Does the Obama administration agree with the suspension of the program? Will it seek to authorize UNP to return to North Korea?

Answer. The concerns surrounding the U.N. Development Programme operation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are serious and should be sufficiently addressed before contemplating any resumption of UNP operations in the country. Those concerns include various issues with respect to the management and operation of the UNP program in DPRK detailed last year in a Staff Report of the U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Additionally, and in order to fully address these concerns, the DPRK would need to agree to UNP measures to increase the transparency and accountability of UNP programs there. If confirmed, I would welcome a productive dialogue with all parties involved, including the Group of 77 and China, which have also expressed views on this issue.

Iran

Question. What additional steps do you believe the Council should take to address the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program? If confirmed, what actions do you intend to take to build greater support in the Council for effective action on Iran?

Answer. The President-elect has said that the prospect of an Iran armed with nuclear weapons poses a great threat to our national security, and to the security and stability of the region and the world. The President-elect believes that the U.S. should pursue a strategy that employs all policy tools at our disposal, first and foremost direct, vigorous, and principled diplomacy integrated with effective pressure, including sanctions, and close cooperation with our "P-5 plus 1" partners, other members of the U.N. Security Council, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other partners around the world. It is this kind of comprehensive, integrated strategy that will improve the prospects of more unified action by the U.N. Security Council to enforce existing resolutions on Iran and, if appropriate, pursue additional sanctions.

Darfur

Question. What specific steps do you intend to take to improve the effectiveness of U.N. efforts to address the situation in Darfur, including the U.N. -AU Mission in Darfur (UNAMID)?

Answer. President-elect Obama and Vice President-elect Biden have been very clear and forceful in their condemnation of the genocide in Sudan and in their commitment to far more robust actions to try and end it. The pace of UNMID's deployment needs to be accelerated, combined with sufficient logistical support to protect civilians on the ground. We need to send a clear message to Khartoum that they must end obstruction of the U.N. force (UNAMID), including through endless bureaucratic hurdles and delays. We also need to address some of the U.N.'s own requirements that have inadvertently slowed UNMID's deployment thus far. The Obama administration will evaluate what should be taken to help troops and equipment move into place on an urgent basis.

Question. Many have been critical of China's role in the Security Council in opposing stronger and more effective U.N. action on Darfur. What specific steps do you intend to take to gain greater cooperation from China in efforts to address Darfur?

Answer. Cooperation in the Security Council must be at the center of our efforts to build an effective and responsive U.N. With its fast growing economy, ever-growing global interests, and expanding population, China should be expected to assume a more constructive role on the Security Council, on Sudan and Darfur and elsewhere. The Council's capacity to effectively address key issues derives directly from the ability of its members to identify shared objectives and build pragmatic working relationships. This will be particularly true for the United States and China. Prospects for such collaboration on the Council improve when there are effective, sustained, direct, and serious consultations and negotiations among the Council Members. There are, and will continue to be, times when, despite best efforts, effective Council action is not possible.

Question. The Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court has asked the court to issue an arrest warrant for Sudanese President Bashir on charges of genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. The court is currently reviewing the request.

What affect do you believe the issuance an ICC arrest warrant for President Bashir would have on UNMID's ability to operate in Darfur?

Answer. It should have no affect on UNMID's ability to operate, and the United States and other members of the United Nations Security Council must continue to make this perfectly clear. There will be no tolerance for reprisals directed at U.N. staff, or for obstruction of the U.N. peacekeeping missions operating in Sudan. Regardless of the decision on the Bashir arrest warrant, Khartoum needs to hand over those already indicted by the ICC—militia leader Ali Kushayb and Minister Ahmad Harun immediately, stop the genocide in Darfur, facilitate rather than hinder humanitarian operations, and allow the AU-UN peace keeping force to deploy without obstruction.

Question. What affect do you believe the issuance an ICC arrest warrant for President Bashir would have on efforts to resolve the crisis in Darfur more generally?

Answer. Injecting some accountability for grave crimes into the context of Darfur should help to alter the calculus of various actors in Darfur and discourage ongoing abuses. There is evidence to suggest that the ICC arrest warrant is providing new leverage to the international community's efforts to resolve the crisis. Peace and justice are not mutually exclusive.

Question. Some have urged the U.N. Security Council to pass a resolution directing the ICC not to proceed further with investigation or prosecution of President Bashir. Would you support such a resolution?

Answer. No, not at this time.

Zimbabwe

Question. What steps do you believe the United Nations should be taking to address the situation in Zimbabwe? To what extent do you believe the Council should defer to existing African Union efforts to address Zimbabwe?

Answer. Zimbabwe continues to be gripped by a man-made catastrophe that has all but destroyed the country economically and politically. President Mugabe lost the election last March and has no legitimate claim to power. But he continues to rule the country through violence, intimidation, and corruption. The spill-over effects of Zimbabwe's crisis have long been apparent in the vast numbers of desperate citizens pouring across Zimbabwe's borders, and the potential of this implosion to affect the region has been made plain most recently and tragically by a cholera outbreak.

We must continue to speak the truth about Zimbabwe, and to support those in the region and elsewhere who do the same. The inaction at U.N. on the matter of Zimbabwe illustrates the reality that the U.N. is only as strong and capable as its member states. More needs to be done. Widened U.S. sanctions are appropriate. It was the right policy to have supported a U.N. Security Council resolution calling for targeted sanctions and an arms embargo. The United States should continue to work diplomatically at the U.N., the AU, and SADC not only to encourage more multilateral pressure on the Mugabe regime, including an arms embargo and greater participation in a regime of targeted sanctions, but also to ensure that humanitarian assistance is available to suffering Zimbabweans and to plan for a well-coordinated recovery effort once sound governance is in place in Harare.

Burma

Question. The deteriorating situation within Burma and the potential consequences for regional stability have remained on the agenda of the United Nations in recent years largely because of U.S. leadership. What is your strategy to ensure

continued United Nations' focus on matters related to Burma including its growing relationship with North Korea?

Answer. Burma, and its reclusive and repressive regime, may represent one of the most intractable challenges for the global community. This is as much, if not more, a challenge for key regional players—Russia, China, India and the ASEAN countries—several of whom sit on the U.N. Security Council and have limited the U.N.'s ability to do more. I believe that there is scope for greater regional and international action to pressure Burma's dictators, including by ASEAN countries. Multilateral sanctions should be pursued, despite the opposition that such measures have faced in the past. This will require creative strategies that push the key regional states to support tougher action. I also want to recognize the important work of Members of Congress in highlighting abuses and keeping faith with the democratic opposition in Burma. If I am confirmed, I look forward to working with the Committee and other interested Members to develop initiatives and strategies.

UN Human Rights Council

Question. Critics contend that the new U.N. Human Rights Council is a marginal improvement at best over the discredited U.N. Human Rights Commission it replaced. The Bush administration decided not to seek membership to the Council and in June of 2008 all but completely withdrew the United States from observer status, declaring that we would only engage with the Council when it involves "matters of deep national interest." What is the position of the Obama administration regarding the U.N. Human Rights Council?

Answer. We have a deep interest in ensuring strong global mechanisms to uphold the respect for human rights. The President-elect is committed to enforcing respect for human rights. There is no question that the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) has been seriously flawed and a major disappointment. Rather than focus on its efforts and energies on most egregious instances of human rights abuses around the world, in places like Burma, Zimbabwe, Sudan and elsewhere, the HRC has devoted an inordinate amount of attention, and a very counterproductive focus, on Israel, one of our closest allies.

Question. Will the Obama administration seek to become a member of the Council at the next opportunity?

Answer. The Obama administration intends to work to strengthen the United Nations human rights mechanisms so that they focus on the world's most egregious human rights abusers. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the President-elect—and consulting with this Committee—as we review whether and when to run for election to a seat on the Council. Whether or not we seek election, our basic orientation will be that our ability to effect change is far greater if we are engaged diplomatically with friends and partners around the world to build a broad-based understanding of the need to use these mechanisms for the purpose they were designed, and not allow them to be hijacked for other purposes.

Question. Does the administration believe the Council spends a disproportionate amount of attention criticizing Israel while ignoring more pressing human rights crises? If this is the case, how will you seek to change this situation?

Answer. Yes. Rather than focus on its efforts and energies on most egregious instances of human rights abuses around the world, in places like Burma, Zimbabwe, Sudan and elsewhere, the Human Rights Council has devoted an inordinate amount of attention, and a very counterproductive focus, on Israel, one of our closest allies. Our basic orientation will be that our ability to effect change is far greater if the U.S. is engaged diplomatically with friends and partners around the world to build a broad based understanding of the need to use these mechanisms for the purpose they were designed, and not allow them to be hijacked for other purposes.

Question. Many critics of the U.N. Human Rights Council point to our ability to work more effectively on human rights issues in the U.N. General Assembly's so-called Third Committee. Do you believe this to be the case and if so, how will you seek to push for greater exposure of human rights abuses in the Third Committee?

Answer. The United States has strong interest in making more effective use of the General Assembly's Third Committee in the consideration of issues relating to human rights, especially given the relationship between the Committee and the GA, and the attention accorded to actions by that body. At the same time, we also have a strong interest in working to enhance the credibility and effectiveness of all human rights institutions associated with the United Nations, including the Human Rights Council.

UNAIDS

Question. Zimbabwe is one of the 189 signatories to the United Nations General Assembly Session (UNGASS), Declaration of Commitment (DOC) to fighting of HIV and AIDS through a comprehensive multi-sectoral approach. Are they living up to their commitments under UNASS? Due to the present political situation, how much assistance overseen by UNIDS is getting to the people that need it?

Answer. The humanitarian situation in Zimbabwe is dire for all citizens, especially those living with HIV/AIDS. UNIDS' latest UNASS report paints a grim picture. Where there is sufficient data to evaluate progress, Zimbabwe falls far behind global averages, especially in antiretroviral treatment, prevention of mother to child transmission, and testing for HIV/AIDS. Given Zimbabwe is largely dependent on foreign assistance and faces severe human resource and supply challenges, according to UNIDS, it is unlikely that the trend of poor progress on their UNASS commitments will be reversed in the short term. It is clear that assistance from UNIDS is reaching some of those infected with HIV/AIDS in Zimbabwe, but not the vast majority. Donor assistance has increased over the past two years, yet positive progress has been negligible.

Question. The Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 specifies that 10 percent of the funding is dedicated to programs to assist those who are orphaned or have made vulnerable by HIV/AIDS. Is UNIDS doing enough to help those who are in this category?

Answer. The needs of the tens of millions of children orphaned or made vulnerable by HIV/AIDS are great, and this is a problem of enormous gravity—and personal importance—that I have seen firsthand during my travels in Africa. Fortunately, this issue has gained increased attention over the years in multilateral fora such as the United Nations General Assembly as well as through the actions of individual countries, including the United States. The simple answer is that this is a problem of large scale that cannot be addressed by a single government or institution. If confirmed, I would support additional U.S. action in this regard and engage with UNIDS, UNICEF, and other agencies, groups and governments to support and strengthen ongoing efforts to assist children affected by HIV/AIDS.

Middle East

Question. In recent years, the United States has exercised its veto in the Security Council on a number of occasions on resolutions dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. What role do you believe the Security Council should play with respect to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict? Do you see any potential for tension between Security Council involvement in this issue and effective efforts by the United States and its Quartet partners to promote successful direct negotiations between the Israeli and Palestinian sides?

Answer. Our goal should be to ensure that the Security Council plays a constructive role in every international issue in which it involves itself. When it is not poised to do so, the United States should not hesitate to ensure that the Security Council does not act, as we have to ensure that it does not pass resolutions that unfairly target the State of Israel. The United States should encourage the Security Council to adopt positions that are in harmony with the Quartet's efforts to promote Israeli-Palestinian peace efforts, and support them when it does.

Question. Some have suggested that the U.N. Relief and Work Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) be disbanded for activities inconsistent with its mandate; do you support this view? If not, what is the Obama administration's position on the strengths and weaknesses of UNWA?

Answer. UNRWA was founded by the United Nations in 1949 to provide direct relief and works to Palestinian refugees. Concerns have been raised because it does operate in regions where foreign terrorist organizations are present. U.S. law under the Foreign Assistance Act establishes conditions in order for UNRA to receive U.S. funding. For years, the State Department has conducted extensive monitoring of UNRA's activities, including by receiving semiannual reports from UNRA regarding its compliance with our laws and name checks against an international database of known names of terrorists. I expect that these monitoring efforts will continue.

Question. Based on the latest funding chart available on the UNWA website, the United States is the single largest donor with over 31.0 percent of the total funding for the years 2000-2007. The first country from the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) listed is Saudi Arabia at number 10 on the donor list, having given only 2.8 percent of the funding to UNRA over the same year. Why do you believe

the OIC has given so little to a cause for which it professes to have such deep passion? What will you do in your capacity as Permanent Representative to the U.N. to raise the level of OIC contributions to UNRA?

Answer. The United States is the largest bilateral donor to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). The United States strongly supports the mission of UNRWA, which provides education, health, relief, and social services to over 4.6 million Palestinian refugees in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, West Bank, and Gaza. I share your concern about insufficient support for UNRWA by many in the international community, including among the OIC states. The United States will continue to engage diplomatically to increase the donor base of UNRWA, and we will continue to use every available opportunity to solicit greater financial contributions from other member-states. The United States will also work closely with the Commissioner-General and others within the organization to ensure that UNRWA has a sound strategy to meet its urgent funding needs.

Question. As the largest single donor to UNRWA, are you comfortable with UNRWA's compliance with Section 301(c) requirements and UNRWA's overall accountability?

Answer. For years, the State Department has conducted extensive monitoring of UNRWA's activities, including by receiving semiannual reports from UNRWA regarding its compliance with our laws and name checks against an international database of known names of terrorists. I expect that these monitoring efforts will continue.

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for the Palestinian Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) has implemented several measures to ensure the neutrality of its staff and comply with Section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. UNRWA has long-standing staff regulations that outline the neutrality, integrity, and impartiality required of both international and locally hired U.N. staff. With USG encouragement and funding, UNRWA developed a monitoring regime using Operations Support Officers (OSOs) in West Bank and Gaza. These international staff help ensure that UNRWA's facilities are not being misused for political purposes or militant activity. The constant vigilance of the OSOs helps ensure the neutrality and integrity of these installations. Under procedures in place since 2002, the Commissioner General sends semi-annual reports as standing practice to the Department of State containing all relevant information regarding UNRWA's compliance with the Section 301(c) condition for funding, including documenting any abuses, or attempted abuses, of UNRWA facilities.

UNRWA also vets its current and prospective partner organizations against the U.N. 1267 Sanctions Committee list of terrorist organizations. On a semi-annual basis, UNRWA also checks the names of all persons and entities to whom or to which the Agency made payments against the U.N. sanctions list. From January 1-June 30, 2008, the most recent period, no matches were found. In late 2008, UNRWA for the first time checked the names of all their beneficiaries against the U.N. sanctions list and found no matches.

Finally, I understand that as a member of UNRWA's Advisory Commission, the United States receives regular updates on UNRWA's financial situation, as well as progress made against UNRWA's extensive management reform initiative. UNRWA's strong accountability and transparency is reflected in its active and open engagement with members of the Advisory Commission, including the United States.

Question. What is the status of the U.N. sponsored investigation into the 2004 murder of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri? Is it proceeding unfettered in your opinion? Is it receiving appropriate funding and support from the US and member states?

Answer. I am encouraged to see that the Tribunal will officially begin operations on March 1, but as the head prosecutor recently stated, it is unclear when the Tribunal will bring indictments. The Security Council established various safeguards to ensure an objective and expeditious judicial process. First, it includes provisions on enhanced powers, so the Tribunal may take independent measures to prevent unreasonable delays. Second, it mandated a transparent appointment process of international officials, including the judges and prosecutor. Third, it includes provisions on the rights of victims to present their views. The Security Council explicitly requested that the Tribunal be based on "the highest international standards of criminal justice," and I will work with our international allies to ensure this pledge is fulfilled. The Tribunal has sufficient funding, approximately \$51 million, for its first year of operation, and additional funds will need to be raised for years two and three.

Question. The November 18, 2008, report to the Secretary General on the implementation of UNCR 1701 regarding the conflict between Israel and Hezbollah stated "further progress in the implementation of the resolution is increasingly over-

due. The parties must make greater efforts to resolve the pending issues described in the present report that hinder a permanent ceasefire between Lebanon and Israel. Achieving this will require the determination and political will of all parties to the conflict, as well as continued strong international support.”

Will implementation of UNCR 1701 (and 1759) be a priority for the Obama administration? What can the United States do to promote more effective implementation of these resolutions? Are these the most effective tools for pushing for Hezbollah to disarm while maintaining stability in Lebanon?

Answer. Syria and Iran are in flagrant violation of Resolution 1701, as they continue to supply advanced weaponry to Hezbollah in Lebanon, which undermines Lebanese sovereignty and threatens to drag the region into another round of violence. President-elect Obama is committed to implementing U.N. Security Council Resolutions that reinforce Lebanon’s sovereignty. We need to work with our partners on the Security Council to consider additional measures to toughen penalties for violators, and strengthen enforcement tools. Additionally, the United States and others should work to strengthen the institutions of the Lebanese government to help it exercise its sovereignty throughout the country.

Question. Do you believe the U.N. can be helpful in resolving the Shebaa Farms dispute between Lebanon and Israel? If so, how? Is the U.N. viewed as an impartial player in this?

Answer. Various proposals have emerged for the United Nations to play a role in resolving the Shebaa Farms issue by, for example, taking control of the territory as a trusteeship until Lebanon and Israel reach a permanent peace agreement. The input of the parties is necessary to be able to evaluate these types of proposals. The U.N.’s historical role in Lebanon creates both opportunities and potential concerns about its involvement in the Shebaa Farms matter, so discussions with the parties are essential.

Iraq

Question. Following the Oil-for-Food scandal, and the tragic bombing of the U.N. headquarters at the Canal Hotel in August 2003, the U.N. Assistance Mission to Iraq (UNAMI) has had few major successes. Many Iraqis, particularly the Kurds, feel that in addition to being complicit in undermining sanctions, U.N. agencies took credit for work that was never done and were selective in their criticism of human rights abuses under Saddam. Foreign Minister Zebari, in a speech at the U.N. in December 2003, stated, “The United Nations as an organization failed to help rescue the Iraqi people from a murderous tyranny that lasted over 35 years and today we are unearthing thousands of victims in horrifying testament to that failure. The United Nations must not fail the Iraqi people again.” What is your assessment of UNMI’s work in Iraq? What can the U.S. do to help the U.N. and its agencies regain its credibility in Iraq?

Answer. It is first worth recalling the extent of the U.N.’s efforts and sacrifice in Iraq during the post-war period. The U.N. sent its finest to Baghdad, and it was the U.N. Mission in Baghdad that suffered one of the first major attacks, tragically killing the U.N.’s envoy and noted diplomat Sergio Vieira de Mello and many other U.N. officials. DeMello, Lakhdar Brahimi, and others from the U.N. played important roles in promoting the political process in those critical early years, and the United Nations will continue to play a significant, important role to help Iraq become more secure and stable. The U.N. has already demonstrated its useful role in key areas, including preparations for multiple and critical elections scheduled in 2009; efforts to help resolve the status of disputed territories (especially Kirkuk); and humanitarian assistance to internally displaced persons and others. The U.S. and its partners need to work constructively with the U.N., which will be a key component of the international community’s contribution to Iraqi stability. A strengthened U.N. role in Iraq will promote governance, support elections, strengthen political institutions, improve coordination of development, and enhance regional security.

Question. Has the U.N. mission in Iraq (UNAMI) made its final recommendation on how it will implement article 140 of the Iraqi constitution regarding the status of the disputed territories? If not, when can we expect it, or is something delaying the announcement?

Answer. UNAMI has yet to make its final recommendation on article 140 of the Iraqi constitution. It is expected to release its second and final set of proposals—including on Kirkuk and disputed districts in Al-Anbar and Al-Karbala—shortly after the January 31 provincial elections.

Question. I understand that the U.N. Security Council may consider as soon as today a proposal to use the U.N. assessed peacekeeping budget to fund material support for the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM). The Department of State notified the Committee of this proposal only late yesterday. I am concerned that using the U.N. budget to pay the expenses of non-UN peacekeeping operations will set a dangerous precedent that may lead regional organizations to look to the U.N. to fund their operations on a routine basis. It would also place further strain on the already stretched resources available for U.N. peacekeeping. In addition, I am concerned that there are not adequate mechanisms in place to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of resources transferred from the U.N. to the AU. Do you share these concerns? Do you agree that there are better alternative means for the international community to support the efforts of regional organization peacekeeping operations, including through the use of foreign assistance funds? If confirmed, will you work to ensure that the U.N. peacekeeping budget is not used to pay the expenses of non-UN operations?

Answer. On January 16, the Security Council unanimously approved the resolution that enabled the U.N. to use pre-commitment authority to provide equipment and services to support AMISOM. Given the uncertainty about a follow-on U.N. peacekeeping operation, this is an unusual use of precommitment authority. At the same time, it is important to U.S. national security interests that AMISOM be reinforced with equipment and services. I understand there will be no cash transfers. More generally, it is also clear that the international community must develop means to more reliably support critical regional peace operations that take place outside U.N. auspices while ensuring accountability.

Question. The United Nations Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) headed by SRSG Kai Eide received a renewed annual mandate from the U.N. Security Council on March 20, 2008, that further defined the lead role for UNMA in international civilian efforts. Shortly before the mandate was approved by the UNC, the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. suggested some priorities for the new SRSG and UNMA including:

- i. the essential bolstering of the international commitment to Afghanistan;
 - ii. the coordination and integration of international efforts;
 - iii. providing highly motivated and capable people with the right skills in Afghanistan, as well as sufficiently robust funding and security assets for them.
- To what extent has UNMA and the new SRSG achieved improved effectiveness in their mandate since March 2008?
 - Will the Obama administration seek to bolster the UNMA role? If so what primary purpose do you see for UNMA going forward in the near to mid-term?
 - Should UNMA concentrate its efforts on one or two significant programs, such as the elections expected this year and next?

Answer. My understanding is that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Kai Eide of Norway, is working to implement the Council's mandate for a re-energized U.N. approach to Afghanistan. To that end, efforts are underway to augment UNMA staffing to enhance efforts on elections, institution-building, humanitarian assistance, and development.

Furthermore, the General Assembly, with strong leadership and support from the United States, recently approved an increase in UNMA's budget and staffing.

The President-elect considers Afghanistan to be one of the highest-priority foreign policy challenges for the United States. I expect that the new administration will review the work of UNMA in the context of the broader U.S. strategy for Afghanistan, and look for ways to support a U.N. role that adds value to our objectives. Of particular significance is UNMA's support and assistance to the preparations for elections that are currently scheduled for later this year and 2010. Another major priority is better integration and coordination of the work of the various U.N. development agencies in the field. Any enhanced U.N. role should be expanded in consultation with Afghan counterparts and key international stakeholders.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO SUSAN E. RICE
BY SENATOR ROBERT P. CASEY, JR.

UN Response to Iraqi Refugee Crisis

Question. Credible reports indicate that up to two million Iraqis have fled to neighboring countries. The Iraqi refugee crisis is contributing to the largest population movement in the Middle East since Israel was created. My home state of

Pennsylvania has directly been impacted by the Iraqi refugee crisis as it has been a leader in resettling Iraqi refugees here in America. Since the mid-1970s, more than 100,000 refugees have made Pennsylvania their home and I am proud of this tradition.

However, as the United States looks to redeploy troops in Iraq, we must remember our moral responsibility to those innocent Iraqis who have been driven from their homes and to those who risked their lives to serve the United States.

I witnessed firsthand the challenges facing Iraqi refugees last August when I spent time in Jordan. They have become increasingly desperate and have no where to turn. In the last Congress, I introduced the Support for Vulnerable and Displaced Iraqis Act of 2008 to require the State Department to formulate a comprehensive strategy to respond to the mass displacement of Iraqi citizens.

Can you please outline what efforts the Obama administration is likely to take to assist the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees, the lead agency responding to the Iraqi refugee crisis?

Answer. The President-elect believes that the United States has a moral obligation and a responsibility for security that demands that we address Iraq's humanitarian challenge. The magnitude of this challenge requires a comprehensive approach developed working with the Iraqi government, the regional states, the United Nations and other institutions to address the full range of needs—humanitarian assistance directly to the refugees and displaced persons, assistance to host countries, assistance to facilitate repatriation, assistance to help integration, and expanded resettlement. This will require substantial resources. As you have noted, the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees (UNHCR) is playing, and will continue to play, a leading role. The President-elect has committed the U.S. to expand its support to Iraqi refugees and displaced persons.

Sexual Abuse by U.N. Peacekeepers

Question. In May 2008, sexual abuse allegations by U.N. peacekeepers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo were reported. Before this Committee last year, the Acting Assistant Secretary for International Organizations Affairs testified that allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse of women and children in conflict zones severely hampered the effectiveness of U.N. peacekeepers.

The United Nations has recently instituted preventative and disciplinary action to carry out its policy of zero tolerance. Ensuring that those who have taken an oath to protect do not become the predators, what other actions do you feel are necessary to halt these kinds of abuses?

Answer. The incidents of sexual exploitation are totally reprehensible and unacceptable. This issue calls for the utmost attention and effort from the U.N. leadership and the member states, as these scandals strike at the heart of the purpose and value of the United Nations. I believe the U.N.'s top leaders understand the magnitude of this threat. They are right to adopt a policy of zero tolerance. A range of steps have been taken, including disciplinary measures, a new model Memorandum of Understanding between the U.N. and troop-contributing countries covering standards, and the waiving of immunity, but more needs to be done. The U.S. will continue to work with other member states to follow up on actions taken by troop- or police-contributing governments against personnel dismissed from U.N. missions for engaging in inappropriate or abusive behavior. As a woman and a mother, I take this issue personally and will follow it closely, if confirmed. Unless we make every effort to end this problem, the legitimacy and credibility of the United Nations in the eyes of the very peoples that the U.N. is supposed to protect will erode dangerously. I will press this issue not just within the U.N. system but also with member states in order to expand the consensus, examine potential additional steps, and focus on ensuring full implementation of the steps taken to date.

Question. How do resource constraints affect the ability of the U.N. to battle sexual abuse as well as other misconduct such as mismanagement and corruption within its ranks?

Answer. As I noted during the confirmation hearing, the United Nations is being asked to do more than ever before and yet resources and capacities have not been aligned with the mandates that member states are giving the U.N. This is manifest in U.N. management and oversight as well as program capacities, particularly in the realm of peacekeeping. With some 90,000 peacekeepers in 16 U.N. missions—more than ever before, the U.N. needs greater capacity for training, monitoring and oversight. The United States has supported the recent efforts to restructure the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and to establish a Peacebuilding Commission to deal with the challenges of post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. These efforts are a start, not an end in themselves and effective implementation will re-

quire additional resources. As I noted during the confirmation hearing, the President-elect, the Secretary-designate and I believe that the United States should pay its U.N. dues, including our peacekeeping assessment, on time and in full.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO SUSAN E. RICE
BY SENATOR DAVID VITTER

Question. What are your views regarding the status within the international system of the independent, sovereign state in general, and the importance of preserving and protecting American sovereignty in particular? Do you ascribe to traditional views of national sovereignty or to the theory of “global governance?”

Answer. As I stated at the confirmation hearing, if I am confirmed, I will always advocate and defend the United States’ national interest at the United Nations. No U.S. administration will ever or could ever cede sovereignty to an international body or to any other institution.

President-election Obama, Vice President-elect Biden, Secretary-designate Clinton and I believe that U.S. interests are, to a great extent, served by the United Nations when the U.N. is operating effectively. Too often, we are faced with difficult options when addressing international challenges: doing nothing in the face of violence or conflict or atrocities, and allowing threats and risks to fester. Second, the United States can act unilaterally, often at great cost in lives and treasure. Or, third, the United States can join together with allies and partners and other nations, and share the burden of addressing collective challenges. Given that the costs of inaction or unilateral action are very often so high, the Obama administration believes that it is in the U.S. national security interest to invest in strengthening the United Nations to make it a more effective tool to share the burdens and costs of meeting global challenges.

Question. An issue you will have to focus on quickly is the World Conference Against Racism, commonly known as Durban II and scheduled for this April. The preparations for the conference are well underway. Unfortunately, it appears likely to reinforce the intolerance and anti-Semitism of the previous Durban meeting. Several countries have already indicated they will not attend and the stated U.S. position is that unless major progress is made in ameliorating these problems, we will not attend either.

Should the U.S. attend the Durban II conference?

What is the policy of the incoming administration on attending the conference? What changes do you think are necessary to make it possible for the U.S. to attend?

Answer. Racism is and remains a serious global challenge that merits our sustained effort, attention, and involvement. It is appropriate to convene an international conference on this subject. As you have stated, the problem is that in the past, and potentially now as we head towards the conference in April, rather than focus on racism, some member states and some nongovernmental organizations have instead sought to equate Israel’s actions with racism and promote an atmosphere of hate and anti-Semitism. This is highly offensive and a distortion of the meaning of the term racism. It merits our strongest objections.

The question is how to proceed. The President-elect believes that we should make early efforts to determine whether early U.S. engagement could enable the upcoming conference and its draft document to be improved, refocused on racism, and stripped of the offensive language that we find abhorrent. If this is not possible, then we—as well as other member states that respect basic principles of justice and equity—should not participate in April.

Question. In its first few months, the Obama administration will decide whether to change existing U.S. policy to attend the Durban Review Conference (Durban II) and fully participate in the United Nations Human Rights Council by seeking a seat in the upcoming May election. Would you recommend that the President continue current policy or reverse it?

Answer. Regarding the Human Rights Council, the United States has a deep interest in ensuring strong global mechanisms to uphold the respect for human rights. The President-elect is committed to enforcing respect for human rights. As I stated during the confirmation hearing, there is no question that the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) has been seriously flawed and a major disappointment. Rather than focus on its efforts and energies on most egregious instances of human rights abuses around the world, in places like Burma, Zimbabwe, Sudan and elsewhere, the HRC has devoted an inordinate amount of attention, and a very counterproductive focus, on Israel, one of our closest allies.

The Obama administration intends to work to strengthen the United Nations human rights mechanisms so that they focus on the world's most egregious human rights abusers. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the President-elect—and consulting with this Committee—as we review whether and when to run for election to a seat on the Council. Whether or not we seek election, our basic orientation will be that our ability to effect change is far greater if we are engaged diplomatically with friends and partners around the world to build a broad-based understanding of the need to use these mechanisms for the purpose they were designed, and not allow them to be hijacked for other purposes.

Regarding the upcoming Durban II conference, see answer to the previous question.

Question. The U.N. is charged with many serious responsibilities and tasks. Yet, as evidenced by the well-publicized scandals involving the Iraq Oil-for-Food program and recent revelations of corruption in U.N. procurement, the U.N. all too often has proven vulnerable to corruption and fraud, unaccountable in its activities, lacking in transparency and oversight, and duplicative and inefficient in its allocation of resources. What specifically would you do to address these problems?

Question. As I noted in the confirmation hearing, I agree that no one can be fully satisfied with the performance of the United Nations, and too often we are dismayed. The United States must press for high standards and bring to its dealings with the U.N. high expectations of its performance and accountability. The Oil-for-Food scandal underscored the need for institutional reform in the U.N. system to ensure greater transparency and accountability. The subsequent investigations and prosecutions served as a wake up call across the U.N. system and prompted more robust efforts to address corruption and mismanagement.

If I am confirmed, I will be committed to working to ensure that the U.N. is maximally effective and efficient. The United Nations has made some notable progress on reform, dating back to 1994 with the establishment of the Office of Internal Oversight Services to strengthen its capacity to ensure that money being spent is being well accounted for. To date, OIOS recommendations have saved the U.N. and the taxpayer an estimated \$200 million. The U.N. has developed an internal audit and an inspector general capability, strengthened whistleblower protections, and enhanced financial disclosure requirements for U.N. staff. More recently we have seen efforts to reorient and restructure the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and to establish a Peacebuilding Commission to deal with the challenges of post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. The procurement task force has substantially improved the U.N.'s procurement operations and has uncovered over \$650 million in faulty contracts. So there have been important steps taken. But more must be done.

My top priorities for U.N. reform would be financial accountability, management efficiency, transparency, ethics and internal oversight, and program effectiveness in areas such as peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and mediation. A key challenge now is ensuring effective implementation of ongoing initiatives and preventing them from being watered down or weakened, even as we consider what further steps should be taken to improve U.N. effectiveness and ability to address the challenges of the 21st century. I believe firmly that it is not enough to ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are not being wasted. We must insist that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being spent effectively and accomplishing their intended goals.

Question. Information provided by UNP whistleblowers to the U.S. Mission to the United Nations in 2006 led the U.S. to investigate the practices and activities of UNP in North Korea. U.N. and independent audits concluded that these activities directly violated U.N. and UNP standard operating procedures and basic “best practices.”¹ Current law requires the U.S. to withhold 20 percent of U.S. contributions to the UNP unless the Secretary of State certifies that UNP has given the U.S. adequate access to information on its programs and activities, is conducting appropriate oversight of UNP programs and activities globally, and is implementing a whistleblower protection policy equivalent to that of the U.N. Ethics Office. Would you agree that such a certification is not merited at this time?

Answer. I take very seriously my responsibility to the U.S. taxpayer to ensure that our U.N. contributions are well-spent and well-managed. I also take very seriously compliance with U.S. law. It is clearly in our interest for the UNP to be as

¹Brett D. Schaefer and Steven Groves, “Congress Should Withhold Funds from the U.N. Development Program,” WebMemo #1783, January 26, 2008, at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/>; and George Russell, “Report Shows U.N. Development Program Violated U.N. Law, Routinely Passed on Millions to North Korean Regime,” Fox News, Jun 11, 2008, at <http://coburn.senate.gov/ffm/index.cfm>.

efficient and transparent as possible and to not facilitate any illicit activity in the countries in which it has programs. And, to take this one step further, it is vital that Member States—including the United States Government—have access to all information necessary to have confidence in UNP programs. I understand that in October 2008, the State Department did report to Congress that the UNP had met the three criteria set out in the transparency and accountability provision of section 668(b) (1)(2)(3) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2008 (Div. J, P.L. 110–161). If I am confirmed, I will closely evaluate the certification requirement pertaining to the UNP and work very closely with the Secretary-designate to examine how best to ensure that U.S. funds, whether they are provided to the UNP or any other multilateral institution, are spent consistent with U.S. national interests and U.S. law.

Question. U.N. peacekeeping is now being conducted with unprecedented pace, scope, and ambition, and increasing demands have revealed ongoing, serious flaws. Specifically, recent audits and investigations have uncovered substantial problems with mismanagement, fraud, and corruption in procurement for U.N. peacekeeping, and incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. peacekeepers and civilian personnel have been shockingly widespread. Please explain the steps that have been taken by the U.N. to address these problems, why they have failed to address the situation, and what specific policies and reforms you would pursue to address these ongoing problems?

Answer. The incidents of sexual exploitation are totally reprehensible and unacceptable. This issue calls for the utmost attention and effort from the U.N. leadership and the member states, as these scandals strike at the heart of the purpose and value of the United Nations. I believe the U.N.'s top leaders understand the magnitude of this threat. They are right to adopt a policy of zero tolerance. A range of steps have been taken, including disciplinary measures, a new model Memorandum of Understanding between the U.N. and troop-contributing countries covering standards, and the waiving of immunity, but more needs to be done. The U.S. will continue to work with other member states to follow up on actions taken by troop- or police-contributing governments against personnel dismissed from U.N. missions for engaging in inappropriate or abusive behavior. As a woman and a mother, I take this issue personally and will follow it closely, if confirmed. Unless we make every effort to end this problem, the legitimacy and credibility of the United Nations in the eyes of the very peoples that the U.N. is supposed to protect will erode dangerously.

I pledge to work tirelessly to ensure that every American taxpayer dollar is spent wisely, effectively, and efficiently. The United States will weigh very carefully the merits of existing and proposed U.N. peace operations, and we will continue to evaluate ongoing preventive measures that have been undertaken as a result of recent scandals. The United States will also continue to strongly support an independent and effective Office of Internal Oversight Services, including the integration of the U.N. Procurement Task Force. Finally, the United States has supported recent efforts to reorient and restructure the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and to establish a Peacebuilding Commission to deal with the challenges of post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction—in part to ensure more robust training and oversight of U.N. peace operations.

Question. The United States has long maintained a policy—one backed by presidents of both parties—of opposing the many one-sided Security Council resolutions that, more often than not, criticize Israel, but fail to address other issues, such as Palestinian terrorism. More than forty-one anti-Israel Security Council resolutions have been vetoed by the United States over the years.

Do you support the use of the American veto to block one-sided anti-Israel resolutions in the Security Council?

What do you believe should be the standard employed in deciding whether to veto or not?

Answer. Yes. The United States has a long history of using its veto at the Security Council to ensure that it does not pass resolutions that unfairly target the State of Israel. Each proposed resolution must be judged on its merits, and the Obama administration will act in our interest in the Security Council. I don't want to speculate on what future resolutions might look like. When it is in the U.S. interest, we will use our veto as necessary.

Question. On the nuclear front, the Director-General of the IAEA, Mohamed El-Baradei, recently said Iran could produce enough enriched uranium for a nuclear bomb in six months to a year. Though the Security Council has passed three resolutions imposing sanctions on Iran for its refusal to suspend its enrichment activity,

overall, the response has been weak with efforts to impose harsher sanctions repeatedly being delayed and diluted by Russia and China. Iran has also violated the U.N. charter, calling for the destruction of Israel, a fellow member.

As U.N. Ambassador, how high on your agenda is the issue of Iran? What do you believe should be done at the Security Council regarding the Iranian nuclear threat?

What steps will the Obama administration push early this year? What do you believe can be done to get better cooperation from Russia and China?

Answer. The President-elect has said that the prospect of an Iran armed with nuclear weapons is unacceptable, and poses a great threat to our national security and to the security and stability of the region and the world. As I stated during the confirmation hearing, Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapons will continue to demand the attention of the U.N. Security Council as a central element of the U.S. agenda. The President-elect believes that the U.S. should pursue a strategy that employs all policy tools at our disposal, first and foremost direct, vigorous, and principled diplomacy integrated with effective pressure, including sanctions, and close cooperation with our "P-5 plus 1" partners, other members of the U.N. Security Council, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other partners around the world. It is this kind of comprehensive, integrated strategy that will improve the prospects of more unified action by the U.N. Security Council to enforce existing resolutions on Iran and, as appropriate, pursue additional sanctions.

As I noted during the confirmation hearing, the United States has a wide and complex set of interests when it comes to Russia and China. The Obama administration will conduct these relationships by seeking to maximize our shared interests and common objectives, notably with respect to the challenge of Iran's nuclear program, while also recognizing that there will be instances and areas of difference. If confirmed, I will reach out to my Russian and Chinese colleagues early and often in an effort to develop pragmatic working relationships with both countries at the U.N. I will work to build these relationships to try to maximize their willingness to join us on issues where we share common interests vital to our national security.

Question. Can and should Iran's status at the United Nations—particularly its leadership role in key committees—be challenged if it continues to call for the destruction of Israel and continues to violate multiple mandatory Security Council resolutions calling upon it to cease its nuclear enrichment program?

Answer. The U.S. will seriously review Iran's bids for leadership positions in the United Nations. In recent years, the United States has persistently opposed Iran's candidacy for such positions. For example, in October 2008, despite its intense lobbying of other members, Iran was resoundingly defeated by a vote of 158 to 32 in the General Assembly secret ballot for a non-permanent (two-year) membership on the U.N. Security Council.

Question. Would you oppose decisions by international bodies—whether sanctioned by treaties or not that would impede the movement and operations of the U.S. Navy?

Answer. Yes, the United States would oppose such decisions. The United States controls the movement and operations of the U.S. Navy.

Question. Would you support efforts by American companies to explore mineral resources in the ocean on their own, outside multilateral treaties or organizations?

Answer. U.S. law (the Deep Seabed Hard Minerals Resources Act of 1980), which contemplates international regulation of seabed mining beyond U.S. jurisdiction, requires any U.S. company wishing to exploit mineral resources in the deep seabed to apply for a permit from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Under the existing international regime, most other countries of the world would be bound not to honor such a permit. The Obama administration supports maximizing legal certainty and international recognition of the outer limits of the U.S. continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles to promote and support U.S. commercial exploration of seabed mineral resources. This is most effectively achieved through U.S. accession to the Law of the Sea Convention.

Question. Regarding national sovereignty, what is the bright line beyond which you will not compromise the United States' position?

Answer. As I stated at the confirmation hearing, if I am confirmed, I will always advocate and defend the United States' national interest at the United Nations consistent with U.S. sovereignty. As with all past administrations, the Obama administration will be guided by the interests of our country and our people.

Question. In a world supposedly beset by more and more global problems and by calls for global solutions, what role do you see for the US continuing to act as a sovereign nation, rather than as one entity in a global village?

Answer. I agree that in the 21st century, the United States and the world face urgent global threats, challenges, and opportunities. Terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, civil conflict, climate change, genocide, extreme poverty, and deadly infectious disease are shared challenges that no single nation can defeat alone. It is because our security at home is affected by instability, violence, disease, or failed states in far corners of the world that the President-elect has affirmed America's commitment to the United Nations as an indispensable, if imperfect, institution for advancing our security and well-being in the 21st century. He has made it clear that we must pursue a national security strategy, based on America's interests and security, that builds strong international partnerships to tackle global challenges through the integration of all aspects of American power—military and diplomatic; economic and legal; cultural and moral. The Obama administration will invest in the United Nations as a sovereign nation in pursuit of our national interests. Like all U.S. presidents, President-elect Obama will never hesitate to take the action necessary to protect this country and secure our interests.

Question. The resources of the Arctic are becoming accessible. Should these resources be allocated by the five nations bordering the region, or should every nation in the world participate?

Answer. Rights over resources depend upon such factors as the nature of the resources and their location. Coastal States have complete sovereignty within their 12-mile territorial seas, for example. A coastal State is entitled to sovereign rights over natural resources within 200 nautical miles from its shores. A coastal State also enjoys sovereign rights with respect to resources (but not the water column above) of the continental shelf beyond 200 nm to the extent the area meets the relevant criteria under international law. (Parties to the Law of the Sea Convention have access to a procedure that will maximize legal certainty and international recognition of the outer limits of the continental shelf beyond 200 nm.) Where there are overlapping maritime claims with respect to any of these areas between opposite or adjacent States, it is up to those States to agree bilaterally on the boundary between them. A separate regime would apply to the exploitation of mineral resources in areas of the Arctic beyond any State's jurisdiction.

Question. As you may be aware, there have been calls, for example by a former official in the Clinton administration's State Department named Nigel Purvis with the Brookings Institute (in a paper for Resources for the Future), that the U.S. should disband with the practice of seeking Senate ratification of environmental agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol. Given that many parties have suggested the U.S. will certainly join to a Kyoto successor expected to be negotiated this year, this issue is one of concern to me.

Note that despite many inaccurate media reports, the U.S. signed Kyoto during the Clinton administration (November 12, 1998), and despite two presidents choosing to not ask the Senate to ratify, it never officially rescinded that signature. As the Senate has not sought to push the issue of ratifying the signed treaty, either, it is fair to say there is a demonstrated lack of Senate support for such an agreement.

Still, this position argues that, given Kyoto's history in the Senate, a successor protocol should be entered but this time not treated as a treaty, but instead called a congressional-executive agreement thereby getting around the obviously unattainable two-thirds requirement. This also would ensure a no amendment, no filibuster vote on the agreement.

Now, it seems clear that the courts, should they take this potentially "political question," would look with disfavor on an effort so transparently reactive to a lack of two-thirds Senate support. Regardless, it seems we should want to avoid such disputes altogether. So, do you agree that such an important, potentially economically significant agreement should be entered in this fashion, or do you agree that any Kyoto successor or Kyoto-style treaty should continue to be treated by the U.S. as a treaty for purposes of Senate ratification?

Answer. As the President-elect has said, the world is in need of an urgent response to climate change and United States must be a leader in developing and implementing it. The Obama administration intends to consult closely and often with Congress regarding climate change. The content, form, and implementation of any international agreement will be consistent with the U.S. Constitution and a subject for close consultation with the Senate.

Question. President-elect Obama has never endorsed the International Criminal Court treaty. Senator Hillary Clinton has never endorsed the International Criminal Court treaty either. Will you, if confirmed, actively seek ratification of the International Criminal Court treaty?

Answer. The President-elect believes strongly that it is in the U.S. national interest to have effective mechanisms of international justice. Now that the ICC has been operational for some years, we are learning more about how the ICC functions. Thus far, the ICC has acted with professionalism and fairness, pursuing perpetrators of truly serious crimes, like genocide in Darfur, and atrocities in the Congo and Uganda. The President-elect intends for the United States to continue to support the ICC's investigations of perpetrators of genocide in Darfur and, working with our allies, to shape the court. The United States will be a leader in bringing war criminals to justice, consistent with U.S. policy interests and with U.S. law.

The United States has more troops deployed overseas than any nation. As commander in chief, the President-elect will want to make sure that they have maximum protection. We intend to consult thoroughly with military commanders and other experts, and examine the full track record of the ICC, before reaching any decision on whether to join the ICC. A very important element of this evaluation will be engaging with, and understanding the views of, Congress, particularly this Committee.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO SUSAN E. RICE
BY SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ

Darfur

Question. I applaud the stand you have taken concerning genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan. I have long been at the forefront of trying to put a stop to this, as I know you have been as well.

What steps can the U.S. take to speed up the deployment of peacekeepers and otherwise improve the security situation in Darfur?

Answer. President-elect Obama, Vice President-elect Biden, Secretary-designate Clinton and I have been very clear and forceful in our condemnation of the genocide in Sudan and in our commitment to far more robust actions to try and end it. As I stated during the confirmation hearing, the pace of UNAMID's deployment needs to be accelerated, combined with sufficient logistical support to protect civilians on the ground, and this will be an urgent focus of mine, if I am confirmed. We need to send a clear message to Khartoum that they must end obstruction of the U.N. force (UNAMID), including through endless bureaucratic hurdles and delays. We also need to address some of the U.N.'s own requirements that have inadvertently slowed UNAMID's deployment thus far.

Question. Assuming the international community is able to deploy all 26,000 UNAMID peacekeepers in the near term. What is your assessment of how this will change the situation on the ground in Darfur? Is it likely that people in IDP camps will return to their areas of origin? Will 26,000 be able to provide sufficient security for the entire Darfur region? What are the major risks to this deployment?

Answer. Full deployment of the UNAMID force, including much-needed logistics and communications units, should enable the mission to more effectively and comprehensively protect civilians in Darfur. But lasting security that would encourage the displaced to return to and rebuild their homes cannot be achieved without a comprehensive political solution that enfranchises and empowers the people of Darfur. Failure to ensure that UNAMID is fully deployed and adequately resourced would gravely threaten the mission, as would failure to achieve a political solution to the crisis.

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement

Question. The genocide in Darfur has moved attention away from the extremely important Comprehensive Peace Agreement which was signed in 2005. If the peace agreement fails and there are no consequences for failing to adhere to the Agreement, the citizens of Sudan will suffer greatly. I see a direct correlation between success of the CPA, and any progress in Darfur.

What can the U.S. do to ensure success in the implementation of the CPA?

Answer. I agree that the success of the CPA and resolution of the crisis in Darfur are inextricably connected, and believe that policy toward Sudan must take a comprehensive approach. The United States will demonstrate strong recommitment to CPA implementation and work with international partners toward this end, includ-

ing by assisting all relevant parties to prepare for safe, free, and fair elections in 2009 and working to achieve a viable wealth-sharing agreement for Abyei.

Question. With its oil revenues falling (assuming this continues), and less cash available to Southern Darfur, is there a window of opportunity for ending coercive politics, and for the international community to work more effectively with Sudan to finally end the genocide in Darfur?

Answer. It is possible that falling oil revenues will require the Government of Sudan to make greater effort to build consensus in taking federal decisions. The United States and the rest of the international community should explore every potential opportunity to end the genocide in Darfur and promote justice and peace in Sudan. That said, we must always be mindful of the Government of Sudan's record of abusive policies and unfulfilled commitments.

Iran

Question. Iran poses a major challenge for the U.S. and its allies. It is the world's leading state sponsor of terror, openly threatens the existence of U.N. member states, and is working toward achieving a nuclear weapons capability. In June 2008, Mohamed El-Baradei, the director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency, said that if it chose to do so, Iran could produce enough enriched uranium to make a nuclear bomb in six months to a year. Though the Security Council has passed resolutions imposing sanctions on Iran for its refusal to suspend its enrichment activity, these resolutions have not dissuaded the Iranians. Efforts to impose harsher sanctions have been delayed or watered down by Russia and China.

Given the current circumstances, what course of action should the U.S. take at the Security Council regarding the Iranian nuclear threat?

Answer. The President-elect has said that the prospect of an Iran armed with nuclear weapons is unacceptable, and poses a great threat to our national security and to the security and stability of the region and the world. As I stated during the confirmation hearing, Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapons will continue to demand the attention of the U.N. Security Council as a central element of the U.S. agenda. The President-elect believes that the U.S. should pursue a strategy that employs all policy tools at our disposal, first and foremost direct, vigorous, and principled diplomacy integrated with effective pressure, including sanctions, and close cooperation with our "P-5 plus 1" partners, other members of the U.N. Security Council, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other partners around the world. It is this kind of comprehensive, integrated strategy that will improve the prospects of more unified action by the U.N. Security Council to enforce existing resolutions on Iran and, as appropriate, pursue additional sanctions.

U.N. Millennium Development Goals

Question. In the year 2000, the international community agreed to a set of goals such as cutting global poverty in half by 2015, putting every child in school, tackling preventable diseases, and other critical development objectives. While significant progress has been made in several regions, many countries, particularly in Africa, continue to lag behind on progress towards these objectives. President Elect Obama has stated that he will make the U.N. Millennium Development Goals official U.S. policy, and that he expects to see progress in meeting the Goals by the end of his first term, including reducing by half the number of people living on less than a dollar a day and suffering from hunger, and reversing the number of new HIV infections and malaria cases.

How would you work with our foreign assistance agencies, and with NGOs, to coordinate U.S. development assistance with the Millennium Development goals?

Answer. As you note, the President-elect is committed to integrating the Millennium Development Goals into U.S. foreign policy. The President-elect, the Secretary-designate and I intend to strengthen the civilian aspects of foreign policy including diplomacy and development by increasing foreign aid and by empowering our diplomatic and development experts to use their knowledge to manage programs creatively. Officials and NGOs are often working in the same regions to meet the same challenges. The Obama administration will work constructively with NGOs, some of which are already working to advance the MDGs. For example, at the September 25, 2008, conference on the Millennium Development Goals in New York, NGOs, such as the Gates Foundation, made important pledges in support of these global objectives. Sustained dialogue with NGO partners will be an important element of the Obama administration's approach in this regard.

Responsibility to Protect

Question. The U.S. has endorsed the concept that the international community has a responsibility to protect civilians from genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity, when a state is unable or unwilling to do so. While the responsibility to protect, or R2P, may include some forms of military intervention as a last resort, there is a great deal that can be done, short of military action, to prevent genocide and mass atrocities.

Currently, there is no mechanism within the U.N. to coordinate the collection of information on potential threats of genocide and mass atrocities. The U.N. Secretary General is expected to release his first report very soon on implementing the Responsibility to Protect in the U.N. system. One likely proposal in that report will be the creation of a mass atrocities “early warning” office at the U.N., to collect information, assess, and warn of threats of mass atrocities.

Do you support the creation of a U.N. mass atrocities early warning office?

Answer. Yes. The Responsibility to Protect is a multi-faceted doctrine that begins with prevention and encompasses the entire range of policy options up to, and including, the use of force, to encourage and enable countries to act in a fashion that protects those within their borders and prevent them from being attacked and harmed. As I noted during the confirmation hearing, I agree with you that there has been a gap between the expectations that the norm created and the realities on the ground, including regarding the international community’s ability to identify potential threats of genocide and mass atrocities. Development of a more effective and reliable process for assessing risk and providing early warning should be a priority.

UNDPA

Question. The second initiative involves the U.N. Department of Political Affairs (DPA), which currently has a staff of only 223 employees. To bolster DPA’s presence and peacemaking ability, Under Secretary General for Political Affairs Lynn B. Pascoe asked the General Assembly to increase personnel at DPA by 100 posts. The General Assembly decided to table this proposal until 2009.

What is your view on expanding the size of the U.N. Department of Political Affairs?

Answer. Conflict prevention is an essential, yet comparatively weak, component of the United Nation’s work. The United States has long supported the strengthening of the Department of Political Affairs, which means improving the focus and quality of its work—not just the number of employees. I understand that the most recent U.N. budget agreement included 49 new posts, as well as flexibility for how to deploy some of the senior posts within DPA. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Secretary-General and other member states to promote further enhancements to DPA’s work.

Human Rights at the U.N.

Question. The U.N. Human Rights Council, created in 2006 to replace the U.N. Human Rights Commission, was criticized by the outgoing administration as being only marginally better than the body it replaced, and the United States did not seek to become a member of the Council. I would note that the criteria for membership on the Human Rights Council is not very exacting, as states that are under U.N. sanctions for human rights abuses are allowed to be members. The Human Rights Council has also focused on allegations of human rights violations by Israel, while failing to confront human rights abusers such as Iran, Burma, Sudan, and North Korea.

The Human Rights Council is currently in a five-year incubation period that ends in 2011. Do you think the Human Rights Council, as it is currently set up, should become a permanent U.N. body at the end of that period?

Answer. We have a deep interest in ensuring strong global mechanisms to uphold the respect for human rights. The President-elect is committed to enforcing respect for human rights. There is no question that the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) has been seriously flawed and a major disappointment. Rather than focus its efforts and energies on most egregious instances of human rights abuses around the world, in places like Burma, Zimbabwe, Sudan and elsewhere, the HRC has devoted an inordinate amount of attention, and a very counterproductive focus, on Israel, one of our closest allies. The Obama administration intends to work to strengthen the United Nations human rights mechanisms, including the Human Rights Council, so that they focus on the world’s most egregious human rights abusers. The incoming Obama administration has not made a decision regarding the future of the Human

Rights Council beyond the 2011 deadline, and will evaluate this issue based on the principles outlined above.

In your view, what is the best way for human rights issues to be brought up and addressed at the UN?

Answer. Promoting and defending human rights has been a principle priority of the United States and other U.N. members states since the founding of the United Nations, and it is among the core principles of the United Nations. The Obama administration will seek to advance human rights across the full spectrum of venues, institutions, and opportunities at the United Nations. And, there is a wide range of international norms and standards and several international institutions in which to do so. The body of international human rights standards that are now widely acknowledged (if not always respected) by nearly all the governments were in great measure developed within the United Nations system. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which the United States is a party, were developed by the Human Rights Commission. These and other instruments have been, and will continue to be, important tools used to press for an end to violations of human dignity and for the promotion of civil and political rights. Similarly, the United Nations has played a key role in the development of treaties signed or ratified by the United States and relating to labor rights, the rights of women, racial discrimination, the rights of children in conflict, and many other issues.

In addition, the U.N. plays an important role in the promotion and protection of human rights in the field, including through human rights monitoring and electoral assistance. Beyond that, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights deploys several different kinds of standing human rights missions that help to ensure respect for human rights and the rule of law: these include human rights country offices and/or advisors providing advice and assistance to governments and civil society; human rights advisors in United Nations peace operations; and regional offices and centers providing advice and assistance in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa. The United States will support important efforts, such as these, that reflect our commitment advancing and defending human rights.

However, as noted above, the HRC, some member states have sought to shield from scrutiny the worst perpetrators of abuses, while providing distorted and disproportionate criticisms on Israel. The challenge for the United States and its partners, friends, and allies is to bring the full weight of sustained diplomacy, shared values, and power to improve the Human Rights Council by building broad and deep coalitions in support of universal human rights at the United Nations.

Security Council Reform

Question. A General Assembly task force recently recommended that negotiations take place towards increasing the number of permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, with Japan, Germany, Brazil and India being most frequently mentioned as new members.

What is your view on expanding the number of permanent members of the Security Council? What do you believe the criteria should be for a nation to become a new permanent member of the Security Council? Will the Obama administration support permanent Security Council membership for Japan?

Answer. The President-elect and I recognize that the Security Council was created many years ago at a time when there were very different international realities and that there is a strongly felt sentiment among many member states that the Security Council should better reflect 21st century circumstances. The factors that the Obama administration would consider most essential, including in evaluating additional permanent Council members, would be ensuring that a proposal does not impede the Security Council's effectiveness and that it enhances the standing of the Council in the eyes of those nations that seek a greater voice in international fora. Regarding specific candidacies for permanent Council membership, at this stage we have not made a determination about any particular configuration of SC reform.

Use of U.S. Veto in Security Council

Question. In past administrations, both Republican and Democratic, the United States has frequently vetoed U.N. Security Council resolutions because the resolutions were excessively critical of actions by Israel.

In your view, what standard should the U.S. follow in deciding whether to veto a U.N. Security Council resolution?

Answer. Yes. The United States has a long history of using its veto at the Security Council to ensure that it does not pass resolutions that unfairly target the State of Israel. Each proposed resolution must be judged on its merits, and the Obama administration will act in our interest in the Security Council. I don't want to specu-

late on what future resolutions might look like. When it is in the U.S. interest, we will use our veto as necessary.

UN Management Reform

Question. The U.N. is being called upon to do more and more each year, with fewer and fewer resources, making sound management of its resources more critical than ever. The Secretary-General continues to push member states to take further steps in the area of management reform, particularly in the areas of procurement, accountability, and personnel.

What actions should the U.S. take to advance the reform of management operations at the U.N. Secretariat?

Answer. As I noted in the confirmation hearing, I agree that no one can be fully satisfied with the performance of the United Nations, and too often we are dismayed. The United States must press for high standards and bring to its dealings with the U.N. high expectations of its performance and accountability. The Oil-for-Food scandal underscored the need for institutional reform in the U.N. system to ensure greater transparency and accountability. The subsequent investigations and prosecutions served as a wake up call across the U.N. system and prompted more robust efforts to address corruption and mismanagement.

If I am confirmed, I will be committed to working to ensure that the U.N. is maximally effective and efficient. The United Nations has made some notable progress on reform, dating back to 1994 with the establishment of the Office of Internal Oversight Services to strengthen its capacity to ensure that money being spent is being well accounted for. To date, OIOS recommendations have saved the U.N. and the taxpayer an estimated \$200 million. The U.N. has developed an internal audit and an inspector general capability, strengthened whistleblower protections, and enhanced financial disclosure requirements for U.N. staff. More recently we have seen efforts to reorient and restructure the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and to establish a Peacebuilding Commission to deal with the challenges of post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. The procurement task force has substantially improved the U.N.'s procurement operations and has uncovered over \$650 million in faulty contracts. So there have been important steps taken. But more must be done.

My top priorities for U.N. reform would be financial accountability, management efficiency, transparency, ethics and internal oversight, and program effectiveness in areas such as peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and mediation. A key challenge now is ensuring effective implementation of ongoing initiatives and preventing them from being watered down or weakened, even as we consider what further steps should be taken to improve U.N. effectiveness and ability to address the challenges of the 21st century. I believe firmly that it is not enough to ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are not being wasted. We must insist that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being spent effectively and accomplishing their intended goals.

United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)

Question. The United Nations Development Fund for Women provides financial and technical assistance to programs that foster gender equality in more than 100 countries. It focuses its support in areas where women are facing the highest levels of economic and political insecurity, often where other assistance agencies have pulled out.

Would you seek to increase attention and support for UNIFEM, both within the U.S. government and by other member states?

Answer. Yes. If I am confirmed, I will seek to increase attention and support for UNIFEM.

United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women

Question. The United Nations Trust Fund to End Violence against Women has supported national, regional and local efforts in the developing world to combat violence against women. While funds have increased, in 2007 the Trust Fund was only able to award \$5 million to 29 initiatives working in 36 countries.

As U.S. Permanent Representative, would you seek to increase attention and support for the U.N. Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women, both within the U.S. government and by other member states?

Answer. Yes. If I am confirmed, I will seek to increase attention and support for the U.N. Trust Fund to End Violence against Women.

U.N. Peace Building Commission

Question. In 2005, the U.N. Peace Building Commission was created to streamline reconstruction and peace building efforts in countries emerging from violence. As I understand it, the Peace Building Commission is intended to provide a mechanism

to coordinate and provide foreign assistance more effectively to countries emerging from conflict. To date, some of the countries this commission has provided support for include Burundi, Sierra Leone, Cote d'Ivoire and Guinea Bissau.

What is your view of the U.N Peace Building Commission?

Answer. The United States is a member of the U.N. Peacebuilding Commission and supports its work. The U.N. Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is an important pillar of U.N. reform that will enhance the U.N.'s capacity to address post-conflict stability, reconstruction, and governance challenges.

Cluster Munitions Convention and Oslo Process

Question. On December 3, 2008 several of our closest military allies [Britain, France, Canada, Australia, Netherlands]—signed a treaty in Oslo banning the use of cluster munitions. The Bush administration took no part in the negotiation of this treaty and did not sign it. President-elect Obama has indicated that he is committed to restoring our diplomatic alliances and reengaging the United States with international humanitarian law. A spokeswoman for the Obama transition team told the Chicago Tribune after the signing of the cluster munitions treaty that the next president would “carefully review the new treaty and work closely [with] our friends and allies to ensure that the United States is doing everything feasible to promote protection of civilians.”

Should the United States join the Convention on Cluster Munitions?

Answer. The President-elect believes that the U.S. objective should be to stop the use of cluster bombs that pose a serious risk to civilians. The Obama administration has not taken a position on the new cluster bomb treaty. If confirmed, I look forward to participating in the Obama administration's review of the new treaty and working closely with our friends and allies to ensure that the United States is doing everything feasible to promote protection of civilians—especially children—while also protecting our troops.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO SUSAN E. RICE
BY SENATOR JIM DEMINT

Foreign Policy Philosophy

Question. What is your view regarding the status within the international system of the independent, sovereign state in general, and the importance of preserving and protecting American sovereignty in particular? Do you ascribe to traditional views of national sovereignty or to the theory of “global governance?”

Answer. As I stated at the confirmation hearing, if I am confirmed, I will always advocate and defend the United States' national interest at the United Nations. No U.S. administration will ever or could ever cede sovereignty to an international body or to any other institution.

President-elect Obama, Vice President-elect Biden, Secretary-designate Clinton and I believe that U.S. interests are, to a great extent, served by the United Nations when the U.N. is operating effectively. Too often, we are faced with difficult options when addressing international challenges: doing nothing in the face of violence or conflict or atrocities, and allowing threats and risks to fester. Second, the United States can act unilaterally, often at great cost in lives and treasure. Or, third, the United States can join together with allies and partners and other nations, and share the burden of addressing collective challenges. Given that the costs of inaction or unilateral action are very often so high, the Obama administration believes that it is in the U.S. national security interest to invest in strengthening the United Nations to make it a more effective tool to share the burdens and costs of meeting global challenges.

Question. The United States has long maintained a policy—espoused by presidents of both parties—of opposing the many one-sided U.N. Security Council resolution. More than forty-one anti-Israel Security Council resolutions have been vetoed by the United States over the years.

Do you support the use of the American veto to block one-sided anti-Israel resolutions in the Security Council?

What do you believe should be the standard employed in deciding whether to veto or not?

How would you have advised President-elect Obama to vote on the recent U.N. resolution on Israel and Hamas? Would you have recommended a veto or voting for, against, or abstaining?

Answer. Yes. The United States has a long history of using its veto at the Security Council to ensure that it does not pass resolutions that unfairly target the State of Israel. Each proposed resolution must be judged on its merits, and the Obama administration will act in our interest in the Security Council. I don't want to speculate on what future resolutions might look like. When it is in the U.S. interest, we will use our veto as necessary.

As for U.N. Security Council Resolution 1860, we are obviously very concerned about the serious situation in Gaza and southern Israel. President-elect Obama has spoken about his deep concern for the loss of civilian life in Gaza and Israel, and it is very important that a durable ceasefire be achieved. That will require an end to Hamas rocket fire at civilians, an effective mechanism to prevent smuggling of weapons into Gaza, and an effective border regime. We will work hard with our international partners to make sure all these elements happen. The ceasefire should be accompanied by a serious effort to address the immediate humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people and a longer term reconstruction and development effort. The Bush administration is in the middle of sensitive diplomatic negotiations on behalf of the United States, so I think it is best that I not comment specifically on the negotiations underway. I will say that we plan to be actively engaged on diplomacy in the Middle East in pursuit of peace agreements to resolve conflicts and, when necessary, to bring hostilities to an end. We are committed to helping Israel and the Palestinians achieve their goal of two states living side by side in peace and security, and will work toward this goal from the beginning of the administration.

Taiwan

Question. Several years ago, Asia experienced a serious infectious disease issue with the Avian Flu. However, each nation's response had varying degrees of success. Specifically, the lack of membership in the World Health Organization (WHO), was a hindrance to Taiwan's ability to respond. Do you support Taiwan's membership in the WHO?

Answer. As a matter of law and consistent with the "one China" policy, the United States has supported, and will continue to support, meaningful participation through observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization.

Iran

Iran poses a challenge for the U.S. and for the international community. It is the world's leading state sponsor of terror; it openly threatens the existence of U.N. member states; and it is working toward achieving a nuclear weapons capability.

On the nuclear front, the Director-General of the IAEA, Mohamed El-Baradei, recently said Iran could produce enough enriched uranium for a nuclear bomb in six months to a year. Though the Security Council has passed three resolutions imposing sanctions on Iran for its refusal to suspend its enrichment activity, overall, the response has been weak with efforts to impose harsher sanctions repeatedly being delayed and diluted by Russia and China.

Iran has also violated the U.N. charter, calling for the destruction of Israel, a fellow member.

Question. What do you believe should be done at the Security Council regarding the Iranian nuclear threat? What steps will the Obama administration push early this year? What do you believe can be done to get better cooperation from Russia and China?

Answer. The President-elect has said that the prospect of an Iran armed with nuclear weapons is unacceptable, poses a great threat to our national security and to the security and stability of Israel, the region and the world. The President-elect believes that the U.S. should pursue a strategy that employs all policy tools at our disposal, first and foremost direct, vigorous, and principled diplomacy integrated with effective pressure, including sanctions, and close cooperation with our "P-5 plus 1" partners, other members of the U.N. Security Council, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other partners around the world. It is this kind of comprehensive, integrated strategy that will improve the prospects of more unified action by the U.N. Security Council to enforce existing resolutions on Iran and, if appropriate, pursue additional sanctions.

As I noted during the confirmation hearing, the United States has a wide and complex set of interests when it comes to Russia and China. The Obama administration will conduct these relationships by seeking to maximize our shared interests and common objectives, notably with respect to the challenge of Iran's nuclear program, while also recognizing that there will be instances and areas of difference. If

confirmed, I will reach out to my Russian and Chinese colleagues early and often in an effort to develop pragmatic working relationships with both countries at the U.N. I will work to build these relationships to try to maximize their willingness to join us on issues where we share common interests vital to our national security.

Question. Can and should Iran's status at the U.N.—particularly its leadership role in key committees—be challenged if it continues to call for the destruction of Israel and continues to violate multiple mandatory Security Council resolutions calling upon it to cease its nuclear enrichment program?

Answer. The U.S. will seriously review Iran's bids for leadership positions in the United Nations. In recent years, the United States has persistently opposed Iran's candidacy for such positions. For example, in October 2008, despite its intense lobbying of other members, Iran was resoundingly defeated by a vote of 158 to 32 in the General Assembly secret ballot for a non-permanent (two-year) membership on the U.N. Security Council.

International Atomic Energy Agency

Question. Will you pledge to consult closely with the members of this Committee concerning who the U.S. will support as the next Executive Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency?

Answer. Yes. If confirmed, I will work with the Secretary of State to consult closely with the Committee on this issue.

Durban II

Question. The original Durban Conference on Racism, held in 2001, was an anti-America, anti-Israel hatefest from which then-Secretary of State Colin Powell walked out. The Durban Review Conference, or Durban II, is scheduled for April 2009 and its preparatory process is being chaired by Iran and Libya, among others. Former Assistant Secretary of State Kristin Silverberg stated last April in testimony before Congress that “There is, absolutely no case to be made for participating in something that is going to be a repeat of Durban I.”¹

Durban II's declared agenda is “to foster the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Program of Action.” That declaration singles out Israel for accusations of racism against the Palestinians. This is the only country-specific accusation in a document that is supposed to address international racism and xenophobia. The Durban Review Conference Working Group has recently revealed the latest draft of its outcome report. The opening of the report claims it will “preserve all themes and messages” of Durban II which includes such outrageous anti-Semitic attacks such as:²

- “Expresses deep concern at the practices of racial discrimination against the Palestinian people as well as other inhabitants of the Arab occupied territories”
- “. . . the Palestinian people . . . have been subjected to . . . torture.”
- “. . . a foreign occupation founded on settlements, laws based on racial discrimination . . . contradicts the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. . . .”

The report also includes efforts to limit the freedom of expression and thwart international efforts to combat terrorism. Regardless of the presence or absence of new hate-speech in Durban II's final product, involvement in Durban II would legitimize the advancement of anti-Semitism. As a result, Canada and Israel have refused to participate, and the Netherlands and other EU states are also considering staying away.

If confirmed, will you commit to continuing the United States policy of withholding U.S. funds in order to avoid directly or indirectly funding this event? Will you commit to continuing the U.S. policy of refusing to participate in the conference “unless it is proven that the conference will not be used as a platform for anti-Semitic behavior”³ —a stance that has already prompted decisions by some nations not to participate?

¹Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Kristin Silverberg, “United Nations Peacekeeping Operations,” House Foreign Affairs Committee, April 2, 2008. <http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/110/41673.pdf>

²From the December 26, 2008 Durban Review Conference Preparatory Committee Report found at EyeOntheUN.org. <http://tinyurl.com/6tgk2n>

³Khalilzad, April 8, 2006. <http://www.usunnewyork.usmission.gov/press—releases/20080408—075.html>

Answer. Racism is and remains a serious global challenge that merits our sustained effort, attention, and involvement. It is appropriate to convene an international conference on this subject. As you have stated, the problem is that in the past, and potentially now as we head towards the conference in April, rather than focus on racism, some member states and some nongovernmental organizations have instead sought to equate Israel's actions with racism and promote an atmosphere of hate and anti-Semitism. This is highly offensive and a distortion of the meaning of the term racism. It merits our strongest objections.

The question is how to proceed. The President-elect believes that we should make early efforts to determine whether early U.S. engagement could enable the upcoming conference and its draft document to be improved, refocused on racism, and stripped of the offensive language that we find abhorrent. If this is not possible, then we—as well as other member states that respect basic principles of justice and equity—should not participate in April.

Human Rights Council

Question. The United Nations Human Rights Council was supposed to reform the discredited Human Rights Commission. The United States voted against the adoption of the resolution creating the Council because of its many inherent flaws that did not bode well for the new body. Over the past 2 and a half years of the Council's existence that concern was confirmed:

- More than 50 percent of the resolutions adopted by the Council condemning a specific country for human rights abuses adopted by the Council have been directed at Israel, while the Commission had 30 percent of its resolutions directed at Israel.
- The Council has had four special sessions condemning Israel (as compared to 9 regular sessions for human rights issues around the globe); the Commission had one special session on Israel.
- The Council eradicated the human rights investigations that had been created by the Commission on Cuba, Belarus, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

There is deep concern that the Council has taken steps backwards and continues to provide cover for some of the worst human rights abusers. If you are confirmed and during your tenure, will the United States continue to refrain from rejoining, funding, or otherwise legitimizing the Human Rights Council?

Answer. The United States has a deep interest in ensuring strong global mechanisms to uphold the respect for human rights. The President-elect is committed to enforcing respect for human rights. As I stated during the confirmation hearing, there is no question that the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) has been seriously flawed and a major disappointment. Rather than focus on its efforts and energies on most egregious instances of human rights abuses around the world, in places like Burma, Zimbabwe, Sudan and elsewhere, the HRC has devoted an inordinate amount of attention, and a very counterproductive focus, on Israel, one of our closest allies.

The Obama administration intends to work to strengthen the United Nations human rights mechanisms so that they focus on the world's most egregious human rights abusers. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the President-elect—and consulting with this Committee—as we review whether and when to run for election to a seat on the Council. Whether or not we seek election, our basic orientation will be that our ability to effect change is far greater if we are engaged diplomatically with friends and partners around the world to build a broad-based understanding of the need to use these mechanisms for the purpose they were designed, and not allow them to be hijacked for other purposes.

Question. What do you believe should be U.S. strategy for promoting and advocating for human rights at the United Nations?

Answer. Promoting and defending human rights has been a principle priority of the United States since the founding of the United Nations, and it is among the core principles of the United Nations. The Obama administration will seek to advance human rights across the full spectrum of venues, institutions, and opportunities at the United Nations. The body of international human rights standards that are now widely acknowledged (if not always respected) by nearly all the governments were in great measure developed within the United Nations system. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which the United States is a party, were developed by the Human Rights Commission. These and other instruments have been, and will continue to be, important tools used to press for an end to violations of human dig-

nity and for the promotion of civil and political rights. Similarly, the United Nations has played a key role in the development of treaties signed or ratified by the United States and relating to labor rights, the rights of women, racial discrimination, the rights of children in conflict, and many other issues.

In addition, the U.N. plays an important role in the promotion and protection of human rights in the field, including through human rights monitoring and electoral assistance. Beyond that, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights deploys several different kinds of standing human rights missions that help to ensure respect for human rights and the rule of law: these include human rights country offices and/or advisors providing advice and assistance to governments and civil society; human rights advisors in United Nations peace operations; and regional offices and centers providing advice and assistance in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa. The United States will support important efforts, such as these, that reflect our commitment advancing and defending human rights.

However, as noted above, there also remains cause for deep concern regarding the Human Rights Council. In the HRC, some member states have sought to shield from scrutiny the worst perpetrators of abuses, while pursuing distorted and disproportionate criticisms of Israel. The challenge for the United States and its partners, friends, and allies is to bring the full weight of sustained diplomacy, shared values, and power to improve the Human Rights Council by building broad and deep coalitions in support of universal human rights at the United Nations.

UN Peacekeeping

Question. According to the Government Accountability Office, U.S. contributions for U.N. peacekeeping have more than doubled in the last six years.⁴ In 2003, U.S. taxpayers funded over \$700 million for peacekeeping, but in 2009, the amount is expected to rise to \$1.8 billion. Even though the U.S. is assessed only 22 percent for the U.N. core budget, Congress appropriates 26 percent of the entire peacekeeping budget.

The other members of the U.N. Security Council do not even give Peacekeeping half of what the U.S. taxpayer gives—yet they have equal responsibility with the decisions to create, veto or maintain Peacekeeping missions. China only gives 3 percent, Russia gives less than 1 percent, France gives just 7.5 percent, and the U.K. gives almost 8 percent.

Should U.S. peacekeeping assessments be lowered and the other Security Council members' raised in order to equally share the burden? What action will you take to change the assessment level for each of the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council?

Answer. I do believe that the scale of assessments for peacekeeping should be examined to address whether some members of the Council are not paying their proper share. I do not believe it would be wise to unilaterally lower U.S. peacekeeping assessments. The U.S. is currently the lead financial contributor to U.N. peacekeeping, but only marginally more so than Japan. It is not in the United States' interest—as a founding member and host country of the U.N., and the sole remaining superpower in the world—to cede its leadership role at the United Nations. Furthermore, we should recognize that the U.S. contributes less than 1 percent when it comes to military personnel for U.N. peacekeeping mission—significantly less than the United Kingdom and France.

Question. According to a leaked 2007 report from internal United Nations auditors, 43 percent of mostly U.N. peacekeeping procurement investigated was tainted by fraud. Out of \$1.4 billion in U.N. contracts internally investigated, \$610 million was tainted by ten “significant fraud and corruption schemes.”⁵ Since 43 percent of the mostly peacekeeping procurement contracts are tainted and the U.S. taxpayer contributes up to 26 percent of all U.N. funding, it is safe to say the entire U.S. contribution in this case has been lost to corruption and waste.

According to human rights and aid groups, such as Save the Children, U.N. peacekeepers many times sexually exploit and abuse the women and children that they are meant to protect in U.N. refugee camps. Some reports state that “children as

⁴“United Nations Peacekeeping: Challenges Obtaining Needed Resources Could Limit Further Large Deployments and Should Be Addressed in U.S. Reports to Congress,” Government Accountability Office, December, 2008.

⁵“Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the activities of the Procurement Task Force for the 18-month period ended 30 June 2007,” U.N. General Assembly, October 5, 2007. <http://tinyurl.com/9extl7>

young as six are trading sex with aid workers and peacekeepers in exchange for food, money, soap . . .”⁶

Please explain the steps that have been taken by the U.N. to address these problems, why they have failed to address the situation?

Answer. The incidents of sexual exploitation are totally reprehensible and unacceptable. This issue calls for the utmost attention and effort from the U.N. leadership and the member states, as these scandals strike at the heart of the purpose and value of the United Nations. I believe the U.N.’s top leaders understand the magnitude of this threat. They are right to adopt a policy of zero tolerance. A range of steps have been taken, including disciplinary measures, a new model Memorandum of Understanding between the U.N. and troop-contributing countries covering standards, and the waiving of immunity, but more needs to be done. The U.S. will continue to work with other member states to follow up on actions taken by troop- or police-contributing governments against personnel dismissed from U.N. missions for engaging in inappropriate or abusive behavior. As a woman and a mother, I take this issue personally and will follow it closely, if confirmed. Unless we make every effort to end this problem, the legitimacy and credibility of the United Nations in the eyes of the very peoples that the U.N. is supposed to protect will erode dangerously.

Question. Given the amount of waste, fraud, and sexual abuse that takes place in U.N. peacekeeping operations, what specific policies and reforms you would pursue to address these ongoing problems and protect the U.S. taxpayer from inadvertently funding these illicit activities?

Answer. As I noted above, this issue calls for the utmost attention and effort from the U.N. leadership and the member states, as these scandals strike at the heart of the purpose and value of the United Nations. In addition, as I stated during the confirmation hearing, I pledge to work tirelessly to ensure that every American taxpayer dollar is spent wisely, effectively, and efficiently. The United States will weigh very carefully the merits of existing and proposed U.N. peace operations, and we will continue to evaluate ongoing preventive measures that have been undertaken as a result of recent scandals. The United States will also continue to strongly support an independent and effective Office of Internal Oversight Services, including the integration of the U.N. Procurement Task Force. Finally, the United States has supported recent efforts to reorient and restructure the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and to establish a Peacebuilding Commission to deal with the challenges of post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction—in part to ensure more robust training and oversight of U.N. peace operations.

Question. Do you think it is acceptable that U.N. procurement contracts for peacekeeping or other programs are not publicly transparent? Since the U.S. is the largest contributor to U.N. peacekeeping, what actions will you take to bring transparency and accountability to peacekeeping procurement?

Answer. As I noted in the confirmation hearing, I believe that transparency and accountability remain vitally important. If confirmed, I intend to pursue broader and deeper cooperation from friends, partners and allies to achieve substantial and sustained reform across the full range of management and performance challenges.

U.N. Reform

Question. Under the Bush administration, there was a concerted effort to improve transparency and accountability at the U.N. However, these successes were limited to the Secretariat and not the myriad of other funds and agencies that make up the U.N. Do you support these efforts and what policies will you promote to improve reform the U.N.?

Answer. I believe that expanding the reach of transparency and accountability reforms to the full range of U.N. funds and specialized agencies is important. If confirmed, I intend to pursue this issue with our friends, partners and allies, as well as with the U.N. leadership. In addition, as I noted during the confirmation hearing, I believe that our challenge today regarding U.N. reform includes ensuring effective implementation of enacted reforms and ensuring that those steps are not weakened or watered down, but rather strengthened, over time.

UN Development Program

Question. The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations released a report in January 2008 which documented how the U.N. Development Program

⁶“Watchdog needed on child abuse by peacekeepers: NGO.” AFP, May 27, 2008.

(UNDP) lacked even basic fiscal and management controls with its programs in North Korea.⁷ The report included findings such as:

- UNDP gave “development” money to the North Korean entity that finances the regime’s illicit missile sales.
- The regime had free access to U.N. bank accounts and used them to launder millions of dollars, avoid sanctions, and wire cash all around the world.
- UNDP broke U.N. rules such as permitting the regime to handpick its own agents to staff and manage UNP programs in North Korea.
- UNDP ignored U.N. ethics and whistleblower protections while punishing—instead of rewarding—UNDP whistleblowers that rang the alarm.

Whistleblowers, human rights groups, and press reports indicate UNP programs in other countries of concern—such as Burma, Syria, Iran, and Zimbabwe—suffer from the same mismanagement and lack of fiscal controls.

The UNP has had an opportunity to reform, but instead, it has restricting public access to program documents and audits—even refusing to release all the evidence during the investigation into this matter by our Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Will you commit to conditioning U.S. contributions to UNP on the following:

1. publicly posting on the internet the past 5 years worth of UNP line-item budgets, audits, and program reviews for each UNP program;
2. posting all new documents of this sort within 2 weeks of completion; and
3. providing unfettered access to the U.S. Government Accountability Office to conduct an investigation of the past 5 years of UNP activity in Burma, Zimbabwe, Syria and Iran and publicly report to Congress its findings as it pertains to:
 - a. fiscal and management controls;
 - b. hiring practices,
 - c. compliance with international accounting standards and Financial Action Task Force recommendations;⁸
 - d. compliance with U.S. export controls for WMD or dual-use capabilities;
 - e. compliance with U.N. guidelines, procurement rules, and Security Council resolutions;
 - f. compliance with international accounting standards; and
 - g. whether or not UNP programs produce independently verified and measurable results?

Answer. This is a vital issue. I take very seriously my responsibility to the U.S. taxpayer to ensure that our U.N. contributions are well-spent and well-managed. I also take very seriously compliance with U.S. law. I am very troubled by the findings of the report from the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigation on the UNP’s programs in North Korea. I understand that the UNP suspended its program in March 2007. I also understand that after several reviews and investigations, a number of recommendations emerged to correct program management weaknesses, some specific to DPRK and others with agency-wide applicability. And it has come to my attention that North Korea has accepted a number of conditions for resuming UNP activities, and that the Executive Board will take up North Korea’s request for resumption shortly.

If I am confirmed, I will work very closely with the Secretary-designate to immediately review the conditions proposed for North Korea, the management and program implementation practices in North Korea, and the general steps taken and commitments made by the UNP to improve accountability and transparency. As part of that review, we will consider your proposed improvements on the transparency side and develop a strategy for seeking even greater transparency from the UNP. It is clearly in our interest for the UNP to be as efficient and transparent as possible and to not facilitate any illicit activity in the countries in which it has programs. And, to take this one step further, it is vital that Member States—including the United States Government—have reasonable access to all information necessary to have confidence in UNP programs. I would also work with other interested

⁷“UNDP: A Case Study of North Korea,” Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, January 23, 2008. <http://tinyurl.com/8w9et4>

⁸“Methodology for Assessing Compliance with the FATF 40 Recommendations and the FATF 9 Special Recommendations,” Financial Action Task Force, October 2008. <http://tinyurl.com/98muha>

parties to try to build a strong consensus view at the United Nations in this regard and make clear to the UNP that this is a matter of significant focus and concern.

Question. Several U.N. programs, such as the U.N. Development Program, utilize a method of funding called “national execution” where the U.N. transfers funding directly into the central banks of countries where the U.N. works. While the U.N. claims this is to build “capacity” of these countries to perform their own development programs, as in the case of North Korea and Burma, the U.N. has no fiscal controls in place to verify the funds are used as intended. And since money is fungible, there are no guarantees the transferred funds will not pay for things such as the genocide in Burma or the concentration camps of North Korea. For example, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations reports the UNP, while claiming to be transferring economic development money to North Korea, ended up transferring funds to the state-controlled entity that finances the regimes illicit weapons sales-sales which reportedly continue even as recently as August of 2008.⁹

The Financial Action Task Force (FATF) is an inter-governmental body whose purpose is the promotion of national and international policies to combat money laundering and terrorist financing. FATF has a list of 40 recommendations and 9 special recommendations it uses to test whether financial institutions are taking necessary precautions to avoid terror financing, moneylaundering and other illicit activities.¹⁰

Will you commit to protecting the U.S. taxpayer from inadvertently funding such things as genocide in Burma or weapon sales to terrorists by North Korea by prohibiting U.S. funds from going to any U.N. System entity¹¹ or other foreign development organization that transfers funds to banks within states that are not certified by FATF?

Answer. As I noted above, I take very seriously my responsibility to the U.S. taxpayer to ensure that our U.N. contributions are well-spent and well-managed. We intend to carefully review the best way to advance our interests through the U.N. while at the same time ensuring that U.S. taxpayer dollars are not inadvertently funding the illegal and immoral acts of rogue regimes. If confirmed, I will work with the President-elect, the Secretary-designate and the Cabinet, will ensure that the U.S. employs all tools of national power to crack down on terror funding, money laundering and other illicit activity.

U.N. Budget

According to the State Department, the U.N. 2008/2009 Biennial Budget represents the largest increase for a funding request in U.N.s history.¹² The 2008/2009UN budget is in excess of \$5.2 billion. This represents 25 percent more than the 2006/2007 budget that was only \$4.17 billion and a 193 percent increase from 1998/1999 budget. The U.N. budget has grown 17 percent in the previous five years, but the U.S. budget has grown only 7 percent.

The State Department also reports that the overwhelming majority of the U.N. budget—75 percent—goes to staff salaries and common staff costs including travel to resorts for conferences rather than direct humanitarian assistance or conflict prevention. Despite the increasing costs, the U.N. has yet to identify offsets in existing funding to pay for the increased spending, a position that is supported by a U.N. General Assembly resolution.¹³

Following the U.N. Secretariat’s poor example, the 3/4 of the U.N. not covered by the U.N. budget have their own out of control spending growth and lack of offsets: Peacekeeping is growing by 40 percent, the U.N. Tribunals are growing by 15 percent, and the numerous Funds and Programs are no better off.¹⁴

⁹“UNDP: A Case Study of North Korea,” Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, January 23, 2008 <http://tinyurl.com/8w9et4>; Hosenball, Mark and Christian Caryl, “The Flight That wasn’t,” Newsweek, December 1, 2008.

¹⁰“Methodology for Assessing Compliance with the FATF 40 Recommendations and the FATF 9 Special Recommendations,” Financial Action Task Force, October 2008. <http://tinyurl.com/98muha>

¹¹“United Nations System: Principle Organs,” United Nations—<http://www.un.org/aboutun/chart-en.pdf>

¹²“Presentation of Ambassador Mark Wallace on the 2008/2009 U.N. Budget,” State Department, December 11, 2007. <http://tinyurl.com/993mba>

¹³Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, 2005 World Summit Outcome, A/RES/60/1, October 24, 2005.

¹⁴“Presentation of Ambassador Mark Wallace on the 2008/2009 U.N. Budget,” State Department, December 11, 2007. <http://tinyurl.com/993mba>

Question. With a large U.S. deficit right now, and the U.N.'s refusal to identify wasteful and duplicative spending to offset new spending. Would you support a zero-growth budget at the U.N. and that the U.S. only make zero-growth budget requests to Congress for all future contributions to U.N. entities?

Answer. If I am confirmed, addressing the U.N. budget will be an important issue for me. The United Nations is a vital institution, but it must be run more effectively and efficiently. The U.N. budget has increased as member states have asked the U.N. to take on increased responsibilities. The U.N. is contributing in significant ways in places of importance to the United States including Afghanistan and Iraq. The U.N. Secretariat is also trying to improve its capacities, which may in some cases require additional resources. In June 2008, the Fifth (Budget) Committee approved an additional 45 positions for the Department of Peacekeeping Operations' Office of Military Affairs (OMA), in order to improve its capacity for planning operations. I support these efforts.

At the U.N., the U.S. needs to engage in thoughtful, effective diplomacy early on in the budget process. While the idea of zero-based budgeting may appear attractive, it may not allow the U.N. to strengthen those capacities that are sorely needed. Some areas may need to grow, others be reduced, but at different rates. Diplomacy's best resource is good people. They run the programs and staff the missions. Therefore, staff costs are an important component of the budget of diplomatic organizations like the U.N. Working through the U.N. enables the U.S. to share the burdens and costs of managing international peace and security, climate change and human dignity. When it is necessary to act internationally, sharing the costs can help efficiency especially in a time of economic constraints.

Increasing Transparency, Accountability and Effectiveness at the U.N.

Question. The U.N. is charged with many serious responsibilities and tasks. Yet, as evidenced by the well-publicized scandals involving the Iraq Oil-for-Food program and recent revelations of corruption in U.N. procurement, the U.N. all too often has proven vulnerable to corruption and fraud, unaccountable in its activities, lacking in transparency and oversight, and duplicative and inefficient in its allocation of resources. In addition to the other problems highlighted, what other specific ideas do you have to address these problems?

Answer. As I noted in the confirmation hearing, I agree that no one can be fully satisfied with the performance of the United Nations, and too often we are dismayed. The United States must press for high standards and bring to its dealings with the U.N. high expectations of its performance and accountability. My top priorities for U.N. reform would be financial accountability, management efficiency, transparency, ethics and internal oversight, and program effectiveness in areas such as peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and mediation.

As I noted above, a key challenge now is ensuring effective implementation of ongoing initiatives and preventing them from being watered down or weakened, even as we consider what further steps should be taken to improve U.N. effectiveness and ability to address the challenges of the 21st century. I believe firmly that it is not enough to ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are not being wasted. We must insist that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being spent effectively. In this regard, and in light of the substantial cost of U.N. peace operations, I intend to devote substantial focus to ensure that U.N. peace operations are efficient, effective, and appropriate, including by ensuring that U.N., as well as our own, procedures to support such operations are streamlined.

U.N. Accountability and Transparency Reform

Question. While there are several steps taken toward U.N. reform—a U.N. Ethics Office, permanent oversight board, and the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS)—they have turned out to be disappointments. The U.N. Ethics Office is ignored by U.N. agencies, such as the U.N. Development Program, while U.N. whistleblowers are attacked, demoted, and demeaned by U.N. officials with impunity. The OIOS is undermined by not having independent funding or free authority to investigate senior U.N. officials and programs as necessary.

Recently, a special task force of the OIOS that focused on rooting out fraud and corruption that undermines the entire U.N. system, has been shut down by the U.N. bureaucrats and member state representatives that are most threatened by accountability and sunshine. This task force has resulted in the identification of over \$630 million in U.N. contracts that are tainted by bribery and fraud, successfully brought criminal convictions to U.N. employees and a contractor involved in corruption, and suspended or removed more than 45 private companies from the U.N. contracting

system, and initiated disciplinary actions against 17 other U.N. employees including 5 who were dismissed.

However, the U.N. system will not restore funding to this task force, and it will now close down.

Given the failure of the past two administrations to “talk the U.N. into reforming,” and given that the only time the U.N. has seriously considered reform was when the US withheld its contributions, what actions will you be willing to take to have the U.N. reform including a permanent restoration of funding to the anti-fraud task force?

Answer. Regarding the U.N. procurement task force, as I noted during the confirmation hearing, the United States strongly supports the independent authority of an OIOS that is fully staffed and retains its robust mandate. A stronger and more effective U.N. requires a greater focus on accountability and transparency. It is essential that OIOS have the capacity to undertake professional investigations. The United States will work to ensure that, as the procurement task force is transitioned into the OIOS, the capacity and resources to sustain its investigative oversight of U.N. procurement practices remain robust.

Question. What specific reforms will you pursue should you be confirmed?

Answer. As I noted in the confirmation hearing, I agree that no one can be fully satisfied with the performance of the United Nations, and too often we are dismayed. The United States must press for high standards and bring to its dealings with the U.N. high expectations of its performance and accountability. My top priorities for U.N. reform would be financial accountability, management efficiency, transparency, ethics and internal oversight, and program effectiveness in areas such as peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and mediation. As I noted above, a key challenge now is ensuring effective implementation of ongoing initiatives and preventing them from being watered down or weakened, even as we consider what further steps should be taken to improve U.N. effectiveness and ability to address the challenges of the 21st century. I believe firmly that it is not enough to ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are not being wasted. We must insist that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being spent effectively. In this regard, and in light of the substantial cost of U.N. peace operations, I intend to devote substantial focus to ensure that U.N. peace operations are efficient, effective, and appropriate, including by ensuring that U.N., as well as our own, procedures to support such operations are streamlined.

Question. Will you commit to a policy of 25 percent withholdings from the U.S. contributions to the U.N. if it continues to refuse reform including the enforcement of the U.N. Ethics office jurisdiction on every U.N. program and fund, permanently restoring independent funding of the anti-fraud task force, and a “Freedom of Information Act” U.N. rule requiring public access to budgets, contracts, procurement documents, program reviews, and other documents showing how the U.N. spends our money?

Answer. I do not believe that the U.S. should, as a general practice, condition its dues to the U.N. on specific reforms. The United States should pay its dues on time and in full. Transparency and accountability are essential for an effective United Nations. If confirmed, I will be committed to working to ensure the independence and credibility of OIOS. This includes supporting existing efforts to absorb the functions and expertise of the Procurement Task Force into OIOS. I will also work with other member states and the Secretary-General to push for a robust ethics and whistleblower protection regime throughout the U.N. system.

Question. The United Nations Transparency and Accountability Initiative is current U.S. policy in place at the State Department. This policy seeks to have the U.N., including all its funds and programs, enact the following reforms:

- Availability of internal audits and other reports, e.g. evaluations, investigations, etc. to Member States;
- Public access to all relevant documentation related to operations and activities including budget information and procurement activities;
- “Whistleblower Protection” policies;
- Financial disclosure policies;
- An effective Ethics Office;
- Independence of the respective internal oversight bodies;
- Adoption of IPSAS accounting standards in the Funds and Programs and
- Establishing a cap on administrative overhead costs for the Funds and Programs.

Will you commit to maintaining this policy? If so, how will this policy manifest in your and your staff interactions with the U.N.?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to review and, as necessary, enhance the capacity of the U.S. mission to press for a more effective and efficient U.N. I will carefully review the U.N. Transparency and Accountability Initiative being pursued by the U.S. Mission and the State Department. In consultation with the Secretary of State, I will ensure that a key objective, as I have noted above, will be to improve financial accountability, management efficiency, transparency, ethics and internal oversight, and program effectiveness in areas such as peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and mediation.

Question. Since the U.S. is vastly outnumbered on the U.N. executive boards for U.N. funds and programs, besides voting for reform, what actions will you take to enforce this policy should you be confirmed?

Achieving effective and lasting reforms at the U.N. requires a broad-based consensus among U.N. member states to enact and fully implement reform measures. I intend to pursue these issues with other member states through direct and sustained diplomatic outreach. Having a more effective and efficient United Nations serves the interests of all member states, and I believe that more can be done through diplomatic engagement that is not encumbered by the divisions of the 20th century.

Question. The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA), co-authored by President-elect Obama, requires all federal funding to be put on the public website, USAspending.gov. This includes all contract, subcontract, grant, and subgrant data such as the amount of award, source of funds, and the intended purpose of the funds.

Despite this law, the State Department has failed to comply by not listing all its contributions to entities within the U.N. system, such as the U.N. Development Program, UNICEF, or UNSCO. Other U.S. agencies that transfer U.S. funds to U.N. entities—such as the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Treasury, Interior, Energy, and Education—have either ignored FFATA or only have submitted partial information for their U.N. funding.

Should the U.S. fund a U.N. entity or any other grantee or subgrantee of the State Department if it does not comply with U.S. law as found in the FFATA, and supply subgrant information to be posted on USAspending.gov? If you are confirmed, what will you do to ensure compliance at the State Department and other U.S. agencies with the FFATA requirements regarding U.N. system funding?

Answer. As I have noted in response to previous question regarding the UNP, I take very seriously my responsibility to the U.S. taxpayer to ensure that our U.N. contributions are well-spent and well-managed. I also take very seriously compliance with U.S. law. As the Department of State has responsibility for compliance with the FFATA, I will work with Secretary-designate Clinton to carefully review this issue and support the Department's efforts to comply with the FFATA, if I am confirmed. It will important to have close consultations with the Committee and other Members of Congress on this and the full range of issues pertaining to the United Nations.