AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 116–211

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 20, 2019

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

40–624 PDF WASHINGTON : 2020

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho, *Chairman*

MARCO RUBIO, Florida
RON JOHNSON, Wisconsin
CORY GARDNER, Colorado
MITT ROMNEY, Utah
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
RAND PAUL, Kentucky
TODD, YOUNG, Indiana
TED CRUZ, Texas

ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware
TOM UDALL, New Mexico
CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, Connecticut
TIM KAINE, Virginia
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
JEFF MERKLEY, Oregon
CORY A. BOOKER, New Jersey

CHRISTOPHER M. SOCHA, *Staff Director*
JESSICA LEWIS, *Democratic Staff Director*
JOHN DUTTON, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

TODD YOUNG, Indiana, *Chairman*

MITT ROMNEY, Utah
RAND PAUL, Kentucky
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina

JEFF MERKLEY, Oregon
TOM UDALL, New Mexico
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
CORY A. BOOKER, New Jersey

CONTENTS

	Page
Young, Hon. Todd, U.S. Senator from Indiana	1
Merkley, Hon. Jeff, U.S. Senator from Oregon	3
Moore, Jonathan, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC	4
Prepared statement	5
Tom, Hon. Kip, to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture, U.S. Mission to the U.N. Agencies, Rome, IT	7
Prepared statement	8
Busby, Scott, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC	10
Prepared statement	12
Schaefer, Brett, Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, DC	25
Prepared statement	28
Yeo, Peter, Better World Campaign, Washington, DC	40
Prepared statement	41
Lehr, Amy K., Director of the Human Rights Initiative, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, DC	49
Prepared statement	52

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Response of Jonathan Moore to Question Submitted by Senator Todd Young	62

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCING U.S. INTERESTS IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:33 p.m. in room SD–419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Todd Young, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senators Young [presiding], Romney, and Merkley.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. TODD YOUNG U.S. SENATOR FROM INDIANA

Senator YOUNG. This hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy will come to order.

Today the subcommittee will hold a hearing to examine an important question: what challenges and opportunities exist for advancing U.S. interests in the United Nations system?

Now, to fully assess this matter, we will hear testimony from two panels of well qualified individuals, one comprised of executive branch officials, and the other comprised of individuals from the private sector. With their help, I anticipate a thought-provoking examination of whether or not United States foreign policy objectives are being fulfilled within the U.N. framework, and I look forward to hearing their testimony shortly.

I will add that we expect votes in the Senate to be called in just moments, and so what I will be doing as chairman of this committee is reading my opening remarks here. I will ask the ranking member to do the same, and then each of our witnesses. I will have you read briefly your opening remarks. At that point, we are likely to recess, go vote, and return into session.

So as we look at the news today and we see the range of conflicts around the world, one thing is clear. Those conflicts are increasingly complex and have impacts that extend beyond their region.

Iran continues to extend its tentacles throughout the Middle East, sowing instability and conflict wherever it goes.

Russia no longer even attempts to hide its aspirations to influence foreign elections around the globe, including here in the United States.

China's unfair trading policies and practices affect every one of its trading partners.

The common thread with each of these challenges is they will be more easily resolved if we work together with international partners and allies. Our role in multilateral organizations is one that continues to be debated among government officials, think tanks, and academics. And while this debate is very important, we cannot lose sight of the changing landscape at the United Nations and other multilateral organizations where the United States and our allies are at risk of ceding moral and policy grounds to those who do not share our conviction for standards and norms.

Today Chinese nationals are at the helm of four U.N. agencies. Americans are only at the head of three. One of the key issues we hope to explore in today's hearing is the implications for senior Communist Party members leading the United Nations in these agencies: the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Telecommunications Union, the International Civil Aviation Administration, and the Industrial Development Organization.

What types of policies will these Communist Party members implement? Who will they bring in? U.N. staff—will they represent the interests of the United Nations and its members or those of the Communist Party of China? And how should we advance our interests, which we believe to be universal given this backdrop?

President Trump has repeatedly said that other countries need to step up and do more to shoulder the weight of addressing the major crises around the world.

As China's economy continues to grow and it exerts greater influence in the world, it is natural that it would seek more positions of power within the U.N. system. But as it does so, it is incumbent upon the United States and our allies to ensure China supports and defends universal values rather than its own domestic political agenda. Human rights, free speech, freedom of movement, freedom of religion, due process, and access to information are just a few of the values that are essential elements of the U.N. Charter and its goal to maintain international peace and security.

We need look no further than Xinjiang or Hong Kong to have serious concerns about China's lack of respect for fundamental human rights. We should be very concerned about how the United Nations gives a platform to countries like Cuba, Venezuela, and China to talk about human rights. The U.N. itself publishes reports citing these and other members of the Human Rights Council as countries that retaliate against their own citizens for defending human rights.

We should be similarly concerned about Russia's role at the United Nations and its willingness to exercise its veto power to protect Assad, Maduro, and other autocratic leaders.

Spending time on the council has not reformed these bad actors, but rather given them a larger mouthpiece to share their misguided view of what is considered a human right.

There is no issue more controversial and divisive in the U.N. context than Israel. Each year, the U.N. takes up a disproportionate

number of unbalanced resolutions that assign blame to Israel for perpetuating unrest in the Middle East. These resolutions do not include references to Hamas, a known terror organization. Further, fellow U.N. member countries have resisted U.S. efforts to draw any attention to Hamas activities in any forum.

We look forward to our witnesses' statements on this complex issue and examining how the United Nations can play a more productive role in mediating and resolving conflicts in the Middle East and elsewhere.

Finally, I feel it is necessary to again note why this subcommittee and this hearing are important.

The United States remains the largest donor to the United Nations, paying 22 percent of the regular budget and 25 percent for peacekeeping operations. In 2017, the United States was assessed $3.5 billion by the U.N. and volunteered an additional $7 billion in funds.

Given these enormous sums of funds, it is essential that we as Members of Congress keep a watchful eye on how these funds are being used and ensure they are going toward issues that reflect our values and our priorities.

All that being said, I would like to recognize my distinguished ranking member for his comments. Senator Merkley.

STATEMENT OF HON. JEFF MERKLEY,
U.S. SENATOR FROM OREGON

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you very much, Chairman Young. It is a pleasure to be here with you today working in a bipartisan fashion to look at the challenges and opportunities to advance U.S. interests and leadership in the United Nations.

Thank you to our distinguished guests and for your willingness to testify on this important topic.

The United Nations was stood up after the oppression, brutality, and destruction of World War II. In fact, the U.S. Constitution served as an inspiration for the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The United States played an instrumental role in shaping that post-war order and laid in a concert of nations to collaborate in defending liberty, human rights, and religious freedom to ensure that the horrors of the past did not reproduce themselves.

In this era of great power competition where countries like China and Russia attempt to rewrite the global rules of the road, the United States is needed more than ever to push back. It is with great concern that I have seen the United States retreat from global leadership in recent years to our detriment and to the detriment of the world. Our withdrawal from the Human Rights Council and a repeated hesitance, even refusal to act meaningfully on human rights issues have created a void in the United Nations system that China, Russia, and other likeminded countries have eagerly exploited.

The challenges we are facing today on existential threats such as those posed by climate chaos to the threats to democracy and human rights in authoritarian states are global in nature and require a global response. In the battle of ideas, China's vision puts development ahead of human rights, seeks to curtail access to the

United Nations to human rights activists who challenge China's human rights record or policies and applies economic pressure on nations to support its interests.

I look forward to hearing from our first panel on what we are doing to preserve and strengthen the post-World War II international order and to our second panel on how we work with the United Nations to best advance our interests and values. This is the first oversight hearing on the United Nations in a couple years, and I very much appreciate the chairman scheduling this hearing to take a closer look.

So with that, let us get going. Thanks.

Senator YOUNG. Well, thanks so much, Senator Merkley.

We will now turn to our first witness, Mr. Moore. Mr. Jonathan Moore serves as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organizations at the State Department. He is a career member of the senior Foreign Service with decades of diplomatic experience. Mr. Moore, your full statement will be included in the record, without objection. So if you could please keep your remarks to no more than 5 minutes or so, we would certainly appreciate it so that members of the committee can engage with you on their questions. Mr. Moore?

STATEMENT OF JONATHAN MOORE, PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY, BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. MOORE. Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you today.

As you said, Mr. Chairman, I am here on behalf of the State Department's Bureau of International Organization Affairs. We are dedicated to ensuring that the views of the administration and the values of the American people are accurately reflected and respected in multilateral fora, including in United Nations resolutions, statements, reports, correspondence, and activities.

In addition to our foreign affairs professionals, we are extremely fortunate to have energetic, expert, informed, and influential ambassadors and permanent representatives in New York, Geneva, Rome, Montreal, Vienna, and Nairobi. Thank you very much for including Ambassador Kip Tom in this hearing.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member cited as well, the United States played the lead role in founding the United Nations nearly 75 years ago, and we continue to host the U.N. Security Council and General Assembly in New York. The U.N. and other international organizations have key responsibilities on the global stage, and American leadership is crucial.

The challenges we face are real: active conflicts, humanitarian crises, terrorism, threats to global health.

The opportunities are also real from protecting intellectual property to improving aviation safety, reinforcing human rights, and helping people in need.

The administration has repeatedly demonstrated its determination to promote American interests and prosperity in and through international organizations.

As you noted, Mr. Chairman, the United States remains by far the largest financial contributor to the U.N., well over $9 billion

last year, the vast majority of which supports humanitarian response efforts.

U.N. peacekeeping operations are among the most effective mechanisms to address global challenges to international peace and security and remain an essential tool in protecting the most vulnerable populations.

Across the multilateral system, the administration's commitment to reform is unwavering. Much more can and must be done to cut waste and overlap, improve hiring practices, including for American citizens, and embrace transparency.

Eliminating sexual exploitation and abuse is another critical aspect of reform, both in peacekeeping operations and throughout U.N. agencies.

Reform also extends to fixing parts of the multilateral system that have failed to keep pace with global trends. At the Universal Postal Union, grossly outdated pricing systems created market distortions that harmed U.S. business. In October 2018, the President announced his intent to withdraw from the UPU unless corrective action was taken. Over the following year, we coordinated intensive diplomatic outreach and accomplished that goal, with the result that U.S. businesses will no longer face severe disadvantages related to the international shipping of small packages. This is just one example.

The U.N. Human Rights Council, however, as cited, is a less positive example. Our efforts to spur reform of the council were genuine and sustained, but it remains fundamentally broken. Nevertheless, with the strong support of Congress, the United States remains vigorously engaged in protecting human rights around the world. My colleague, Scott Busby, will speak to this.

As a further example of our multilateral engagement, the administration is considering our return, with the consent of Congress, to the U.N. World Tourism Organization, recognizing that tourism is a significant economic driver in many areas of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as we approach the U.N.'s 75th anniversary, we need the U.N. to remain relevant and serve our national interests, particularly as other centers of power, such as China, become increasingly assertive.

Over its history, the U.N. has been responsible for some impressive successes and some spectacular failures. Your attention and that of Congress are invaluable in helping us serve the United States and keep the U.N. on track.

Thank you again for the opportunity to discuss these and other important issues today. I look forward to my colleagues' testimony and to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Moore follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JONATHAN MOORE

Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you today.

I'm here on behalf of the State Department's Bureau of International Organization Affairs. We are dedicated to ensuring that the views of the administration and the values of the American people are accurately reflected and respected in multilateral fora, including in United Nations resolutions, statements, reports, correspondence, and activities.

In addition to our foreign affairs professionals, we are extremely fortunate to have energetic, expert, informed, and influential ambassadors and permanent representa-

tives in New York, Geneva, Rome, Montreal, Vienna, and Nairobi. Thank you for including Ambassador Kip Tom in this hearing; he will speak to his perspectives from our mission to the U.N. in Rome.

Mr. Chairman, the United States played the lead role in founding the United Nations nearly 75 years ago, and continues to be the proud host of the U.N. Security Council and General Assembly in New York. The U.N. and other international organizations have key responsibilities on the global stage, and American leadership is crucial.

The challenges we face are real—active conflicts, humanitarian crises, terrorism, and threats to global health.

The opportunities are also real—from protecting intellectual property to improving aviation safety, reinforcing human rights protections, and helping people in need.

The administration has repeatedly demonstrated its determination to promote American interests and prosperity in and through international organizations.

As you know well, Mr. Chairman, the United States remains by far the largest financial contributor to the United Nations—well over 9 billion dollars last year, the vast majority of which supports humanitarian response efforts.

U.N. peacekeeping operations are among the most effective mechanisms to address global challenges to international peace and security, and remain an essential tool in protecting the most vulnerable populations.

It's important to note that the U.N. has recently concluded peace operations in Cote d'Ivoire and Liberia, and that the peacekeeping mission in Haiti has transitioned to a special political mission.

Across the multilateral system, the administration's commitment to reform is unwavering. Much more can and must be done to cut waste and overlap, improve hiring practices, and embrace transparency.

Eliminating sexual exploitation and abuse is another critical aspect of reform, both in peacekeeping operations and throughout U.N. agencies.

Reform also extends to fixing parts of the multilateral system that have failed to keep pace with global trends. At the Universal Postal Union, grossly outdated pricing systems created market distortions that harmed U.S. business. In October 2018, the President announced his intent to withdraw from the UPU unless corrective action was taken.

Over the following year, we coordinated intensive diplomatic outreach and accomplished that goal, with the result that U.S. businesses will no longer face severe disadvantages related to the international shipping of small packages.

This is just one example of how the administration is scrutinizing international organizations to guarantee that our international commitments do not result in unfair or inequitable treatment for the United States.

The U.N. Human Rights Council is a less positive example. Our efforts to spur reform of the Council were genuine and sustained, but it remains fundamentally broken. Nevertheless, with the strong support of Congress, the United States remains vigorously engaged in protecting human rights around the world. My colleague, Scott Busby, will speak to this.

As a further example of our multilateral engagement, the administration is considering our return—with the consent of Congress—to the U.N. World Tourism Organization, recognizing that tourism is a significant economic driver in many areas of the United States.

As we approach the U.N.'s 75th anniversary, we need the U.N. to remain relevant and serve our national interests, particularly as other centers of power such as China become increasingly assertive.

Mr. Chairman, over its history, the U.N. has been responsible for some impressive successes and some spectacular failures. Your attention, and that of Congress, are invaluable in helping us serve the United States, and keep the U.N. on track. Thank you again for the opportunity to discuss these and other important issues today. I look forward to responding to your questions.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you, Mr. Moore.

Our next witness is Ambassador Kip Tom. Ambassador Tom serves the United States now at the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture in Rome. He is a farmer with a lifetime of agricultural and development experience, and I would be remiss if I did not mention his most important attribute. He happens to be a fellow Hoosier. Mr. Ambassador, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. KIP TOM, REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE, U.S. MISSION TO THE U.N. AGENCIES, ROME, IT

Ambassador TOM. Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley and to all members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Agencies in Rome represents the United States' interests to the three U.N. principal organizations dedicated to food and agriculture, as well as our three international organizations handling the rule of law, harmonization of commercial law, and cultural heritage preservation.

As a successful seventh generation farmer and businessman, I came into this job knowing what it takes to grow a business, create jobs, and empower youth. I also came into this position appreciating the strong leadership of this committee and the United States on global food security. After more than 6 months in Rome, I am pleased to report to you on the central leadership role that the United States takes at the United Nations as we advance our nation's interests.

First, the World Food Programme, or WFP, is in the good hands under the leadership of Executive Director David Beasley, the former Governor of South Carolina. The scale of humanitarian need and forced displacement around the world is unprecedented, and WFP provided food, cash-based transfers, and commodity vouchers to over 86 million people in 2018. The United States remains a leader in generosity and assistance, as we are likely to donate nearly $3 billion USD through the WFP this year alone. With a staggering 821 million people globally who are under-nourished, WFP demonstrates the value of the international community coming together under strong U.S. leadership to deliver critical life-saving support to so many of the world's most vulnerable. Our continued leadership is saving lives and furthering the interests of our country each and every day.

The Food and Agriculture Organization, or FAO, is equally critical to American interests, given its role in Codex Alimentarius and setting the food standards that give the framework for American farmers and food companies to be the leading exporter of agricultural products globally. FAO must also provide the tools and policy support for agriculture practitioners and rural communities to transform in response to modern challenges. These tools should include biotechnology and other innovations so farmers can make sustainable choices. If FAO works the way it should by enhancing people's livelihoods and economic potential in all communities, we can advance key American objectives, including by addressing some of the root causes of conflict and economic migration. Simply put, if we do not get the FAO right, we can never put enough money into the World Food Programme.

However, there are challenges at FAO. Like other U.N. agencies, FAO needs to address issues such as opaque hiring practices, waste and overlap, and concerns about misconduct. FAO, like U.N. agencies, has just begun to undertake specific commitments to fight sexual exploitation and abuse of humanitarian workers operating its auspices. FAO is under new leadership, with former Chinese Vice Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Qu Dongyu, taking office in August of

this year. As Dr. Qu himself has said, we can and must hold FAO's leadership to account in ensuring that FAO is an organization that meets the interests of all member states and directly addresses the significant challenges facing rural communities today.

Dr. Qu has promised to improve FAO's models by giving farmers expanded access to all tools and knowledge to help them feed themselves and grow their economies. He also recognizes that the world is changing and his team needs to increase partnerships with the private sector to ensure agriculture and rural communities are economically sustainable. We will both hold FAO and Dr. Qu to these promises.

With this leadership change, the strong U.S. voice at the FAO is more critical than ever. We provide more than $100 million in assessed contributions annually and almost an equal amount in voluntary funding to support critical work such as addressing animal and plant health globally and responding to agricultural crises. But we are also working to ensure that FAO is held accountable and is transparent in decision-making and crafting the programs that truly impact the global community.

I am proud of our strong team at U.S. U.N. Rome Mission as they work daily to ensure American citizens are equitably represented amongst the FAO employees, including at the senior level. Our scientists and agriculture experts, for instance, are best in class. We need the critical thinking skills and evidence-based decision-making they bring to the table for discussions about agriculture policies and tools. We also seek to ensure a fair playing field for American agricultural interests through negotiations and policies on agriculture and standards.

Today I am proud to uphold the work we do in Rome as a clear example demonstrating that the United States remains a central leader at the United Nations and in the multilateral sphere. We need to increase our presence to further American interests globally. As a business leader, I have always believed that there is nothing more important to a leader's success than the ability to unify those with different backgrounds and interests behind a common purpose. We see this daily at the U.N. agencies in Rome, and with your support, we will continue our work to ensure American leadership in addressing food insecurity and the rule of law around the world.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Tom follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR KIP TOM

Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, and all Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Agencies in Rome represents the United States' interests to the three U.N. principal organizations dedicated to food and agriculture, as well as three international organizations handling the rule of law, harmonization of commercial law, and cultural heritage preservation. As a successful seventh-generation family farmer, I came into this job knowing what it takes to grow agriculture, create jobs, and empower youth. I also came into this position appreciating the strong leadership of this Committee and the United States on global food security. After more than 6 months in Rome, I am pleased to report to you on the central leadership role that the United States takes at the United Nations, as we advance our nation's interests.

First, the World Food Programme (or WFP) is in good hands under the leadership of Executive Director David Beasley, the former Governor of South Carolina. The

scale of humanitarian need and forced displacement around the world is unprecedented, and WFP provided food, cash-based transfers, and commodity vouchers to over 86 million people in 2018. The United States remains a leader in generosity and assistance, as we are likely to donate nearly 3 billion U.S. dollars through WFP this year. With a staggering 821 million people globally who are undernourished, WFP demonstrates the value of the international community coming together, under strong U.S. leadership, to deliver critical life-saving support to so many of the world's most vulnerable. Our continued leadership is saving lives and furthering the interests of our country every day.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (or FAO) is equally critical to American interests, given its role in Codex Alimentarius and setting the food safety standards that give the framework for American farmers to be the leading exporters of agricultural products globally. FAO must also provide the tools and policy support for agricultural practitioners and rural communities to transform in response to modern challenges. These tools should include biotechnology and other innovations so farmers can make informed choices. If FAO works the way it should, by enhancing people's livelihoods and economic potential in all communities, we can advance key American objectives, including by addressing some of the root causes of conflict and economic migration. Simply put, if we don't get FAO right, we simply cannot put enough money into WFP to meet future challenges.

However, there are challenges at FAO. Like other U.N. agencies, FAO needs to address issues such as opaque hiring practices, waste and overlap, and concerns about misconduct. FAO, like all U.N. agencies, has undertaken specific commitments to fight potential sexual exploitation and abuse by humanitarian workers operating under its auspices. FAO is under new leadership, with former Chinese Vice Minister of Agriculture Dr. Qu Dongyu taking office in August of this year. As Dr. Qu himself has said, we can and must hold FAO's leadership to account in ensuring that FAO is an organization that meets the interests of all member states and directly addresses the significant challenges facing rural communities today.

Dr. Qu has promised to improve FAO's models by giving farmers expanded access to all the tools and knowledge to help them feed themselves. He also recognizes that the world is changing and his team needs to increase partnership with the private sector to ensure agriculture and rural communities are economically sustainable. We will hold both FAO and Dr. Qu to these promises.

With this leadership change, the strong U.S. voice at FAO is more critical than ever. We provide more than $100 million in assessed contributions annually—and a similar amount in voluntary funds—to support critical work such as addressing animal and plant health globally, and responding to agricultural crises. But w are also working to ensure that FAO is held accountable and is transparent in decision-making and crafting the programs that impact the global community.

My team works daily to ensure American citizens are equitably represented amongst FAO employees, including at the senior level. Our scientists and agriculture experts, for instance, are top-notch. We need the critical thinking skills and evidence-based decision-making they bring to the table for discussions about agriculture policies and tools. We also seek to ensure a fair playing field for American agricultural interests through negotiations and policies on agriculture and standards.

The United States demonstrates similar leadership at the other international agencies in Rome. For example, as the president of the Standing Committee of the International Development Law Organization, we just led a process to select a strong new Director General to lead this critical organization in addressing rule of law challenges globally. This week, our negotiators are concluding a protocol to facilitate financing for the sale of mining, agriculture, and construction equipment to developing countries. We work with institutions like the International Fund for Agriculture Development to ensure low-cost loans or grants for growing new small businesses in rural areas, thereby generating jobs.

Today, I am proud to uphold the work we do in Rome as a clear example demonstrating the United States remains a central leader at the United Nations and in the multilateral sphere. We need to maintain and increase our presence to further American interests globally. As a business leader, I have always believed that there is nothing more important to a leader's success than the ability to unify those with different backgrounds and interests behind a common purpose. We see this daily at the U.N. agencies in Rome. With your support, we will continue our work to ensure American leadership in addressing food insecurity and rule of law around the world.

Thank you.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Our third witness, Mr. Scott Busby, serves as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor at the Department of State. He served his nation in a series of roles for over 25 years. Mr. Busby, you may now proceed.

STATEMENT OF SCOTT BUSBY, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY, BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. BUSBY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Merkley, thank you for this opportunity to testify on how the U.S. is promoting human rights in multilateral fora and organizations. We are committed to working closely with you on this issue.

The United States continues to work through a variety of multilateral and multi-stakeholder venues and mechanisms to educate, persuade, and fight for human rights. That said, all of these tools have challenges ranging from simple disagreement among U.N. member states to actions by malicious governments to thwart human rights.

At the United Nations, the U.S. interacts with myriad U.N. bodies, programs, special mandate holders, and agencies that address human rights and democracy. From work on counterterrorism efforts to development, the U.S. insists that human rights, good governance, and respect for the rule of law are integral to achieving the peace, prosperity, and security to which these entities and the U.S. are committed.

Thus, for instance, at the U.N. Third Committee, the body charged with taking up human rights issues within the General Assembly, the U.S. recently led or supported a variety of resolutions on troubling country situations, including Iran, North Korea, Burma, Syria, and Russia, Russian occupied Crimea, as well as important thematic issues like a U.S.-sponsored resolution on elections and democratization.

We also seek to highlight human rights by organizing or joining events or statements in U.N. fora on countries or issues of concern. For example, during this year's U.N. General Assembly high-level week, the U.S. along with several other countries sponsored a widely publicized event on the horrible abuses occurring in the Xinjiang region of China. Subsequently, we joined 22 other countries to deliver a strong statement of concern at the Third Committee about the abuses taking place there.

At the Security Council, we have also sought to elevate attention to human rights by, among other things, sponsoring discussions on human rights in countries like North Korea and Syria and supporting the inclusion of human rights and justice-focused mandates in peacekeeping missions, where appropriate.

We also support the U.N. Secretary-General's efforts to end impunity among U.N. peacekeeping forces, including by implementing the U.N.'s zero-tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse and ensuring that peacekeepers are not drawn from security forces responsible for human rights abuses.

Consistent with the recently released U.S. Women, Peace, and Security strategy, we are also steadfast advocates for increasing

the meaningful participation of women in peacekeeping operations and at all levels of negotiation and dispute resolution.

We also raise and act on concerns about U.N. bodies that do not live up to the human rights ideals of the United Nations. For example, we withdrew as a member of the Human Rights Council out of concern about the process for electing its members and its biased, unfair, and unacceptable singling out of Israel. Just last month, for instance, U.N. member states inexplicably elected Venezuela over Costa Rica to the council. While we chose to leave the council for these reasons, we will continue our reform efforts so that the council might realize its potential.

While we are no longer members of the council, the U.S. does participate in the Universal Periodic Review process, through which every member state of the U.N. undergoes an evaluation of its human rights record. We have also supported certain country and thematic mandates and mechanisms created by the HRC that genuinely advance human rights including, for instance, country mandates on Iran, North Korea, Cambodia, Eritrea, Burundi, Syria, South Sudan, Venezuela, and Myanmar, as well as thematic mandates on freedom of expression, freedom of association and peaceful assembly, and freedom of religion.

We also regularly engage with the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights and her office and support its activities in a number of countries and on a range of issues.

Moreover, we continue to strongly support the International Labor Organization, which serves as a key U.S. partner for combating exploitative child labor and human trafficking, promoting worker rights, and improving working conditions.

In addition to our work at the U.N., we continue to actively promote human rights and democracy in regional organizations and other multilateral and multi-stakeholder initiatives. For instance, for more than four decades, the United States has been the foremost champion of human rights within the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Among other things, we support OSCE missions in Ukraine, the Balkans, and Central Asia that work with host governments and civil society to monitor and advance human rights, the rule of law, good governance, and rights-respecting approaches to security.

Closer to home, the Department also works with the Organization of American States and the inter-American human rights system to promote and defend the democratic principles in the Inter-American Democratic Charter. For instance, in June at the OAS General Assembly, we led efforts to adopt new text paving the way for coordinated action to hold the former Maduro regime accountable for its ongoing violations of human rights and democratic principles.

We also contribute similarly to the African Union and its organs to build their capacity to promote human rights.

In recent years, we have also strongly supported the establishment of new multi-stakeholder processes that bring together likeminded governments and other key players such as business and civil society to work on specific human rights problems. We have played a leading role in developing and sustaining a number of such initiatives, which are described in my written testimony.

Promoting human rights and democracy in international fora is a lengthy, iterative, and often slow process. Since the end of the Cold War, we have made progress, but there has been backsliding, as well as significant pushback. China, as both of you mentioned, seeks to weaken human rights action in international fora with flowery resolutions that use benign phrases like "mutually shared beneficial cooperation" or "win-win" outcomes. Russia pushes resolutions that try to elevate undefined traditional values over rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And many try to ensure that independent NGOs have no voice at the U.N. Despite these efforts, we continue to believe that the U.N. and other international fora are crucial arenas in which to advance human rights, and we will continue to fight there for the unalienable rights and fundamental freedoms in America's founding documents and the Universal Declaration.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Busby follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SCOTT BUSBY

Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, and distinguished Members of the Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development and Multilateral Institutions, thank you for this opportunity to testify on how the U.S. is promoting human rights in multilateral fora and organizations. I commend the committee for its attention to these issues. The Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor at the State Department is committed to working closely with the committee to address pressing human rights problems around the globe through multilateral organizations.

On the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, Professor Mary Ann Glendon wrote:

Ultimately, promoting human rights depends on deep support across cultural and ideological divides. This is what Eleanor Roosevelt envisioned, when she declared that documents expressing ideals "carry no weight unless the people know them, unless the people understand them, unless the people demand that they be lived."[1]

These words provide insight on what any successful promotion of human rights and democracy, particularly in a multilateral setting must do—build support across divides. The Government of the United States works through a variety of multilateral and multi-stakeholder venues and mechanisms to educate, persuade, and fight for human rights. Our task in these institutions is to establish and sustain platforms where governments can seek to reach consensus on international human rights law, where human rights defenders and civil society voices can be heard, and where the international community can call to account those governments and individuals that violate or abuse human rights. That said, all of these mechanisms have challenges ranging from simple disagreement among U.N. member states to actions by malicious governments to thwart attention to human rights.

At the United Nations, the U.S. interacts with myriad U.N. bodies, programs, special mandate holders, and agencies that address human rights and democracy issues. From work on counterterrorism efforts to development, the U.S. insists that human rights, good governance, and respect for the rule of law are integral to achieving the peace, prosperity, and security to which these entities and the U.S. are committed. During UNGA High Level Week, for instance, the President hosted the Global Call to Protect Religious Freedom with the Secretary General of the U.N. Over 130 delegations from U.N. member states, observers, and U.N. agencies attended, as well as religious leaders, business leaders, and civil society.

At the U.N. Third Committee, the body charged with taking up human rights issues within the General Assembly, the U.S. supports a variety of resolutions on troubling country situations and important thematic issues. The Third Committee is concluding its session now and we have actively advocated for resolutions on the human rights situations in Iran, North Korea, Burma, Syria, and Russian-occupied Crimea, as well as the U.S.-sponsored resolution on elections and democratization. Last year, we led efforts to get the Third Committee to pass important resolutions on Freedom of Expression and Freedom of Association and Peaceful Assembly.

[1] https://www.the-american-interest.com/2018/12/19/the-universal-declaration-turns-70/

We also seek to highlight human rights by organizing and co-sponsoring events and marshalling joint statements in U.N. forums on countries or issues of concern. For example, during this year's U.N. General Assembly high-level week, the U.S. along with several other countries sponsored an event on the horrible abuses occurring in the Xinjiang region of China. Hearing from Uighurs who have suffered or whose families have experienced abuses, we learned more about the repressive measures the Chinese Communist government has undertaken. We brought the international community together to hear about mass detentions in internment camps; pervasive, high-tech surveillance; draconian controls on expressions of cultural and religious identity; and coercion of individuals to return from abroad to an often perilous fate in China, and we challenged the international community to do more. Subsequent to the event, we joined 22 other countries to deliver a strong joint statement of concern at the Third Committee about the abuses taking place in Xinjiang. The U.S. hosted a similar event on Xinjiang on the margins of the March U.N. Human Rights Council session and has hosted similar events on Nicaragua in conjunction with its Universal Periodic Review; on Venezuela, also on the margins of the March U.N. Human Rights Council; and, together with the European Union, on female detainees in Syria on the margins of the July U.N. Human Rights Council session.

At the Security Council, we have sought to elevate attention to the link between human rights and international peace and security by, among other things, sponsoring discussions on the human rights situation in countries like North Korea and supporting the inclusion of human rights and justice-focused mandates, and strengthening of civilian institutions in peacekeeping missions, where appropriate. For example, in Haiti over the last year, we successfully pushed for the reconfiguration of the peacekeeping mission to focus on justice, police, and the rule of law and added a robust human rights monitoring mandate, including recognition that more must be done to counter pervasive gender-based violence. As the justice mission in Haiti progressed, the U.N. Security Council transitioned from a justice-focused peacekeeping operation to a special political mission. The U.N. special political mission in Haiti now joins other U.N. civilian missions charged with strengthening political stability and good governance while monitoring and reporting on human rights abuses, including in Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Libya, and Somalia. In the Central African Republic, we have supported the peacekeeping mission's mandate to assist the CAR specialized domestic court to hold accountable those responsible for atrocities. Last month, we noted the critical role the U.N.–AU Mission in Darfur plays in promoting accountability for human rights abuses.

At the United States' urging, the U.N. Security Council in August held the first standalone session on the Assad regime's ongoing practice of arbitrarily detaining, torturing, and extrajudicially killing hundreds of thousands of Syrian civilians in order to silence calls for reform and change. The session provided an unprecedented platform for raising the concerns of Syrian civil society, as well as former detainees, and bolstered international consensus on the importance of tangible progress towards the release of those arbitrarily detained in Syria, greater access for families to information on their detained loved ones, and improved prison conditions as a key component of efforts towards a political resolution to the Syria conflict in line with UNSCR 2254.

We also support the U.N. Secretary-General's efforts to end impunity among U.N. peacekeeping forces, including implementing the U.N.'s zero-tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse. As the leading bilateral partner for peacekeeping capacity-building assistance, the U.S. demands the best of our partners and of ourselves as we support effective development and delivery of peacekeeping training that meets or exceeds U.N. standards. We regularly reiterate the importance of pre-deployment and in-mission training of all peacekeeping personnel on preventing sexual exploitation and abuse and gender-based violence, including in context-specific scenario-based training and early-warning preparedness.

We have also supported the U.N. Secretariat's efforts to ensure that peacekeepers are not drawn from security forces that have been responsible for human rights abuses. For instance, the U.N. recently suspended future Sri Lankan Army deployment to peacekeeping operations in response to Lieutenant General Shavendra Silva being appointed as Sri Lanka's army chief, a person who is credibly alleged to be responsible for gross violations of human rights. We are also steadfast advocates for increasing the meaningful participation of women in peacekeeping operations, which results in "higher reporting of sexual and gender-based violence, as well as lower

incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse."[2] The State Department's Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) increases women's participation in peacekeeping training and peacekeeping deployments. Since 2007, more than 9,300 female peacekeepers have participated in GPOI training events. Moreover, since 2010, GPOI partners have increased the number of deployed women military peacekeepers by 105 percent, while non-GPOI countries have only increased their numbers by 21 percent.

Women peacekeepers are able to more effectively engage with women at the local level, and therefore, can gather more valuable information on threats to the civilian population, including conflict-related sexual violence, than their male counterparts. Similarly, consistent with the recently released U.S. Women, Peace, and Security Strategy, we are actively promoting the meaningful participation of women at all levels of dispute resolution, including in decision-making and negotiating bodies and meditating teams. We know that meaningfully including women in decision making and peace processes, highly contributes to whether that peace process will be successful and sustainable.

Furthermore, throughout the U.N. system, the United States works to ensure that the voices of human rights defenders are heard and that they may speak without fear of reprisals. In this respect, one of our focuses is on the Economic and Social Council's NGO accreditation committee, which is populated by a number of states that prefer to silence human rights defenders and non-governmental organizations. In this respect, we recognize the unique threats that women human rights defenders face and have mobilized attention and support to this issue. We are also strong supporters of the Secretary-General's efforts to collect and call out reprisals taken against members of civil society for their participation in U.N.-related meetings or processes. And we have fought to counteract efforts by other countries to prevent human rights defenders from speaking at the U.N.

We also raise concerns about U.N. bodies that do not live up to the human rights mandates of the United Nations, and act on those concerns when necessary. For example, we withdrew as a member of the Human Rights Council out of concern about the criteria and process for electing its members, which has resulted in some of the world's worst human rights abusing governments serving on the Council. Just last month, for instance, U.N. member states inexplicably elected Venezuela to join the HRC over Costa Rica—an outrageous outcome for a body founded to advance human rights. Similarly, we object to the Human Rights Council's biased, unfair, and unacceptable singling out of Israel, which remains the only country that has a Council agenda item specifically devoted to it. While we chose to leave the Council for these reasons, we will continue our efforts to try to reform the Council to address these shortcomings and realize its potential.

While we do not engage on Human Rights Council resolutions, the U.S. does participate in Universal Periodic Review—a process in which every member state of the U.N. submits a self-evaluation of its domestic human rights practices and engages in an interactive dialogue with other governments their recommendations for improvement. As every U.N. member state participates in the UPR, we use the process to raise our concerns and make human rights recommendations to every country in the world. We continue to believe that the UPR process sets benchmarks that the country under review agrees to uphold, allowing the international community to hold every member state accountable for its commitments. We have also supported certain country and thematic mandates and mechanisms created by the HRC that genuinely advance human rights, including, for instance, the special rapporteurs on Iran, North Korea, Cambodia, and Eritrea; the Commissions of Inquiry on North Korea, Burundi,, and Syria; the Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan; the Fact Finding Missions on Venezuela and Myanmar; the thematic rapporteurs on freedom of expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association; and the independent expert on sexual orientation and gender identity, among others.

We also regularly engage with the High Commissioner for Human Rights and her office (OHCHR) and support their activities in a number of countries and on a range of issues.

OHCHR has field presences throughout the world that provide technical assistance, monitor human rights, serve as the human rights component of peacekeeping operations and respond to immediate crises. The U.S. is the second largest donor to OHCHR so far in 2019.

We further support work on human rights, good governance and democracy issues in a variety of other U.N. independent agencies, offices, including U.N. Women, UNICEF, the U.N. Development Program, the International Labor Organization, the International Telecommunications Union, the U.N. Democracy Fund, the U.N.

[2] https://www.un.org/press/en/2019/sc13773.doc.htm

Office of Drugs and Crime, and the World Bank. The United States remains UNICEF's largest donor both in terms of core funding and overall resources, helping the U.N.'s flagship agency promote and protect children's welfare and well-being.

At the ILO, which serves as a key U.S. partner for achieving international labor-related objectives, such as combating exploitive child labor and human trafficking, promoting worker rights, and improving working conditions we have focused on the problem of forced labor in Myanmar and have supported the Government of Qatar's attempts to reform its kafala system, which can facilitate forced labor. The tripartite nature of the ILO—where governments, workers and business all have an active role—encourages a balanced and representative discussion on international labor standards.

The U.S. continues to actively engage with the U.N. and other multilateral institutions to enhance coordination on atrocity prevention, mitigation, and response efforts, while also advancing the institutionalization of this agenda within the U.N. system. Additionally, we are a member of the Group of Friends for the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) where we continue to reaffirm the United States' commitment to atrocity prevention and strengthen U.S. ties to partner nations and civil society actors. Further, we regularly participate in exchanges with likeminded countries to develop shared recommendations and coordinated action to mitigate the risk of mass atrocities.

We also support mechanisms that lay the ground for accountability for atrocities through our diplomatic and/or financial support to a number of U.N. investigative mechanisms, including the U.N. International Impartial and Independent Mechanism (IIIM) for Syria, the U.N. Investigative Team to Promote Accountability for Crimes Committed by Da'esh (UNITAD), and the U.N. Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar (IIMM).

In addition to our work at the U.N., the State Department does a great deal of human rights and democracy promotion work in regional organizations and other multilateral and multi-stakeholder initiatives. For instance, for more than four decades, the United States has been the foremost champion within the 57-member Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) of fundamental freedoms and of human rights defenders targeted for repression by their governments. The United States uses weekly meetings of the OSCE's Permanent Council to speak out about ongoing human rights concerns—from abuses against Crimean Tatars and others opposed to Russia's occupation of Ukraine's Crimea, to Russia's persecution of Jehovah's Witnesses and members of other religious minority groups, the undermining of the rule of law in Turkey, the crackdown on dissent in Azerbaijan, the plight of political prisoners in the post-Soviet states of Central Asia, and the rise in anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance in the OSCE region. We also are a leading participant in the OSCE's annual Human Dimension Implementation Meeting (HDIM) in Warsaw, which constitutes the largest human rights gathering in Europe and Eurasia, drawing hundreds of frontline civil society activists and representatives of human rights advocacy organizations in addition to governments.

We also support the work of the OSCE's independent institutions, such as its High Commissioner on National Minorities, its Representative on Freedom of the Media, and its Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR). ODIHR's methodologies are considered the world's gold standard for independent elections observation. We also support OSCE field missions in Ukraine, the Balkans, and Central Asia that work with host governments and civil society to advance human rights, the rule of law, good governance, and rights-respecting approaches to security. The OSCE's Special Monitoring Mission provides invaluable reporting on the mounting human cost of Russia's continuing aggression against Ukraine. We use OSCE diplomatic tools to spotlight other serious abuses. For example, in December 2018, the United States and 15 other countries invoked the OSCE's Moscow Mechanism in response to reports of serious abuses committed against LGBTI individuals, human rights monitors, and others in Russia's Republic of Chechnya. The resulting fact-finding Mission drew unprecedented international attention to the alarming human rights conditions in Chechnya, which the Kremlin allows to continue with impunity.

In addition, the U.S. also engages with and supports the work of the Council of Europe (COE), which promotes democracy and the rule of law in its 47 member states, including all EU members. The U.S. is an observer to the COE and a full member of some COE subsidiary bodies, including the European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission) and the Group of Countries Against Corruption (GRECO).

Closer to home, the Department works through the Organization of American States and the Inter-American human rights system to promote and defend, throughout the entire hemisphere, the democratic principles enshrined in the Inter-

American Democratic Charter. We actively participate in Permanent Council meetings on matters of shared concern, as well as other bodies including sessions of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the Inter American Women's Commission (CIM), and the regional anti-corruption peer review mechanism (MESICIC) supporting the Inter American Convention Against Corruption.

For instance, at the June OAS General Assembly in Medellin, we took decisive action to strengthen the OAS's role in forging a hemisphere distinguished by democracy, peace, respect for human rights, and cooperation. In particular, we adopted new texts paving the way for coordinated action to hold the former Maduro regime accountable for its ongoing violations of democratic order. We also established a clear process to review the state of democracy in Nicaragua, through a new high-level fact finding commission of the OAS. And we sponsored the first ever OAS text on religious freedom, allowing us to partner with countries around the hemisphere to strengthen best practices and dialogue in support of liberty and religion or belief.

As an observer at the African Union (AU), we have worked with the AU and its organs to build their capacity to promote human rights, strengthen democratic governance, and support the rule of law and access to justice. For instance, the United States is working with the AU to stand up the Hybrid Court for South Sudan to hold perpetrators of violations of international law and applicable South Sudanese law accountable.

We have long believed that getting like-minded governments and other key stakeholders such as business and civil society together to work on specific human rights problems can reap benefits and have strongly supported the establishment of such processes in recent years. We have been active participants in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) as it develops guidance for companies on respecting human rights. The OECD is a venue to share best practices and help develop guidance alongside governments, companies, NGOS, and labor and provides an important venue to discuss corporate implementation of international best practices around human rights. In the wake of the human rights tragedies in the Niger delta in the 1990s, the U.S. led the founding of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights—an initiative involving governments, businesses, and civil society organizations that seeks to promote human rights in the security operations of extractive companies. We have also played a leading role in developing and sustaining the International Code of Conduct for Security Providers and its related association, which seeks to encourage all private security providers to respect human rights; the Freedom Online Coalition—a group of like-minded governments committed to advancing human rights online; the Centre for Sport and Human Rights, which is committed to addressing human rights concerns throughout the lifecycle of mega-sporting events; the Equal Rights Coalition, a group of likeminded governments that addresses human rights and dignity of LGBTI individuals, the Open Government Partnership—a multi-stakeholder initiative in which governments and civil society work together to promote accountable governance and empower citizens, and the Community of Democracies—the primary international grouping of governments working to advance democratic values and principles globally.

Promoting human rights and democracy in international fora is a lengthy, iterative, and often slow process that moves in fits and starts. It is a long-term endeavor. It was only in 1948 that the Universal Declaration on Human Rights was approved. The High Commissioner's position was created in 1993. Since the end of the Cold War, we have made progress, but there is also significant pushback as well as backsliding. The People's Republic of China seeks to weaken respect for human rights and deflect and water-down human rights criticism and action in international fora with flowery resolutions that use seemingly benign phrases like "mutually shared beneficial cooperation" or "win-win" outcomes to advance its policy priorities. Russia pushes resolutions that try to elevate indeterminate "traditional values" over the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration. Cuba, Venezuela, Iran, Russia, China and others fight to ensure that NGOs that are critical of governments will have no voice at the U.N. These efforts seek to avoid or thwart accountability for human rights violations and abuses at the U.N. and elsewhere. On the contrary, we believe that the U.N. and other international fora are crucial arenas in which to advance human rights internationally and we will continue to fight for American values and for the unalienable rights and fundamental freedoms in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Senator YOUNG. Well, thank you, Mr. Busby.

I appreciate each of you gentlemen for your testimonies, and we will be adjourning and then going to vote, as I said earlier, and

then back as soon as possible. So in just minutes, I know Senator Merkley and I will return. We are eager to hear your answers to all of our questions.

[Recess.]

Senator YOUNG. The subcommittee reconvenes. I thank everyone for their patience, including the tens of viewers we have on C–SPAN too.

[Laughter.]

Senator ROMNEY. I was going to say that would be our peak.

Senator YOUNG. That is right.

My apologies to Hoosier Brian Lamb.

So, listen, we will run with questions for about 30 minutes because I am very eager to dive into those. I am actually going to take the chairman's prerogative here, if the ranking member is ready, and defer to him, allow him to begin questions. We will do 7-minute rounds until we get to about the 30-minute mark, and then we will bring on the next panel.

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am happy to jump in.

I want to start first on the human rights front. And I appreciate your testimony, Mr. Busby. But I am concerned. I am concerned that I did not hear the names of Russia in your presentation. I did not hear the names of the Philippines. I did not hear Saudi Arabia. I did not hear North Korea. It seems to me, as we get feedback from across the world, that the inconsistent advocacy for human rights and the U.S. routinely dissing its allies while promoting dictatorships from the Oval Office is really damaging our international credibility. I know it is your job to say otherwise, but I wanted to raise the concern and just hear what you have to say.

Mr. BUSBY. Thank you for the question, Senator.

I did, in fact, mention Russia and North Korea in my testimony. Russia in particular has undertaken several resolutions in the Human Rights Council, one on traditional values, which we have consistently opposed. And on North Korea, we recently agreed with the consensus on a resolution at the Third Committee in New York and continue to work closely with the special rapporteur on North Korea who is cataloging abuses there.

We have not shied away from calling out human rights abuses in places like Saudi Arabia and the Philippines and other places. In Saudi Arabia, we did apply Global Magnitsky sanctions against I think 16 of the individuals implicated in the death of Jamal Khashoggi. And in the Philippines, we also have called attention to the unjust killings of many people in conjunction with the drug war there. So we are calling out other countries.

We do continue to publish our annual human rights reports, which do cover every country in the world, and we do not pull any punches in those reports.

Senator MERKLEY. I know you could go on at length about all the effects and so forth. But it does not look that way to the rest of the world.

And on Saudi Arabia, do you not think there is something fundamentally wrong with us attacking the 16 who were following orders from the crown prince while ignoring the crown prince and promoting him as a leader we can work with in the world?

And I must say you did mention Burma in your remarks, but the President of the United States has never said a single word about Burma. Not a single word. And he did not know what the Rohingya were when he had a Rohingya in his office. He said I think, where is that or what is that. It is very clear that when you have the worst genocide on the planet back 2 years ago, that not having the President of the United States take a stand on it sends a message, even when all of you in the State Department are working very hard. So I just wanted to express that concern.

I want to turn to the role of China in the United Nations and specifically its increasingly assertive use of the United Nations, various agencies. My colleague pointed out that they now head a number of agencies. They have been quite assertive in the Human Rights Council in tabling resolutions, which is very concerning. They have used their influence in the General Assembly to neuter resolutions on peacekeeping mandates and funding related to human rights.

Share a little bit with us about the strategy of how we address the growing role of China in the United Nations.

Mr. MOORE. Senator, thank you very much for that question.

It is a very comprehensive problem and it is being dealt with in a very comprehensive way. We are working with coalitions at many levels and in many regions to push back on China's efforts to erode or co-opt the norms of the U.N. system, and we are strengthening those coalitions in particular with likeminded states. We are seeing China seeking the leadership of U.N. institutions, particularly those which are responsible for setting rules and standards. We see in many cases China seeking exactly those positions to subvert the standards and the rules of the U.N. system for its own national purposes. This is something which is recognized by other countries and other partners in the U.N. We are combating this again through building coalitions, through bilateral and multilateral diplomacy to seeking to make sure that key U.N. institutions have the strongest possible leaders, persons who are expert and who have the goals and values of the U.N. and all of its member states, not just China, in mind. It is a very comprehensive effort.

Senator MERKLEY. Well, let us take an individual example. The International Telecommunications Union is under the leadership of a Chinese official, which some argue gives China a platform to push its concept of a digital Silk Road. Is there a risk that the ITU can be used to push other countries to adopt Chinese models of surveillance or other key issues related to communications?

Mr. MOORE. Senator, thank you for raising the ITU. It is one of those organizations that is absolutely at the top of our list of concerns. Our mission to the U.N. in Geneva works directly every day to focus on the work of ITU. We have directly criticized the head of the ITU for having engaged in a memorandum of understanding with Huawei, the Chinese company, on the subject of 5G. We are very concerned that the leadership at all levels of ITU again reflect international standards, and ITU should not be used by anyone, not its head and not by external actors for the interests of a specific country.

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you. I pass it back.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Romney.

Senator ROMNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you to each of the participants today for your testimony.

There are some people in my party, my wing of the world, if you will, that are very wary of international institutions of any kind, particularly the U.N. I got a lot of questions when I was campaigning about support for the U.N. They feel a degree of skepticism about what role these institutions have, and I think there is a fear that international institutions will, in some way, impede on American sovereignty, our right to set our own course and do what is in the best interests of America.

But at the same time, these international institutions are shaping international standards, and those standards affect everything from agriculture to communications, electronics, and so forth. And so if you want to have America participate in the global economy, it would strike me as important for us to participate in the international institutions.

I would also note that if we want to see, I will call them, malign players having less influence in international institutions, the only way that I know how to effectively do that is by having us play a greater role. And when we pull back from participating in international organizations, then obviously someone else is going to step in. It will be someone who considers themselves the heir apparent to become the super power of the world.

So let me ask each of you. First of all, Mr. Tom, with regard to Chinese leadership in the Food and Agriculture Organization, what does that mean? What kind of things can they do? Is it just a nice title to have, or is there actual impact that might have that would affect America's farmers, America's growers, America's packagers, and so forth?

Ambassador TOM. Senator, thank you for that question.

Over the past 6 months since arrival in Rome, I can assure you I have spent significant time at the World Food Programme where we provide aid around the world. And the role of FAO was to create resilience and capacity. And I can share with you. On my many mission trips to South Sudan, Rwanda, Zimbabwe, and in conversations at the WFP, I can share with you that it continues to be a problem across the Sahel, from the east coast to the west coast of Africa, where we see people giving up hope. They migrate. And when they migrate, tens of thousands, sometimes hundreds of thousands go into IDP camps, some of whom have been there for four generations. Some give up hope from that and join extremist groups that are moving across Africa. We see people involved in human trafficking, guns movement, and illicit drugs. All this is because we are not holding our line in the continent of Africa to make sure we can have reliable food systems to feed people that want to stay home.

We will work hard at the FAO to make sure that the standard-setting at Codex Alimentarius stands for American values and has a high standard to make sure that our nations in the global food supply remain safe. At the same time, we will keep a watchful eye, as we would on any nation that leads the Food and Agriculture Organization regardless of whether it is China or whoever. We would be held to those standards. So we have got a lot of work to do.

Thank you.

Senator ROMNEY. And that certainly has wonderful salutary impact on other nations and the poor and those that are destitute around the world. Does it also have impact on us and our national interests?

Ambassador TOM. It has a significant impact on our peace and security and our national standards to make sure that the United States remains safe. If we continue to see these migrations and these people joining Boko Haram, ISIS, al-Qaeda, we are not living in a safe world any longer. And if the population of the continent of Africa doubles in the next 32 years, the problem exponentially grows. We have to play a role to making sure the world is food secure. Our own national security and peace counts on that.

Senator ROMNEY. Thank you.

Mr. Moore, why is China becoming so actively involved in some of these international organizations? What are their objectives? What are they doing this for?

Mr. MOORE. Senator, we are seeing China taking on an increasingly large role. For many years, China, despite having a permanent seat in the Security Council, together with us and three other countries, took rather a passive role, hid behind the G77 and other blocs. Over the past few years, China is taking an aggressive role not looking at it from a Cold War perspective, what does Washington have, what does Moscow have, but rather seeking control of those specific U.N. institutions that do set rules and standards. They are engaging in this in a very direct and extremely aggressive way to ensure that they get the votes that they want, to ensure that they have the influence they want throughout the world, opportunities for their companies who, of course, in nearly every instance are state-owned, and that they have control of all of the world's regions and sympathy for policies, including the so-called Belt and Road Initiative and other things of which you are familiar.

It is a concerning and comprehensive approach. It has forced all of us to remind ourselves what the true goals and values of the U.N. are and why some of those institutions exist. And at the same time, it has also led us to reevaluate some elements of the U.N. system which may not be as relevant, may not serve the interests of the American people, those parts of the U.N. where the administration has made a principal decision to leave them, for example, UNESCO, which previous administrations have stepped away from, which Israel has also stepped away from because of inherent anti-Semitism, or the Human Rights Council, which we discussed earlier, which we see, as I mentioned in my testimony, as fundamentally broken. We need to focus our energies on those parts of the U.N. system where again the rules and standards are set. As we heard for ITU, the World Intellectual Property Organization also in Geneva is extremely important. And there are other parts of the U.N. system. I would be very happy to brief you or your staff in a separate setting in greater detail.

Senator ROMNEY. Thank you.

Mr. Busby, I am going to just end with a question here. We do not have time to have you necessarily respond to it, but it would probably be something all of you would respond to. But that is that

China has been extremely successful in getting itself installed in places of significance where they can set standards and can influence the world. Has that happened because we are ineffective? Has that happened because we have not tried? Why have they been able to be so successful and we have not? Is it lack of effort on our part, just lack of prioritization, or is it that we just do not know how to do it?

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Busby, feel free to respond.

Senator ROMNEY. Yes, to answer that easy question.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BUSBY. Thank you, Senator, for the attention to China.

In the human rights space, China is being equally aggressive. They have yet to seize any of the senior positions relating to human rights, but they are trying to change the nature of the discourse on human rights from one focused on the individual and the rights that accrue to the individual to a discourse focused on governments, on the state. So China is saying before we address the rights of the individual, we should require that the state concerned agree to that discussion, and that is deeply troubling to us.

China exercises a lot of influence because, as Jonathan mentioned, they have a strategy through the Belt and Road Initiative to sort of buy off the votes of other governments. And that I think has been extremely successful. It is a bit harder for us to unilaterally do what they have done, but we are working to fight back by coming up with our own strategies for demonstrating to countries that the U.S. approach is better by developing programs and projects to help these countries and to show why it is that China's approach is simply not a healthy or a long-term productive approach.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you.

Mr. Moore, I note that each of you indicated in various ways that China is ramping up its engagement in the United Nations and affiliated agencies. Chinese nationals—it seems like there has been a concerted effort to lead more specialized agencies for a period of time. In fact, the last three appointments prior to this Food and Agriculture Organization election, if my reading informs me correctly, occurred under the previous President's watch. Is that correct?

Mr. MOORE. I believe so, Mr. Chairman.

Senator YOUNG. And then China has used its veto to block a U.N. Security Council resolution 12 times by my reading since 1971, and all but three of those vetoes occurred since 2007 and served to prevent Security Council action against Burma, Syria, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.

So that suggests to me—I would conclude just from that limited information—tell me if this inference is correct—that expansion of Chinese influence at the U.N. is not a new phenomenon, nor is it solely attributable to this administration.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to take the question to give you a more detailed response. But from what I know in my present position, this is something which has been going on for several years, including prior to the beginning of the present administration. They are looking for a variety of opportunities to build influence, to take control, to build indebtedness. And it must

be added, Mr. Chairman, China does not feel remotely constrained by some of the same tools and legislation that we fully respect in the United States, notably the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act or the standards of OECD, by which U.S. businesses and U.S. Government operate. And those are formidable obstacles to us combating some of the tactics that China chooses to engage in.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Moore, like Senator Romney indicated, I see great value in multilateral organizations like the one we created in the United Nations. And the reason I started with that question is to make sure that this conversation steers very far from any sort of partisanship, recognizing that China has a strategy. They have a strategy in this area as they do seemingly in all areas. It is part of their society. It is part of their economic model as well.

With respect to China's influence at the U.N., what issues are of greatest concern to your bureau in terms of China's actions within the U.N. system?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, we are particularly concerned exactly about those elements of the U.N. system which set rules and standards, the rules and standards which apply to all of us in the world, the work that the ITU does, for example, to set radio frequencies. There are other U.N. agencies like the U.N. Office of Outer Space Affairs, which is quite small based in Vienna. That still has huge responsibilities for any number of items in orbit around the earth on any given day.

We need to make sure that throughout all of those elements of the U.N. system, that we are vigilant to make sure that those institutions do not fall solely into Chinese hands, that everyone in the U.N. system, including in the U.N. Secretariat, recognizes, again as we face nearly 75 years of the U.N., the principles and the standards by which the very organization was founded.

Senator YOUNG. So, Mr. Moore, briefly. You know, Secretary Guterres called for an inclusive, sustainable, and durable development, speaking at China's Belt and Road Forum in April of this year. In other media interactions, he has seemingly praised the Belt and Road Initiative such that some have seen it as an unofficial endorsement of China's premier development effort.

Now, I have had some hearings on the Belt and Road Initiative, and I recognize that there is some value that countries receive with respect to the investment, but there is oftentimes predation and deception involved as well.

So is it appropriate for the United Nations as an organization to endorse China's project?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, as you note, this is a topic which we have raised with Secretary-General Guterres on many occasions. He did participate in the summit in Beijing on the Belt and Road, and we have stressed to him exactly as you have just said, the importance of ensuring that the United Nations does not engage in or directly support any single country's particular initiative, but rather looks out for the interests of all member states.

Senator YOUNG. Are there other countries sending similar messages to Mr. Guterres, and are you speaking from the same songbook, as it were?

Mr. MOORE. I would say there are any number of member states who agree with us that the Belt and Road Initiative, also referred

to as "One Belt, One Road," is an obstacle and is a concern, and it is not the task of the United Nations to support it, to spread word about it, or certainly to build the foundations of any activity on the basis of it.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you.

Ambassador Tom, you are our representative in Rome where the Food and Agriculture Organization, or FAO, is based. You spoke earlier to the importance of this organization and its future. It is led by the recently elected Chinese national Qu Dongyu. There were a number of media reports about alleged Chinese manipulation and strong-arm tactics as part of that election.

What did you and your counterparts witness at the U.N. mission in Rome in the events surrounding that election?

Ambassador TOM. Our observations were that the Chinese had been focused on this role for a long time, maybe 8 or 10 years, as all these U.N. organizations. They had a very strong presence leading up to that vote.

There was no means to try to change the outcome of that vote in the weeks leading up to or even probably the year or 2 leading up to it at that point in time. They wanted it. They got it.

Senator YOUNG. In the months since the new Director General has taken the reins, have you seen anything in his leadership role that raises concerns for you or makes you question his support for the United Nations?

Ambassador TOM. Yes, sir. Thank you for that question.

We stay very close to the FAO organization. I stay very close to the Director General. We are working with the Director General to make sure that we get as many Amcits employed at the FAO to make sure we can help support and have impact. But we will hold him accountable like we would any other nation in that role, in that position. We will keep a watchful eye on to make sure that we drive outcomes.

As I said, David Beasley at the World Food Programme can never raise enough money if we do not get the FAO right, and it has been broken for many decades.

Senator YOUNG. So, Ambassador Tom, I am going to have to follow up. I asked you if you had seen anything in his leadership that would raise concerns.

Ambassador TOM. Not at this time.

Senator YOUNG. All right. You were just expressing your vigilance and professionalism, which I appreciate.

According to the latest figures, Mr. Ambassador, the United States contributed $2.5 billion to the World Food Programme in 2017. You indicated that if we do not get the FAO right, we can never put enough money into the World Food Programme.

So with that in mind, given the significant amount of money that is funding the World Food Programme, what is your assessment of the value that the U.S. has received from that contribution?

Ambassador TOM. Quite candidly, in the field you are seeing returns on investment. In Rome, Italy, maybe not so much. They have been working on policy that is very skewed. It is idealistic driven by a number of member states and NGOs running across Africa thinking the food systems that they support, which are food systems that my grandfather put to the side 50–60 years ago. We

will not feed this nation unless we bring some of the modern innovations in biotech to the place where farmers across the continent of Africa can use.

Senator YOUNG. So with an eye towards U.N. reform and accountability to U.S. taxpayers and other member countries, what recommendations might you have provided to the World Food Programme and other agencies to improve what you have seen thus far?

Ambassador TOM. Absolutely. Thank you, Senator, for that question.

I have worked tirelessly with Director Beasley, and we work together. He is very connected to a number of presidents and leaders around the world. And it is disheartening when we go places and we see countries that have the resources, the people can feed themselves, yet policy blocked by certain member nations has not allowed them to bring in some of the modern innovations that American farmers have at their access. They are available. They will make a difference, and we need to stop denying them the access because nothing good comes of it except for migration, human trafficking, and people involved in extremism. It is our own national security. It is a risk.

So I encouraged Director Beasley to weave that into his conversation with presidents and leaders around the world that they need to have a policy framework to allow these modern innovations to come to their country.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

And lastly, Mr. Busby, one question. We held a hearing, myself and Ranking Member Merkley, some time ago about the Human Rights Council. At the time, the United States had not withdrawn from the entity. There was I think among the expert witnesses, I believe there was uniform belief that for the time being we should uncomfortably stay in, but at some point pull out. We did at some point disengage.

Now my question for you is, has our withdrawal in your assessment from the Human Rights Council reduced our effectiveness in promoting important values, human rights?

Mr. BUSBY. Thank you for the question, Senator.

As I tried to lay out in my testimony, despite our withdrawal from the Human Rights Council, we have sought to up our game on human rights in the wide array of fora and agencies that address the human rights issue, whether it is in New York at the Third Committee and the General Assembly, whether it is in the OSCE, the OAS, which has become a far more robust advocate for human rights. We have sought other ways of increasing U.S. attention to human rights and trying to move the needle on the ground.

When it comes to the council itself, I should point out that we do remain engaged in the Universal Periodic Review, and we do that because every country in the world is reviewed there, including Israel and the United States. And we felt that that is a fair forum in which to make our concerns known.

We also continue to engage with mechanisms of the Human Rights Council that we think are genuinely advancing human rights, whether it is special rapporteurs focused on particular countries or mechanisms focused on particular issues.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you, Mr. Busby.

We are on schedule. In fact, we are a couple of minutes ahead of schedule, and I am comfortable with that.

So I want to thank the members of our first panel for your testimonies and responses.

For the information of members, the record will remain open until the close of business on Friday, including for members to submit questions for the record.

Thank you again, gentlemen. This hearing will now adjourn for a few minutes to allow preparations for our second panel.

[Pause.]

Senator YOUNG. This hearing will now reconvene. We will now be hearing testimony and responses from our second panel.

First, we are joined by Mr. Brett Schaefer. Mr. Schaefer, currently serves as the Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs at The Heritage Foundation. Mr. Schaefer, your full statement will be included in the record, without objection. So if you could please keep your remarks to no more than 5 minutes or so, we would appreciate it so that members of the committee can engage with you on their questions. You may proceed, sir.

STATEMENT OF BRETT SCHAEFER, JAY KINGHAM FELLOW IN INTERNATIONAL REGULATORY AFFAIRS, THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. SCHAEFER. Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, thank you for inviting me to testify today.

My written testimony is too long to discuss fully, so I will only cover a few key points that I think are particularly relevant considering recent events.

First, I want to point out that the U.S. is extraordinarily generously in funding international organizations. I raise this issue because some have criticized the U.S. for being "a deadbeat" or not honoring its obligations. To correct this mischaracterization, let me present a few key facts.

The U.S. is currently a member of nearly 200 international organizations and contributes over $12 billion to those organizations, according to the most recent data. In most cases, the U.S. pays it assessment fully and on time and often provides voluntary contributions above its obligations. The vast majority of this U.S. funding goes to the United Nations, U.N. peacekeeping operations, and dozens of other entities affiliated with the organization—a total of over $10 billion a year.

The U.S. has contributed, on average, nearly 19 percent of all U.N. system revenues since 2010. The second largest contributor has paid, on average, about 6 percent. China, which has garnered attention for its increased payments in recent years, contributed $1.4 billion to the U.N. system in 2018—fifth overall. The U.S. paid over seven times that amount.

Second, even taking U.S. withholding into account, the U.S. is by far the largest source of U.N. funding. Nevertheless, the U.S. does withhold funding at times. It does so because the U.S. Government has a higher obligation to the U.S. taxpayer than it does to the United Nations. Our government has a responsibility to make sure that taxpayer dollars are not misused or put to purposes that harm

U.S. interests. Often this requires withholding because other member states do not share our concerns and pressure is necessary to spur changes. Why? In part because of the vastly different level of financial contributions among the member states. The U.N. assesses some countries less than $37,000 a year while the U.S. is charged over $2.4 billion. For the majority of U.N. member states, the financial impact of wasteful spending or budgetary increases is so minuscule that they have very little incentive or reason to fulfill an oversight role or to consider budgetary restraint. Unsurprisingly, in the vast majority of cases, U.S. withholding targets budgetary issues, mismanagement, and threats to the interests of the U.S. and our allies such as confronting anti-Israel bias in the United Nations.

American leadership can be decisive in improving the performance of international organizations and focusing them on their original missions and purposes, but if the U.S. is to succeed, it must not hesitate to use the tools available to it. This includes financial withholding to bolster efforts to reform those organizations and to advance U.S. interests.

Third, some believe that membership in international organizations automatically conveys benefits to the United States. This is not true. Membership in international organizations is not an end in itself. It is a means for securing the safety, prosperity, and opportunities of the American people. Not all international organizations meet this standard. For instance, the Clinton administration withdrew from the World Tourism Organization and the U.N. Industrial Development Organization because they provided poor value for money and were unable to define their purpose or function to any real specific value.

Just as the Clinton administration deserves recognition for looking out for the interests of the American people at that time, so should the Trump administration for its recent decisions to withdraw from UNESCO and the International Coffee Organization.

Every administration should conduct a regular evaluation of the costs and benefits of membership and, in coordination with Congress, use the results of that analysis to shift funding to best support U.S. interests.

In short, the U.S. should participate in international organizations where membership benefits U.S. interests, adjust its support when the costs outweigh the benefits, and always seek to improve performance, efficiency, and accountability.

Finally, I want to conclude my remarks by briefly addressing Chinese influence in the United Nations system. This is an example of how the United States must routinely reevaluate its policy and approach to international organizations.

Twenty years ago, China was not particularly active in the U.N. Today it is a major player. China is increasingly acting to protect itself and other repressive regimes, place its nationals in leadership positions, and modify U.N. resolutions and statements to reflect Chinese policies, values, and interests. This is concerning because China's policy priorities are in many areas antithetical to U.S. interests. As China becomes more economically and militarily powerful, its influence will grow. The U.S. cannot reverse that trend, which is based on political and financial realities. However, the

U.S. must take steps to counter Chinese influence through aggressive diplomacy, strategic action, and applying financial incentives to advance U.S. interests in the U.N. and other international organizations.

Thank you very much for inviting me to testify today, and I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Schaefer follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BRETT SCHAEFER

CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY

Challenges and Opportunities for Advancing U.S. Interests in the United Nations System

Testimony before the
Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy

Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. Senate

November 20, 2019

Brett D. Schaefer
Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs
The Heritage Foundation

My name is Brett Schaefer. I am the Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs at The Heritage Foundation. The views I express in this testimony are my own and should not be construed as representing any official position of The Heritage Foundation.

Chairman Todd Young and Ranking Member Jeff Merkley, thank you for inviting me to testify today before the Subcommittee on "Challenges and Opportunities for Advancing U.S. Interests in the United Nations System."

The preeminent responsibility of the United States government is to defend and protect the American people and advance their interests and welfare. Fulfilling this responsibility, which includes both strategic and economic security, requires the U.S. to involve itself in a broad spectrum of bilateral and multilateral relationships, including international organizations.

The U.S. currently is a member of or contributes financially to nearly 200 international organizations, funds, treaty bodies, councils, groups, bureaus, centers, commissions, and peacekeeping operations. According to the most recent report, the U.S. provides over $12 billion to those organizations each year.[1] The vast majority of this funding, over $10 billion, was distributed to the U.N. and over 60 U.N. specialized agencies, peacekeeping operations, funds, programs, or other entities related to, or affiliated with, the U.N.

There is no uniform funding arrangement for international organizations.

The most well known budgets, the United Nations regular and peacekeeping budgets, are funded through mandatory dues (assessments) paid by member states. In 2019, the U.S. is assessed 22 percent of the U.N. regular budget and 27.8912 percent of the U.N. peacekeeping budget—levels of assessment greater than the vast majority of U.N.

[1]U.S. Department of State, *United States Contributions to International Organizations: Sixty-Sixth Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 2017*, p. 5, https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Sixty-Sixth-Annual-Report-to-the-Congress-for-FY-2017.pdf (accessed October 8, 2019).

member states *combined*.

As illustrated in Table 2 at the end of my testimony:

- For the regular budget, the U.S. is assessed more than 178 other U.N. member states combined and 22,000 times more than the 30 countries assessed the minimum level of 0.001 percent.
- The 30 countries charged the minimum assessment of 0.001 percent each will pay only $29,059 in 2019 based on the 2018–2019 biennial regular budget as amended in December 2018. By comparison, the U.S. is assessed $639 million.
- For the peacekeeping budget, the U.S. is assessed more than 186 countries combined and over 278,000 times more than the 17 countries assessed the minimum level.
- The 17 countries charged the minimum peacekeeping assessment of 0.0001 percent in 2019 are each assessed $6,519 under the recently approved peacekeeping budget. By

TABLE 1

U.S. Funding of the U.N. System and International Organizations

	UNITED NATIONS CHIEF EXECUTIVES BOARD FOR COORDINATION				REPORTS TO CONGRESS	
Year	**Total Revenue for the U.N. System**	**Total Revenue from the United States***	**United States Share of U.N. Revenue**		**U.S. Contributions to International Organizations**	**U.S. Contributions to the U.N. System**
2010	$39,526,833,430	$7,075,888,246	17.9%	2010	$8,518,300,409	$7,691,822,000
2011	$39,509,014,336	$6,176,742,945	15.6%	2011	$5,372,801,191	$4,715,922,111
2012	$42,323,684,975	$8,237,873,575	19.5%	2012	$7,473,284,288	$6,716,965,814
2013	$44,638,863,032	$7,680,181,185	17.2%	2013	$6,741,127,985	$5,999,534,918
2014	$48,079,838,381	$10,066,592,972	20.9%	2014	$7,360,833,363	$7,942,662,070
2015	$47,979,602,491	$9,914,072,653	20.7%	2015	$10,821,521,001	$8,783,808,135
2016	$49,333,227,820	$9,718,025,938	19.7%	2016	$10,487,783,062	$8,670,580,612
2017	$53,199,702,441	$10,427,924,316	19.6%	2017	$12,124,205,262	$10,202,104,430
2018	$56,018,773,165	$9,976,039,097	17.8%	2018		
Total	**$420,609,540,071**	**$79,273,340,927**	**18.8%**		**$68,899,856,561**	**$60,723,400,090**

* UNCEB did not include peacekeeping assessments in revenue from governments until 2013 so "Total Revenue from the United States" adds peacekeeping assessments from "United States Contributions to International Organizations" for FY 2010, FY 2011, and FY 2012 as a proxy.

NOTES:
Data on U.S. contributions to the United Nations System for FY 2011-2013 compiled by the author using funding information provided in U.S. Department of State annual reports on "United States Contributions to International Organizations." Determination of which organizations are part of the U.N. system is based on the table of U.N. organizations in Office of Management and Budget, "Report to Congress of United States Contributions to International Organizations for Fiscal Year 2014" on pages 35-37. "U.S. Contributions to the U.N. System" does not include contributions to the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) even though the United Nations Chief Executives Board for Coordination included those organizations as part of the U.N. system for the purposes of calculating revenue. The IOM officially became a related organization to the U.N. in 2016. The Office of Management and Budget includes contributions to the IOM in its 2017 report to Congress. Data on U.S. contributions to the United Nations System for FY 2014-17 and FY 2010 as reported by the Office of Management and Budget to Congress.

SOURCES:
United Nations Chief Executives Board for Coordination, "Total Revenue," https://www.unsystem.org/content/FS-K00-02#page-title (accessed November 15, 2019); United Nations Chief Executives Board for Coordination, "Total Revenue by Government Donor," https://www.unsystem.org/content/FS-D00-02 (accessed November 15, 2019); U.S. Department of State, "U.S. Contributions to International Organizations," Congressional Reports, https://2009-2017.state.gov/p/io/rls/rpt/index.htm and https://www.state.gov/u-s-contributions-to-international-organizations/ (accessed November 15, 2019); Office of Management and Budget, "Report to Congress on United States Contributions to the United Nations and Affiliated International Organizations for Fiscal Year 2017," September 25, 2019, p. 1, https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/UN-Contributions-2017.pdf (accessed November 15, 2019); Office of Management and Budget, "Report to Congress of United States Contributions to International Organizations For Fiscal Year 2014," July 31, 2016, pp. 35-37, https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/IAD/MASTER%20Sec%20112%20OMB%20Report_final.pdf (accessed November 15, 2019); and Office of Management and Budget, "Annual Report on United States Contributions to the United Nations: FY2010 US Contributions to the United Nations System," June 6, 2011, p. 2, https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/us_contributions_to_the_un_06062011.pdf. (accessed November 15, 2019).

comparison, the U.S. is assessed $1.8 billion.

The vast discrepancy between the amounts that different member states are charged for the expenses of the U.N.—with some countries paying less than $37,000 per year, while the U.S. is charged over $2.4 billion—help explain why most member states are disinterested in reforms to make sure the U.N. more efficient and accountable or to prioritize spending. When governments pay minimal amounts—a majority of U.N. member states are assessed less than $700,000 per year for both the regular and peacekeeping budgets—they have little incentive to fulfill their oversight role and take budgetary restraint seriously. The U.S., on the other hand, has a huge financial interest in efficiency and prudent use of resources.

Even within the U.N. system, however, funding mechanisms vary widely. Some organizations, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, base their rate of assessment on the U.N. regular budget to fund their core expenditures even though they receive significant voluntary contributions. By contrast, the International Maritime Organization bases its assessment on economic factors and merchant fleet tonnage, which resulted in a relatively low U.S. assessment of 2.76 percent in 2017. As another example, the World Intellectual Property Organization receives only about 4 percent of its income from member states and nearly 95 percent from fees and services.

Overall, despite these funding disparities, the U.S. is by far the largest contributor to the U.N. system. As illustrated in the accompanying Table 1, between 2010 and 2018, the U.S. contributed, on average, nearly 19 percent of all U.N. system revenues according to the U.N. Chief Executives Board for Coordination. The second-largest contributor over that span has shifted between Germany, Japan, and the U.K. On average, however, the second-largest contributor provided just over 6 percent of total U.N. system revenues.

China has garnered a lot of attention for its increased U.N. payments. In 2018, however, China remained a distant fifth at $1.42 billion in total contributions to the U.N. system. By contrast, the U.S. provided over 7 times more funding to the U.N. system than China.

Opportunities

America's position in the U.N. system presents both opportunities and challenges. One opportunity that should not be overlooked is that the U.S. was instrumental in establishing the organization and continues to value its founding purposes, including maintaining international peace and security, encouraging self-determination of peoples, and promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms.[2] Although the organization has too often ignored these principles, highlighting them strengthens U.S. arguments and can provide justification for its actions and proposals that can be controversial with other member states.

America's position as one of five veto-wielding permanent members of the Security Council also gives it considerable influence. The Security Council is the most powerful body in the U.N. system with the authority, in service to addressing threats to international peace and security, to impose sanctions, authorize military action, and require compliance from the other U.N. member states. The veto gives the U.S. unilateral authority to block Security Council actions deemed detrimental to U.S. interests and positively influence the text of resolutions.

Another opportunity is the influence our financial contributions provide to guide the U.N. from within and without. For instance:

Employment in International Organizations. Many international organizations formally or informally link staff recruitment to geographical distribution, membership status, financial contributions, and share of the global population. Because of these arrangements, U.S. nationals comprised 5 percent of total U.N. system staff in 2017—more than any other nation.[3] In addition, as a major contributor, U.S. preferences on candidates for senior U.N. positions—though far from dispositive—are influential.

Addressing U.S. Concerns and Priorities. Organizations pay significant attention to concerns and criticisms of their largest source of funding. However, to be credible, there must be genuine belief on the part of the organization that failure to address those concerns and criticism could affect

[2]United Nations Charter, Article 1, https://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/chapter-i/index.html (accessed November 19, 2019).

[3]UN Chief Executives Board for Coordination, "Human Resources Nationality," https://www.unsystem.org/content/hr-nationality (accessed November 19, 2019).

funding.

Voluntarily funded international organizations tend to be most responsive to U.S. concerns because they know that funding relies on the support and goodwill of their member states. This is why Ambassador John Bolton has written that the U.S. objective should be to move the entire U.N. system to a voluntary funding structure.[4]

Organizations funded through assessed contributions are less responsive because the member states have legally committed to providing funding at levels determined by the organization. Nonetheless, the U.S. has enacted a number of laws over the years limiting or conditioning U.S. funding to the U.N. and other international organizations to achieve specific outcomes when diplomatic efforts fell short.

A previous successful assertion of this pressure occurred in 1994. Former U.S. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh, who served as U.N. Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management in 1992 and 1993, informed Congress of his failed attempts to clamp down on mismanagement and waste. Congress decided to withhold 10 percent from the U.N. regular budget until the General Assembly created an inspector general. As a direct response, the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) was created in 1994 as the U.N.'s primary investigative and auditing unit.[5]

Another example is the Helms–Biden Act that conditioned payment of $819 million in arrears and forgiveness of $107 million owed by the U.N. to the U.S. in return for lower assessments and other reforms.[6]

A current example of this tactic is the "Transparency and Accountability" determination in recent appropriations bills that requires the State Department to withhold 15 percent of U.S. contributions to the U.N. and a few other organizations until the Secretary of State reports to Congress that the organizations are meeting specified standards for whistleblower protection and transparency.[7]

Challenges

International organizations have many member states whose interests are at odds. This means that actions and decisions in these organizations often fall victim to a lowest-common-denominator process and gridlock. Inefficiency, mismanagement, and other problems frequently beset organizations but remain unaddressed because some member states benefit from the arrangement.[8] All too often, countries that are opposed to U.S. policies use the U.N. and other international organizations, in which they are on a more equal footing with the U.S., to assert their influence in order to counterbalance U.S. policy.

The ability of the U.S. to counter these efforts is limited for several reasons:

Regional and Ideological Voting. Within the U.N. system, there is a strong tendency to vote in blocs, whether regional groups or ideological groups like the Group of 77 (G-77, 133 member countries) and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC, 56 member countries), to heighten their influence. In practice, this creates a logrolling dynamic wherein countries that have little interest in the substance of a resolution adhere to a group position favored by countries that have a strong interest in the resolution in order to secure their support on resolutions in which they have a strong interest.

Significant overlap in the membership of the groups facilitates extension of positions from one to the others. For instance, while the OIC lacks the numbers of the G-77, most of its members are also members of the G-77, and can influence the G-77 to support OIC positions on Israel. In addition, there is also a strong tendency in the U.N. for regions to

[4]Ambassador John Bolton, "The Key To Changing the United Nations System," forward to Brett D. Schaeffer, ed., *Conundrum: The Limits of the United Nations and the Search for Alternatives* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009).
[5]Luisa Blanchfield, "U.S. Funding to the United Nations System:
Overview and Selected Policy Issues," Congressional Research Service, R45206, April 25, 2018, p. 35, https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R45206.pdf (accessed November 19, 2019).
[6]Ibid., pp. 35–36.

[7]Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Public Law No. 115–141, Division K, Section 7048, https://www.congress.gov/115/plaws/publ141/PLAW-115publ141.pdf (accessed November 19, 2019).
[8]An example is Russia's efforts to block reform of U.N. contracting for commercial aviation in support of U.N. peacekeeping. See Colum Lynch, "The Inside Story of Russia's Fight to Keep the U.N. Corrupt," *Foreign Policy*, June 25, 2013, https://foreignpolicy.com/2013/06/25/the-inside-story-of-russias-fight-to-keep-the-u-n-corrupt/ (accessed November 19, 2019).

vote together as blocs. This often reinforces the solidarity of ideological groups because the G-77 and OIC comprise a majority of countries in Asia and Africa. These regions together comprise a majority of U.N. member states.

The size of these voting blocs is important because, under General Assembly rules, a simple majority (97 votes out of 193 member states) is sufficient to pass most resolutions. Decisions on "important questions" as specified in the U.N. Charter, such as approving the U.N. budget, require approval by a two-thirds majority (129 votes out of 193 member states). It is relatively easy for these groups to use the advantage of their numbers to push or block various resolutions and reforms.

Inertia and Self-interest. The U.N. habitually renews previous resolutions and "mandates" with little debate or scrutiny. For instance, in 2005, the U.N. General Assembly instructed the Secretary-General to compile a list of U.N. mandates for the member states to review for relevance, effectiveness, and duplication. A Mandate Registry was established to provide, for the first time, a comprehensive list of the more than 9,000 individual mandates of the General Assembly, Security Council, and United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Some of these ongoing mandates date back the to the 1940s. One of the few efforts to examine these mandates found that only 155 (56 percent) of the 279 mandates in the Humanitarian cluster were "current and relevant" and that only 18 (35 percent) of the 52 mandates in the African Development cluster were current and relevant. The U.N. General Assembly refused to act on these conclusions and, instead, quietly killed the Mandate Review. Even the Mandate Registry seems to have disappeared from the U.N. website.

Similarly, the U.N. has complained recently about a financial crisis but continues to fund unnecessary and duplicative activities like the Economic Commissions for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Western Asia. Together these Commissions cost the U.N. over $250 million per year and employ more than 1,800 staff to, essentially, organize conferences, conduct policy research, and host meetings to facilitate economic integration and development.[9] This may be a fine goal, but it largely duplicates the efforts of the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank Group, the regional development banks, the European Union, the African Union, ASEAN, and the other dozen or so U.N. organizations that also try to promote economic development and cooperation. Nonetheless, support for the commissions is robust because they offer plum jobs and are regionally placed, i.e., they ensure U.N. funds are disbursed to multiple countries via regional offices.

Finally, whether to conceal scandal or just to protect senior officials, the U.N. system continues to resist robust transparency and accountability, especially in its treatment of whistleblowers and holding peacekeepers and U.N. officials to account for sexual exploitation and abuse.[10]

Political Agendas, Particularly Bias Against Israel. According to UN Watch, the Human Rights Council had adopted 169 condemnatory resolutions on countries as of the end of May 2018 just prior to the U.S. decision to withdraw. Of those, nearly half (47 percent) focused on Israel. The Human Rights Council also has the authority to convene special sessions to address human rights violations or related emergencies. Of the twenty-eight special sessions convened to date, eight focused on Israel. Next came Syria (the focus of five special sessions) and Burma (the focus of two). Each year the U.N. General Assembly adopts around 20 resolutions condemning Israel and about five for all of the other human rights situations in the world. In 2018, the U.N. General assembly adopted 21 resolutions condemning Israel and six focused on other nations—one each for Burma, Iran, North Korea, Russia, Syria, and the U.S (for its Cuba policy).[11]

---

[9]General Assembly Administrative and Budgetary Committee (Fifth Committee), "List of documents relating to the proposed programme plan and budget for 2020: PART V. Regional cooperation for development," A/74/6 Sections 18-22, https://www.un.org/en/ga/fifth/74/ppb2020.shtml (accessed November 19, 2019).

[10]Eileen A. Cronin and Aicha Afifi, "Review of Whistle-Blower Policies and Practices in United Nations System Organizations," Joint Inspection Unit, JIU/REP/2018/4, and Carley Petesch, "Leaked UN report shows failed investigation on sexual abuse," Associated Press, October 31, 2019, https://apnews.com/671330c575b44272bbabe69e43740ac9 (accessed November 19, 2019).

[11]UN Watch, "2018 UN General Assembly Resolutions Singling Out Israel – Texts, Votes, Analysis," November 18, 2018, https://unwatch.org/2018-un-general-assembly-resolutions-singling-israel-texts-votes-analysis/ (accessed November 19, 2019).

Israel should not be immune from scrutiny or criticism for its human rights practices. On the contrary, a credible Human Rights Council must be able and willing to examine the human rights practices of each nation. However, year in and year out, the council and the U.N. member states single out Israel for different treatment from other nations, which is unacceptable.

A more recent, but increasingly urgent, challenge are Chinese efforts to increase its influence in the U.N. system. As its political and economic power has risen over the past 20 years, China has become increasingly assertive in its efforts to insert Chinese terminology and endorsements of Chinese policies and initiatives into U.N. resolutions and statements.[12] China has used its veto to block a U.N. Security Council resolution 12 times since 1971, when the United Nations recognized the People's Republic of China as the official government. All but three of those vetoes occurred since 2007 and served to prevent Security Council action against Burma, Syria, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.[13] Since 2013, China has become increasingly assertive in U.N. human rights institutions, promoting "its own interpretation of international norms and mechanisms."[14]

China has also successfully capitalized on its historical relationships with developing countries, abetted by financial and political carrots and sticks, to secure leadership of the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, and United Nations Industrial Development Organization. A Chinese national has led four of the 15 U.N. specialized agencies in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2019.[15] China's rising influence is concerning because its policy priorities are in many areas antithetical to U.S. interests and, unlike nationals from most other countries who generally act independently in their positions, China demands that its nationals protect and advance Chinese interests.[16] China does not hesitate to act when an official fails to advance its interests. In October 2018, China arrested the president of Interpol, Meng Hongwei, and charged him with abuse of power and refusing to "follow party decisions."[17] Hongwei was one of the highest-level Chinese nationals in any international organization.

Moving Forward

It is in the interests of the U.S. to participate and work through international organizations to bolster its security, foreign policy, and economic prospects, but the U.S. also must be strategic and focused in its efforts. To maximize its influence and administer the resources of the American taxpayer as prudently as possible, the U.S. should recognize both the challenges and opportunities presented by participation in the U.N. and its affiliated organizations to advance U.S. interests by:

- **Focusing on the international organizations that are important to U.S. interests.** This process begins by conducting an analysis of and publicly reporting on how U.S. participation in each international organization advances specific

[12]See, for instance, Frédéric Burnand, "China's 'Win-Win' Rights Initiative Makes Waves in Geneva," swissinfo.ch, March 26, 2018, https://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/un-human-rights-council-_china-s--win-win--rights-initiative-makes-waves-in-geneva/44000588 (accessed November 19, 2019), and Associated Press, "China and US Clash Over 'Belt and Road' Link to UN Afghanistan Mission," September 17, 2019, https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy/article/3027596/china-and-us-clash-over-belt-and-road-credit-un-security (accessed November 19, 2019).

[13]United Nations Dag Hammarskjold Library, "Security Council–Veto List," https://research.un.org/en/docs/sc/quick (accessed November 19, 2019).

[14]Ted Piccone, "China's Long Game on Human Rights at the United Nations," Foreign Policy at Brookings, September 2018, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/FP_20181009_china_human_rights.pdf (accessed November 19, 2019).

[15]The last permanent member of the Security Council to do this was the U.S. in 1956. A French national led three U.N. specialized agencies and the World Tourism Organization from 1978 to 1985, but that was before the World Tourism Organization joined the U.N. in 2003.

[16]Brett D. Schaefer, "How the U.S. Should Address Rising Chinese Influence at the United Nations," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3431, August 20, 2019, https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/BG3431_0.pdf.

[17]"Wife of China's Meng, Former Interpol Chief, Sues Agency," Reuters, July 7, 2019, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-france-interpol/wife-ofchinas-meng-former-interpol-chief-sues-agency-idUSKCN1U20L6 (accessed November 19, 2019).

U.S. interests. The U.S. should conduct a regular evaluation of the costs and benefits of membership in international organizations and use the results of this analysis to shift U.S. funding to increase support where U.S. interests are served while reducing funding where they are not.

If an organization has proven to be critically flawed, such as the Human Rights Council, the U.S. should not lend it unwarranted prestige and credibility by rewarding it with financial support or participation. Likewise, if U.S. interests are negligible or are being capably addressed by the private sector, the U.S. should terminate its support and membership. For instance, after a comprehensive review, the Clinton Administration decided to withdraw from the World Tourism Organization and the U.N. Industrial Development Organization on the basis that they, respectively, provided poor value for money and were unable to "define its purpose and function very well."[18] A more recent example is the decision of the Trump Administration to withdraw from the International Coffee Organization in 2018 because U.S. stakeholders are able to represent their interests without a U.S. government intermediary. In addition, the threat of withdrawal can sometimes spur desired reforms, such as those adopted in September by the Universal Postal Union to address U.S. concerns.[19]

This process should be undertaken periodically by every U.S. administration. In a handful of cases, it could result in a reevaluation of U.S. membership, but in most cases, the benefits of U.S. membership in international organizations will outweigh the costs. Overall, however, it serves U.S. interests to periodically evaluate the benefits of international organizations and can be a powerful tool to prioritize funding and identify organizations in need of reform.

- **Balancing U.S. support against other foreign policy priorities.** While supporting international organizations often helps extend or amplify U.S. influence, sometimes other foreign policy priorities are so negatively affected that the U.S. should withdraw or end its support. An example of this dynamic is the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. The Palestinians have sought membership in U.N. organizations for years as a way to achieve recognition without a negotiated peace with Israel. In response, the U.S. enacted legislation in the 1990s to withhold funding from international organizations that accord "the Palestine Liberation Organization the same standing as member states"[20] or grant "full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood."[21] The U.S. did this because the Palestinian effort undermines prospects for a negotiated peace with Israel. When the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) granted full membership to the Palestinians in 2011, the U.S. ceased funding to UNESCO and withdrew in 2018. Despite Palestinian efforts, other U.N. specialized agencies have heeded the U.S. response to UNESCO and have not granted them full membership if U.S. funding could be effected. To discourage U.N. organizations from granting membership to the Palestinians before they have concluded a mutually agreed peace agreement with Israel, Congress and the Administration should enforce U.S. law.
- **Using U.S. withholding purposefully.** As discussed earlier, the U.S. has successfully and justifiably withheld funding from the United Nations and other international organizations to

[18]United States General Accounting Office, "U.S. Participation in Special-Purpose International Organizations," GAO/NSIAD-97-35, March 1997, https://www.gao.gov/assets/230/223708.pdf (accessed November 19, 2019), and Warren Christopher, "Readying the United Nations for the Twenty-First Century: Some 'UN-21' Proposals for Consideration," U.S. Non-Paper, July 20, 1995, p. 3.

[19]Brett D. Schaefer, "A U.S. Victory at the Universal Postal Union," September 27, 2019, https://www.heritage.org/global-politics/commentary/us-victory-the-universal-postal-union (accessed November 19, 2019).

[20]H.R. 3792, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, Public Law No. 101–246, 101st Cong., February 16, 1990, Title IV, Section 414, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-104/pdf/STATUTE-104-Pg15.pdf (accessed October 8, 2019).

[21]H.R. 2333, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, Public Law No. 103–236, 103rd Cong., April 30, 1994, Title IV, Section 410, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-108/pdf/STATUTE-108-Pg382.pdf (accessed October 8, 2019).

secure specific reforms. When funding is withheld for little discernable purpose, however, it can undermine U.S. interests. A case in point is the practice of paying U.N. assessments in the last quarter of the year. This practice, launched in 1984 to realize a one-time budget savings, continues today. The practical impact on the U.S. budget is negligible—the funds are appropriated regardless, albeit delayed—but provides grist for those eager to criticize the U.S. for any number of reasons. Congress should consider appropriating funds to reverse this practice and its unnecessary damage to U.S. influence for no clear policy purpose.

By contrast, the U.S. must be willing to withhold funding to press the U.N. or other international organizations to adopt specific reforms. Financial leverage is often necessary to spur reluctant member states or bureaucracies to support reforms. A defensible illustration of this practice is the 15 percent withholding to ensure that the U.N. is implementing best practices on whistleblower protection. Another principled withholding is enforcing a 25 percent maximum payment for U.N. peacekeeping. Since the first scale of assessments in 1946, the U.S. has objected to relying excessively on a single member state for the budget.[22] Two decades ago, Ambassador Richard Holbrooke testified to the Senate that he had secured a deal to lower the U.S. peacekeeping assessment to 25 percent as required under U.S. law and as a condition for payment of U.S. arrears under the Helms–Biden agreement. By 2009, the U.S. share had fallen to less than 26 percent. Starting in 2010, however, the U.S. assessment began to rise again. Today, it is 27.8912 percent. The failure to lower the U.S. assessment to 25 percent has cost U.S. taxpayers billions of dollars because Congress, in past years, has approved payments over 25 percent in continuing resolutions and omnibus appropriations bills.[23] When the U.S. does this, the other U.N. member states have little incentive to adopt a maximum peacekeeping assessment of 25 percent. The U.S. should enforce the 25 percent cap as an incentive for the U.N. member states to change the scale of assessments. As with the Helms–Biden Act, the U.S. should pay these arrears only after the U.N. incorporates a maximum assessment of 25 percent in the methodology for calculating the peacekeeping scales of assessment.

- **Initiating and maintaining aggressive diplomatic efforts to achieve U.S. policy objectives.** Withholding funds will not achieve the intended outcome unless other nations know what the U.S. wants to accomplish. Broad-brush goals are not sufficient, the U.S. must inform other governments of the specific changes necessary to resume U.S. funding and initiate aggressive diplomatic engagement. For example, criticizing the Human Rights Council for its anti-Israel bias and poor membership—both valid criticisms—is not sufficient. If the U.S. wants to reform the council, it must explain what specific reforms would lead it to continue its participation and support and work with other governments to achieve those reforms.[24]

  Discussions about desired reforms must start and continue in New York (or Geneva or other locations where organizations are headquartered) but success will require support from U.S. ambassadors to individual countries and occasional intervention by the Secretary of State and the White House. Similar effort must be

[22]Brett D. Schaefer, "The U.S. Must Increase Diplomatic Pressure to Change the United Nations Scale of Assessments," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3397, March 19, 2019, https://www.heritage.org/budget-and-spending/report/the-us-must-increase-diplomatic-pressure-change-the-united-nations-scale.

[23]Brett D. Schaefer, "U.S. Must Enforce Peacekeeping Cap to Lower America's U.N. Assessment," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2762, January 25, 2013, https://www.heritage.org/global-politics/report/us-must-enforce-peacekeeping-cap-lower-americas-un-assessment, and Brett D. Schaefer, "Diplomatic Effort to Reduce America's Peacekeeping Dues Must Start Now," Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4781, November 1, 2017, https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/IB4781.pdf.

[24]See, for instance, Brett D. Schaefer, "A U.N. Human Rights Council Reform Agenda for the Trump Administration," Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4674, March 29, 2017, https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2017-03/IB4674_0.pdf, and Brett D. Schaefer, "U.N. Human Rights Council: Reform Recommendations for the Trump Administration," Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4788, November 27, 2017, https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/IB4788_0.pdf.

initiated early to help rally support for preferred candidates to lead important international organizations.

- **Identifying the purpose, scope, and means of expanded Chinese influence in international organizations.** Congress should charge the U.S. intelligence community with reporting on Chinese objectives, tactics, and influence in international organizations. These reports should be the basis for adjusting U.S. policy and resources to equip the executive branch to counter Chinese influence where it undermines U.S. interests or the independence and purposes of those organizations.
- **Making U.N. voting a mandatory consideration in aid allocation.** While the U.S. uses its foreign assistance to advance a number of goals, advancing U.S. interests in the U.N. must be a priority. Considering the serious matters discussed, debated, and decided in the U.N., failing to include this goal among the hundreds of legislative directives on aid allocation is extremely imprudent. Not every U.N. vote is equally important to the United States, but some affect important U.S. interests. Between 1980 and 2017, voting coincidence with the U.S. averaged 34.6 percent.[25] Diplomacy alone cannot shift the balance; the U.S. can and should exert more influence and pressure on other member states to support its positions when important U.S. priorities are at stake. This consideration has acquired increased urgency now that China is using its bilateral assistance to reward support in the U.N.[26] Congress should make support for U.S. positions in the U.N. a mandatory consideration when allocating aid.

Conclusion

The U.S. should not regard multilateral relationships and membership in international organizations as ends in themselves; they are means for securing the safety, prosperity, and opportunities of the American people. Each international organization has its own virtues and flaws. They contribute differently to U.S. strategic, economic, and political interests. The U.S. should participate where membership benefits U.S. interests, cease participation when the costs outweigh the benefits, and always press for reforms to improve performance, efficiency, and accountability.

American leadership can be decisive in improving the performance of international organizations and focusing them on the missions and purposes that they were created to pursue. It is incumbent on U.S. policymakers to be responsible and judicial in assuming international commitments. If the U.S. is to succeed, it must be willing to work through international organizations to address genuinely shared concerns, but it must not hesitate to use the tools available to it, including withholding its financial support, to bolster its efforts to reform these organizations and advance U.S. interests.

[25]Brett D. Schaefer and Anthony Kim, "The U.S. Should Employ Foreign Aid in Support of U.S. Policy at the U.N.," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3356, October 5, 2018, https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2018-10/BG3356.pdf.

[26]Axel Dreher, Andreas Fuchs, Bradley Parks, Austin M. Strange, and Michael J. Tierney, "Apples and Dragon Fruits: The Determinants of Aid and Other Forms of State Financing from China to Africa," AidData *Working Paper* No. 15, October 2015, http://docs.aiddata.org/ad4/files/wps15_apples_and_dragon_fruits.pdf (accessed November 19, 2019).

TABLE 2

United Nations Scale of Assessments for 2019 (Page 1 of 2)

	REGULAR BUDGET		PEACEKEEPING BUDGET	
	Assessment (%)	Dollars	Assessment (%)	Dollars
Total		$2,905,898,900		$6,518,855,700
Permanent Members of the U.N. Security Council				
United States of America	22.000%	$639,297,758	27.8912%	$1,818,187,081
France	4.427%	$128,644,144	5.6125%	$365,870,776
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.567%	$132,712,403	5.7900%	$377,441,745
China	12.005%	$348,853,163	15.2197%	$992,150,281
Russian Federation	2.405%	$69,886,869	3.0490%	$198,759,910
Non-Permanent Members of the U.N. Security Council				
Belgium	0.821%	$23,857,430	0.8210%	$53,519,805
Cote d'Ivoire	0.013%	$377,767	0.0026%	$169,490
Dominican Republic	0.053%	$1,540,126	0.0106%	$690,999
Equatorial Guinea	0.016%	$464,944	0.0024%	$156,453
Germany	6.090%	$176,969,243	6.0900%	$396,998,312
Indonesia	0.543%	$15,779,031	0.1086%	$7,079,477
Kuwait	0.252%	$7,322,865	0.2331%	$15,195,453
Peru	0.152%	$4,416,966	0.0304%	$1,981,732
Poland	0.802%	$23,305,309	0.2406%	$15,684,367
South Africa	0.272%	$7,904,045	0.0544%	$3,546,258
Total All Current Security Council Members	54.418%	$1,581,332,063	65.1561%	$4,247,432,139
Other Highly Assessed Countries				
Australia	2.210%	$64,220,366	2.2100%	$144,066,711
Brazil	2.948%	$85,665,900	0.5896%	$38,435,173
Canada	2.734%	$79,447,276	2.7340%	$178,225,515
Italy	3.307%	$96,098,077	3.3070%	$215,578,558
Republic of Korea	2.267%	$65,876,728	2.267%	$147,782,459
Saudi Arabia	1.172%	$34,057,135	1.0841%	$70,670,915
Japan	8.564%	$248,861,182	8.5640%	$558,274,802
Turkey	1.371%	$39,839,874	0.2742%	$17,874,702
Spain	2.146%	$62,360,590	2.1460%	$139,894,643
Large Peacekeeping Troop Contributors				
Bangladesh	0.010%	$290,590	0.0010%	$65,189
Ethiopia	0.010%	$290,590	0.0010%	$65,189
India	0.834%	$24,235,197	0.1668%	$10,873,451
Nepal	0.007%	$203,413	0.0007%	$45,632
Pakistan	0.115%	$3,341,784	0.0230%	$1,499,337
Rwanda	0.003%	$87,177	0.0003%	$19,557

TABLE 2

United Nations Scale of Assessments for 2019 (Page 2 of 2)

	REGULAR BUDGET		PEACEKEEPING BUDGET	
	Assessment (%)	Dollars	Assessment (%)	Dollars
Notable Groupings				
Lowest assessment (30 countries regular budget, 17 countries peacekeeping budget)	0.001%	$29,059	0.0001%	$6,519
Least assessed 129 countries (regular budget)	1.633%	$47,453,329		
Least assessed 178 countries (regular budget)	21.603%	$627,761,339		
Least assessed 186 countries (peacekeeping budget)			27.5258%	$1,794,367,182
Geneva Group (17 countries)	67.462%	$1,960,377,516	74.2753%	$4,841,899,628
G-77 + China (133 countries)	25.477%	$740,335,863	20.2829%	$1,322,212,983
G-77 without China	13.472%	$391,482,700	5.0632%	$330,062,702
NAM (119 countries)	9.533%	$277,019,342	4.1673%	$271,660,274
OIC (56 countries)	6.615%	$192,225,212	3.0984%	$201,980,225

NOTES:

- The regular budget amount is half of the biennial budget for 2018 and 2019 as adjusted mid-biennium in December 2018. The peacekeeping budget amount is the approved resources for July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.
- The Geneva Group is made up of countries who share a common view on adminstrative and budgetary matters. Membership is Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Russia, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. Membership list available at The Geneva Group, "About the Geneva Group," http://www.thegenevagroup.net/cms/home/about-the-geneva-group.html.
- The G-77 is made up of 132 countries and "Palestine." Membership list available at The Group of 77, "The Member States of the Group of 77," http://www.g77.org/geninfo/members.html.
- The NAM is made up of 119 countries and "Palestine." Membership list available at 16th Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, "NAM Members & Observers," May 2012, https://web.archive.org/web/20140208210716/http://nam.gov.ir/Portal/Home/Default.aspx?CategoryID=27f3fbb6-8a39-444e-b557-6c74aae7f75f.
- The OIC is made up of 56 countries and the "State of Palestine." Membership list available at Organisation of Islamic Cooperation , "Members," https://www.oic-oci.org/states/?lan=en.

SOURCES:

United Nations General Assembly, "Approved resources for peacekeeping operations for the period from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020," A/C.5/73/21, July 3, 2019, https://undocs.org/A/C.5/73/21; Report of the Secretary-General (accessed November 15, 2019); United Nations General Assembly, "Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of United Nations peacekeeping operations: Implementation of General Assembly resolutions 55/235 and 55/236," A/73/350/Add.1, December 24, 2018, http://undocs.org/en/A/73/350/Add.1 (accessed November 15, 2019); and United Nations General Assembly, "Programme budget for the biennium 2018–2019," A/RES/73/280 A–C, January 7, 2019, https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/73/280%20A (accessed November 15, 2019).

ArticleName ■ heritage.org

****

The Heritage Foundation is a public policy, research, and educational organization recognized as exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. It is privately supported and receives no funds from any government at any level, nor does it perform any government or other contract work.

The Heritage Foundation is the most broadly supported think tank in the United States. During 2018, it had hundreds of thousands of individual, foundation, and corporate supporters representing every state in the U.S. Its 2018 operating income came from the following sources:

Individuals 67%
Foundations 13%
Corporations 2%
Program revenue and other income 18%

The top five corporate givers provided The Heritage Foundation with 1% of its 2018 income. The Heritage Foundation's books are audited annually by the national accounting firm of RSM US, LLP.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you, Mr. Schaefer.

We are also joined by Mr. Peter Yeo. Mr. Yeo serves as President of the Better World Campaign. Mr. Yeo, I apologize if I have mispronounced your name. I think I have correctly pronounced it. And you may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF PETER YEO, PRESIDENT, BETTER WORLD CAMPAIGN, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. YEO. You got it right. Thank you.

Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, thank you for the opportunity to explain how the United Nations furthers the values and the priorities of the United States.

Over the past decade, I have been fortunate to see the lifesaving work of the United Nations in more than 2 dozen countries around the world, many emerging from conflict and disaster. Last November, I traveled to Mali where U.N. peacekeepers opposed no less than six terrorist organizations, offshoots of ISIS and al-Qaeda, each fighting for territory and the overthrow of a democratically elected government in a strategic area for us.

In Jordan, the United Nations Refugee Agency provides shelter for more than a half million Syrian refugees, while the U.N. Population Fund, working in the largest refugee camp, has safely delivered more than 10,000 babies with zero maternal mortality.

In Mexico, the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime helps fight against opioids by tracking illicit crop production, working with the Mexican army to locate and destroy nearly 200,000 plots of poppies in 2017.

In Yemen, one of the world's worst humanitarian disasters, the World Food Programme feeds 12 million people per month, while UNICEF and the World Health Organization are responding to a massive cholera outbreak.

Now, the member states of the U.N. finance these many operations through both assessed and voluntary contributions. While the U.S. is the largest single financial contributor to the U.N. system, the current model is ultimately beneficial to the United States, as it requires all U.N. member states, no matter how big or small, how rich or poor, to help shoulder the burden of the U.N.'s regular and peacekeeping budgets. Some have suggested that moving to an entirely voluntary funding model would lead to more accountability and cost effectiveness. It will not. It is more likely to increase the amount of money spent by the U.S. taxpayers as they are saddled with more expenses. Let me explain.

Our country, under Democratic and Republican administrations alike, has a very broad definition of its foreign policy and national security interests. That is why we support peacekeepers in Mali and the U.N.'s negotiators in Yemen. It is also why we support investigating the human rights situation in North Korea and support programs that stop the flow of opioids into our country. All of these efforts are funded by assessed contributions to the U.N. Few U.N. member states, including Russia and China, share this expansive view of national interests and would not shoulder the burden voluntarily.

Now, as it stands, though, we are one of the few member states not fully paying our assessed contributions for either the U.N. reg-

ular budget or peacekeeping. These shortfalls have contributed to what the Secretary-General has deemed a financial crisis at the U.N. Right now on peacekeeping alone, we are $776 million in arrears, a shortfall that the Senate Appropriations Committee stated last year damages U.S. credibility and negatively impacts U.N. peacekeeping missions.

At the same time that the U.S. is underfunding operations, the stock of our rivals, particularly China, is rising at the U.N., as has been discussed extensively. China is now the second largest financial contributor to U.N. peacekeeping, its assessment rate having risen to 15 percent this year from just 3 percent 10 years ago.

So in the U.N. context, increased Chinese support for the U.N. has boosted Chinese influence, as it would in any large organization with dues-paying shareholders. While the U.S. has withdrawn from several key U.N. bodies, China has increased its leadership and now holds the top jobs in four of the U.N.'s 15 specialized agencies. The Chinese Government also become increasingly assertive at promoting its vision of human rights, which of course values the state over the rights of the individual, in bodies like the Human Rights Council, in which we no longer participate. China is seeking to use the U.N. to promote the Belt and Road Initiative involving infrastructure investments in more than 60 countries.

The right response to the rise of China in the U.N. is clear.

First, the U.S. should boost our level of involvement in U.N. agencies. Sadly the State Department office that pushes U.S. participation in international organizations was cut from five staff to zero.

Second, we should engage in the U.N. system rather than withdraw from it when the U.S. does not achieve all of its negotiating objectives, a position backed by nearly 60 percent of Americans in polling last summer.

Third, the U.S. should pay its dues on time and in full. China has paid its regular and peacekeeping dues. The U.S., meanwhile, is set to be a billion dollars in arrears by next year unless Congress acts. As the State Department stated in a report to Congress this summer, such shortfalls resulted in diminished U.S. standing and the ability to pursue U.S. priorities. Simply put, the other 192 U.N. member states are more likely to vote with the U.S., support its candidates for key U.N. positions, and quietly push against Chinese initiatives if the U.S. is seen as being a fully engaged and supportive player.

This is the time to work cooperatively with the U.N. and other likeminded U.N. member states to focus on implementation of the Secretary-General's ambitious reform agenda, which has been approved with active Trump administration support. And this also means American leadership to ensure that the U.N. remains as much in America's image as it did when we crafted the U.N. Charter with our allies nearly 75 years ago.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Yeo follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PETER YEO

Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee today about an issue of great importance to U.S. foreign policy: the effectiveness of the United Nations and the state of U.S.–U.N. rela-

tions. I'm Peter Yeo, President of the Better World Campaign, a Washington, DC-based organization whose mission is to support a strong and constructive U.S.–U.N. relationship by educating American policymakers and members of the public alike about the importance of the U.N.'s work and how it advances U.S. interests.

2020 marks the 75th anniversary of the San Francisco Conference and the entry into force of the U.N. Charter, the treaty that gave birth to the United Nations. Over the past three-quarters of a century, the U.N. has been one of the bedrock international institutions of the post-World War II international order. Established in the wake of that devastating conflict at the initiative of the United States and its Allies, the organization was conceived in order to "save humanity from the scourge of war" and provide a framework for international cooperation on efforts to address challenges in the security, humanitarian, development, economic, and human rights spheres.

I have seen first-hand what this ideal means in practice. Over the past decade, I've been fortunate to see the life-saving work of the U.N. up close in more than two dozen field presences:

- Last November, I traveled to Mali, a country twice the size of Texas, where U.N. Peacekeepers are opposing no less than six terrorist groups—offshoots of ISIS and al-Qaeda—each vying for territory and the overthrow of a democratically elected government in a strategic region;
- In Jordan, the U.N. Refugee Agency provides shelter for more than a half-million Syrian refugees, while the U.N. Population Fund, working in the largest refugee camp there, has safely delivered more than 10,000 babies with zero maternal mortality;
- In Mexico, the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has helped in the fight against opioids and the increase in heroin coming from the country over the border. Through a UNODC initiative, they are using satellite imagery and aerial photographs to depict where illicit crops are grown and then sharing that information with the Mexican government. This information in turn helped the Mexican army destroy nearly 200,000 plots of poppy in 2017, up 22 percent from the previous year.
- In Yemen, one of the world's worst humanitarian disasters, the World Food Program is feeding 12 million people per month, while UNICEF and the World Health Organization are operating treatment facilities and vaccinating the population in response to a massive cholera epidemic.

But the U.N. has a broader reach than these global hot spots. The U.N. Security Council—despite the inability of its members to reach consensus on some foreign policy issues—is the preferred vehicle to impose global sanctions, which it has done in a comprehensive way against North Korea. And as you know from your meetings with your local Rotary Club, the U.N. vaccinates more than 45 percent of the world's children and helps more than 2 million women per month overcome pregnancy-related risks and complications.

The member states of the U.N. finance many of these operations through "assessed" contributions—a percentage of money owed the U.N. based on a country's gross national income and other factors—as well as voluntary contributions. While the U.S. is the largest single financial contributor to the U.N. system, the current model is beneficial to the U.S. because it requires all U.N. member states, no matter how big or small, rich or poor, to help shoulder the U.N.'s regular and peacekeeping budgets at specified levels. Some have suggested that moving to an entirely voluntary funding model would lead to more accountability and cost effectiveness. It won't. It's more likely to increase the amount of money spent by U.S. taxpayers as they'll be saddled with more expenses.

Our country—under Democratic and Republican administrations alike—has a broad definition of its foreign policy and national security interests. That's why we support peacekeepers in Mali, and the U.N.'s negotiators in Yemen. It's also why we believe in investigating human rights violations in North Korea and supporting U.N. programs that stop the flow of opioids into the U.S. All of these efforts are funded by our "assessed" contributions to the U.N. Few U.N. member states—including Russia and China—share this expansive view of national interests and would not shoulder the burden.

As it stands though, we are one of the few member states not fully paying our assessed contributions for either the regular budget or peacekeeping. These shortfalls have contributed to what the Secretary-General has deemed a "financial crisis" at the U.N. Right now, on peacekeeping alone, we are $776 million in arrears; a shortfall that the Senate Appropriations Committee stated last year "damages U.S. credibility and negatively impacts U.N. peacekeeping missions."

At the same time that the U.S. is underfunding these operations, the stock of our rivals—particularly China—is rising at the U.N. China is now the second largest financial contributor to U.N. peacekeeping; its assessment rate having increased to 15 percent this year from just over 3 percent 10 years ago. It is also one of the largest troop contributors to U.N. peacekeeping operations, providing more uniformed personnel than the rest of the permanent members of the Security Council combined.

In the U.N. context, increased Chinese support for the U.N. has boosted Chinese influence—similar to any large organization with dues-paying shareholders. But that influence brings challenges that the U.S.—due to its accrual of debt on its financial obligations and withdrawal from key U.N. bodies—may be unable to adequately address.

It is our view that by working through the U.N. system, the U.S. helps share the burden for tackling a range of issues, harnessing the resources and political will of most of the world to achieve common diplomatic objectives, while also allowing us to marshal coalitions against those who have objectives that stand in stark contrast to our own. I will provide more detail on how specific aspects of the U.S.–U.N. relationship advance U.S. interests, as well as some of the challenges currently facing U.S. engagement with the U.N., below.

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

U.N. peacekeeping operations are among the most visible, impactful, and complex activities undertaken by the U.N. in the field. Multiple academic studies have confirmed that peacekeeping is an effective tool for saving lives and ending wars. One new book, which analyzes more than two dozen different statistical studies of peacekeeping, states that, "The vast majority of quantitative studies of peacekeeping come to a similar conclusion: U.N. peacekeeping is effective. Using different data sets, leveraging different time periods and controlling for everything one can imagine, the most rigorous empirical studies have all found that peacekeeping has a large, positive, and statistically significant effect on containing the spread of civil war, increasing the success of negotiated settlements to civil wars, and increasing the duration of peace once a civil war has ended. In short, peacekeepers save lives, and they keep the peace." [1]

In addition, a 2013 study by Swedish and American researchers found that deploying large numbers of U.N. peacekeepers "significantly decreases violence against civilians." Their findings were striking: in instances where no peacekeeping troops were deployed, monthly civilian deaths averaged 106. In instances where at least 8,000 U.N. troops were present, by contrast, the average civilian death toll fell to less than two. The paper concluded that ensuring U.N. peacekeeping forces "are appropriately tasked and deployed in large numbers" is critical to their ability to protect civilians.[2]

What is also remarkable is that all of this lifesaving work is being done at such a relatively low financial cost. Currently, there are more than 100,000 peacekeepers—soldiers, police, and civilians—deployed to 13 missions around the world, making U.N. peacekeeping the second-largest military force deployed abroad (after the U.S.). And yet, the total budget for the U.N.'s peacekeeping activities this year is just $6.5 billion, less than 1 percent of what the U.S. spent on its own military in FY'19. Moreover, a 2018 report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that deploying U.N. peacekeepers is eight times cheaper than U.S. forces.[3] It's hard to think of many other programs where the cost-benefit ratio is that favorable.

Right now, peacekeepers are playing a critical role promoting stability in a number of contexts, including Mali in the restive Sahel region of West Africa, where extremist groups linked to al-Qaeda and the Islamic State have proliferated in recent years. Since the peacekeeping mission began, the peacekeepers have facilitated free and fair presidential and parliamentary elections, helping the country return to democracy after a 2012 military coup. They have also overseen a shaky peace agreement between the government and Tuareg separatists in the north, and—most importantly—kept the extremists at bay, preventing them from reasserting control over northern population centers like Timbuktu, Gao, and Kidal.

Peacekeeping in Mali is not a panacea. But things would arguably be much worse if blue helmets weren't on the ground working to promote security and stability. Indeed, the last thing that the region needs is a proto-state run by jihadists emerging in that country. The U.N., by virtue of its presence and its activities in the country, is preventing that from happening, at a significant cost—dozens of peacekeepers have been killed in Mali since the mission began 6 years ago.

Peacekeepers are working to promote stability and civilian protection in a number of other theaters of operation as well. In South Sudan, for example, which was plunged into a devastating civil war in 2013, peacekeepers have been protecting more than 200,000 civilians who fled their homes and sought shelter at U.N. bases. Given the exceptionally brutal nature of the violence in South Sudan and the fact that civilians have been targeted on the basis of their ethnicity, it is likely many of these people would have been killed had the U.N. not intervened to protect them. Further south, peacekeepers are also playing a critical role in eastern Congo, a region that has been ravaged by several decades of conflict and is currently experiencing the second worst Ebola outbreak in history. In addition to their normal stabilization activities, peacekeepers have stepped in to provide protection to health care workers and treatment centers, which have been targeted in attacks by armed groups, as well as provided logistical and operational support to Ebola response efforts. The U.S., for its part, has endorsed the efforts of both missions, by continuing to support the reauthorization of their mandates on the Security Council.

PROVIDING LIFESAVING HUMANITARIAN RELIEF

The U.N.'s work in the field extends far beyond peacekeeping missions though. Every year, U.N. humanitarian agencies provide lifesaving aid to tens of millions of people around the world who have been driven from their homes or had their lives turned upside-down by conflict, famine, and other calamities. These activities have long enjoyed bipartisan support on Capitol Hill, and for good reason: the provision of food, shelter, medical care, education, and protection to people in need reflect our deepest values as a nation. Moreover, there is an important national security imperative to this type of work, as the desperation caused by humanitarian crises can provide openings for extremists and other bad actors to exploit.

Currently, one of the U.N.'s largest humanitarian responses is to the civil war in Syria, which over the last 8 1/2 years has claimed hundreds of thousands of lives and displaced millions. While the U.N. Security Council—largely because of Russia's willingness to deploy its veto in support of the brutal dictatorship of Bashar al-Assad—has mostly been sidelined from dealing with the conflict, particularly on the issue of chemical weapons, U.N. agencies are on the ground working to save lives and provide a measure of hope in the bleakest of circumstances.

The World Food Program, for example—led by former South Carolina Governor David Beasley—distributes food aid to several million displaced civilians inside Syria every month, and provides electronic vouchers that allow more than 1.5 million Syrian refugees to purchase food in local markets, providing a much-needed cash infusion for host communities in Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon, and Iraq. Overall, WFP is the world's largest humanitarian organization addressing hunger and promoting food security; it provides food assistance to an average of 91 million people in 83 countries each year. Around the world on any given day, WFP has 5,000 trucks, 92 aircraft, and 20 ships on the move. It is a humanitarian logistics operation of unrivaled proportion.

The U.N. Children's Fund does equally vital work in size and scale. As noted, the agency supplies vaccines reaching 45 percent of the world's children under the age of 5 as part of its commitment to improving child survival. Immunization is one of the most successful and cost-effective public health interventions, saving an estimated 2 to 3 million lives every year. In Syria, UNICEF is working to help children gain access to vaccines, as well as clean water, hygiene and sanitation services, and education. In addition, the U.N. Refugee Agency (UNHCR) is a provider of shelter for Syrian refugees and works to find durable solutions to their plight, including through resettlement in third countries. And the U.N. Population Fund (UNFPA), a critical provider of sexual and reproductive health care in emergency situations, operates a maternal health clinic in Za'atari—Jordan's largest Syrian refugee camp—that has safely delivered more than 10,000 babies with zero maternal mortality, a huge feat given that 60 percent of all maternal deaths occur in the context of humanitarian emergencies.

The lifesaving work of the U.N. is also in full force in Yemen, which is currently facing the world's worst humanitarian crisis, with more than 80 percent of the population reliant on some form of aid. Here, WFP is working to reach 12 million people per month with food and nutritional assistance; UNICEF and the World Health Organization (WHO) did critical work responding to a massive cholera epidemic, operating treatment facilities and vaccinating people across the country; and UNFPA has integrated nutrition assistance for pregnant women into its reproductive health and safe delivery services in the country. These activities have undoubtedly saved many thousands of lives, even as the country's brutal civil war continues to grind on.

But the U.N.'s work in Yemen is not merely confined to addressing the humanitarian consequences of the conflict. The U.N. is also deeply involved—through the Secretary-General's Special Envoy for Yemen Martin Griffiths—in efforts to navigate a negotiated, political solution to what has become a complex and multi-faceted conflict involving an array of local interests and factions, with the increasingly intense rivalry between Gulf Arab monarchies in the region and Iran layered on top. The U.N. was instrumental in brokering talks that took place in Sweden in December of last year between the Houthis and the Yemeni government, the first time the two sides had met face-to-face in nearly 2 1/2 years. While relatively modest in scope, the agreement they reached on a ceasefire and military redeployment from Hodeidah and several other key ports could—if fully implemented—contribute much to alleviating the suffering of the Yemeni people and set the stage for further diplomatic efforts to peacefully end the conflict. In a recent op-ed published in *The Washington Post*, Ambassador William J. Burns, a former U.S. diplomat and current President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, endorsed the U.N.'s efforts, recommending that the Trump administration "throw our full support behind" the U.N.-led framework for peace talks between the parties.

PROMOTING AND ADVANCING HUMAN RIGHTS

The U.N.'s work on conflict mitigation dovetails with another key pillar of the organization: the promotion and protection of universal human rights. This has been baked into the U.N.'s ethos from the very beginning: Article I of the Charter establishes one of the U.N.'s core purposes as "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." These principles were further elaborated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1948. This seminal document, which Eleanor Roosevelt played a key role in crafting, lays out a litany of basic human rights standards to which all human beings are entitled, including the right to life, liberty, and security of person and the right to freedom of thought, association, expression, and religion.

Seventy-one years later, the U.N. works to advance human rights through a number of tools, mechanisms, institutions, and partnerships, including perhaps most prominently the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). Established in 1993 with U.S. backing, this office conducts fact-finding missions and provides support to independent investigative mechanisms established by the U.N. Human Rights Council (UNHRC) that probe serious violations in specific countries. These activities help raise public awareness of human rights violations, magnify the voices of dissidents and civil society organizations on the ground, and provide a tool for pressuring repressive governments and holding abusers accountable. The Office also has a Rapid Response Unit which can swiftly deploy to the field in human rights emergencies. This mechanism has recently supported fact-finding missions for DR Congo, Myanmar, Nicaragua, North Korea, Syria, Bangladesh, Central African Republic, Sri Lanka, and Venezuela, among other countries.

Another key component of the U.N. human rights system are the more than 50 special procedures— independent experts who do not receive a salary and serve in their personal capacity—who work to promote human rights around the world. Existing special procedures include mandates for country-specific human rights monitoring, as well as the special rapporteurs focused on thematic human rights issues, such as freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; freedom of religion and belief; freedom of expression; and combatting human trafficking. Once referred to by the late former U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan as the "crown jewel" of the U.N. human rights system, these independent experts regularly speak truth to power, calling out governments by name for violating international human rights standards, and supporting the work of local advocates on the ground. In June, for example, Agnes Callamard, the U.N. special rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions, released a report on the murder of Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi, which found evidence suggesting premeditation for the killing at the highest levels of the Saudi government. This report was an important touchstone in efforts by a number of parties—including this body—to hold the Saudi government to account for Mr. Khashoggi's brutal slaying.

Unfortunately, the U.N.'s human rights advocacy has at times been a source of controversy and tension in the U.S.–U.N. relationship. In recent years, there has been understandable concern in Congress about the activities and composition of the U.N. Human Rights Council (UNHRC), a body made up of 47 member states (elected to 3-year terms by the General Assembly) that seeks to advance international human rights standards.

To be clear, I'm not here to defend the UNHRC's disproportionate focus on Israel, or the human rights records of some of its member states. Those are valid criticisms, and areas where there is bipartisan agreement on the need for improvement. What I think is clear though is that when the U.S. reversed course and decided to engage actively with the Council from 2010–2017, the record of the Council improved markedly, in ways that benefited and advanced U.S. interests and core values. With strong U.S. diplomatic engagement, the Council:

- Established a Commission of Inquiry (COI) to investigate human rights violations in North Korea. As a result of a landmark report drafted by the Commission, the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights established a field office in Seoul, South Korea to continue to track rights violations in North Korea;
- Created a COI on the human rights situation in Syria, which has helped gather evidence against specific individuals in the Assad regime for their involvement in crimes against humanity, and created a "perpetrators list" to be shared with international judicial bodies;
- Established a special rapporteur to investigate human rights violations in Iran, which has issued strong denunciations of Iranian government policy on a number of issues, including arbitrary arrests, executions, persecution of religious minorities, and efforts to curb press freedom;
- Passed three historic resolutions on combatting discrimination and violence based on sexual orientation and gender identity in 2011, 2014, and 2016. The most recent resolution established an independent expert focused on combating violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, which allows for unprecedented global-level reporting on international human rights challenges facing LGBTI individuals.

In addition, during the period when the U.S. was a member of the Council, we saw positive movement on Israel's treatment as well. Just to provide some additional context, the UNHRC was created in 2006 to replace a previous U.N. human rights body. During its first several years, the U.S. refused to run for a seat on the new Council, fearing it would be no better than its predecessor. In fact, it was during this period when the U.S. refused to participate that the Council voted to place "the human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories" on its permanent agenda (known as "Item 7").

The Council's record began to shift in 2009, when the U.S.'s posture towards the Council changed and the U.S. won its first term. While Item 7 remains in place, there have been noteworthy improvements in other areas. According to the American Jewish Committee's Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, there was a 30 percent decrease in the proportion of country-specific resolutions focused on Israel during U.S. membership on the Council versus the period when we were off. In March 2018, the State Department itself reported that the Council saw "the largest shift in votes towards more abstentions and no votes on Israel-related resolutions since the creation of the [Council]."

In 2018 though, the Trump administration decided to walk away from the U.S. seat on the Council, as it could not convince others about the proposed U.S. reform agenda. It was a decision welcomed by nations, like China, that do not share our views on human rights.

In addition to our decision to leave the Council, since Fiscal Year 2018, the State Department has withheld a portion of our Regular Budget dues directed towards the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). While amounting to about $19 million each year, this money nevertheless has an impact: earlier this year, OHCHR was almost forced to suspend the activities of a number of human rights treaty monitoring bodies—including those overseeing member state compliance with the Convention Against Torture and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—due to funding shortfalls caused in part by the U.S. withholding. Ironically enough, the U.S. is a party to both of these treaties. Plus, for the first time in nearly a quarter century, beginning in 2020, no American will have a seat on any U.N. human rights treaty body, which weakens our ability to influence international law and fundamental freedoms at the global level. It also provides an opening to other member states, particularly China, who are working to increase their own profile at the U.N. and use it to weaken the organization's human rights pillar.

THE CHALLENGE OF A RISING CHINA AND U.S. RETREAT FROM MULTILATERALISM

In addition to key human rights bodies, other parts of the U.N. system are witnessing a U.S. retreat from the basic tenets of multilateralism as well. With regards

to peacekeeping operations, the U.S. is currently in debt on its peacekeeping assessments—by $776 million—because of Congress's decision to reimpose a 1990s-era cap on U.S. contributions. In part because of these underpayments, the U.N. is facing a major cash shortfall, which has serious consequences. The State Department itself has weighed in on this issue, outlining—in a report to Congress this past June—the following impacts of growing U.S. arrears to the U.N.: "(1) Loss of vote or inability to be a member of governing bodies; (2) Diminished U.S. standing and diminished ability to pursue U.S. priorities; (3) Reduced U.S. ability to promote increased oversight and accountability through reforms that promote efficiency, cost savings, and improved management practices; (4) Reduced standing needed to successfully promote qualified U.S. citizens to assume senior management roles; and (5) Impairments of peacekeeping missions to operate, including addressing objectives that may directly impact the national security of the United States."

With respect to peacekeeping, this also means that troop-contributing countries are not being fully reimbursed for their contributions of personnel and equipment, to the tune of tens of millions of dollars. This can create significant challenges for troop-contributors, most of whom are lower-income countries that rely on reimbursements to help sustain complex longer-term peacekeeping deployments. For example, last year, Rwanda—a major provider of troops to U.N. operations in sub-Saharan Africa—reportedly had to withdraw a planned rotation of one of its troop contingents to the Central African Republic because it had not received reimbursements sufficient to make necessary updates to military equipment. If the U.S. keeps accruing arrears, these cash flow challenges will only grow, potentially denying peacekeepers the resources necessary to project force and conduct patrols, discouraging countries from providing troops and equipment in the first place, and threatening the long-term sustainability of U.N. peacekeeping as a whole.

The knock-on effects of these policies are not solely confined to the effectiveness of the programs in question, however. At the same time that the U.S. is underfunding peacekeeping mandates that it votes in favor of on the Security Council, withdrawing from the Human Rights Council, withholding funding for OHCHR, and abrogating its participation in other U.N. institutions and initiatives, including the Paris Climate Agreement, other countries—particularly China—are taking a far more active role. As noted, China is now the second largest financial contributor and one of the largest troop contributors to U.N. peacekeeping operations. It has also aggressively pushed to expand its role in a range of U.N.-affiliated institutions, and Chinese nationals currently holding the top job in four of the organization's 15 specialized agencies: the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), and the U.N. Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

While greater Chinese participation at the U.N., and a greater share of the financial burden for its costs, are not necessarily negative outcomes in their own right, the way China has sought to use its growing clout is far from benign, particularly in terms of the organization's work on human rights. According to a recent report by the Center for a New American Security, the Chinese government has become increasingly aggressive in recent years in seeking to promote a particularist view of human rights at the U.N.—one which devalues minority rights, elevates a narrow conception of "state sovereignty" over the rights of the individual, gives primacy to economic and social rights over civil and political rights, and seeks to mute criticism of individual countries' human rights records, particularly its own.[4] Naturally, the Human Rights Council has been ground zero for many of these efforts. In 2017 and 2018, for example, China tabled its first-ever resolutions before the Council, on "The contribution of development to the enjoyment of all human rights" and "Promoting mutually beneficial cooperation in the field of human rights." While seemingly innocuous on the surface, both proposals encapsulate Beijing's hostility to universal human rights norms. According to a September 2018 report by Ted Piccone, formerly of the Brookings Institution, an expert on the U.N. human rights system, "Both resolutions emphasized national sovereignty, called for quiet dialogue and cooperation rather than investigations and international calls to action, and pushed the Chinese model of state-led development as the path to improving their vision of collective human rights and social stability. They also represent an important changing of tides toward a Council where China is both an active participant and a key influencer of other countries' votes, at a time when its chief protagonist, the United States, has absented itself from the field."[5] Given our absence from the Council, these efforts are likely to only accelerate.

China's efforts on this front extend beyond the UNHRC, however. In June 2018, during negotiations at the U.N. on the 2018–2019 peacekeeping budget, China pushed for the elimination of a number of important human rights monitoring and civilian protection posts in U.N. peacekeeping missions. While ultimately unsuccess-

ful, the fact this was even tried in the first place is evidence of an emboldened China that is increasingly willing to use its influence—particularly, in this case, its large financial contribution to U.N. peacekeeping—to tilt the field in order to achieve the policy outcomes it desires. Of note, China's efforts in this case were premised on the budgetary limitations caused by the U.S. focus on funding cuts.

U.S. policy has unwittingly aided and abetted China's rise in other ways as well. As previously noted, a central pillar of China's strategy is filling senior posts with Chinese nationals in order to extend and solidify its influence throughout the U.N. system. Unfortunately, this is happening at a time when the State Department, and especially the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, has been hollowed out, thereby limiting our ability to push back against China's efforts or support our own preferred candidates for these positions. For example, there has long been a unit within the Bureau responsible for helping to promote jobs for Americans in international organizations. According to Foreign Policy, that office has shrunk from five employees to zero, putting the U.S. at a severe disadvantage in the competition over coveted posts in the U.N. system.[6]

Beyond these examples, China has also sought to use the U.N. system to promote Xi Jinping's signature foreign policy effort—the Belt and Road Initiative—which carries a host of unique strategic, human rights, and environmental challenges; sought to deny U.N. accreditation to civil society organizations critical of Chinese policies; and, through the ITU, support its "Digital Silk Road" initiative, which according to a recent piece by the Council on Foreign Relations, "has the capacity to spread authoritarianism, curtail democracy, and curb fundamental human rights."[7]

If the U.S. continues to draw down its engagement with the U.N.—by withdrawing from key U.N. bodies, unilaterally cutting funding to core U.N. programs and agencies, or abrogating its obligations under multilateral treaties or agreements—it will leave a void that countries like China have shown they are more than willing, and increasingly able, to fill. That could mean a very different U.N. than the one the U.S. sought to create in the aftermath of World War II—one where U.S. national security interests and foreign policy objectives, as well as our longstanding commitment to advancing universal human rights, are increasingly sidelined. Preventing such a scenario requires more engagement, not less, and that means, in part, honoring our financial obligations to the organization, which account for a tiny fraction of the federal budget.

REFORM & THE WAY FORWARD

Before I wrap up my testimony, I would like to say a few words about the issue of reform. In recent years, the U.N. has undertaken a number of measures to make its operations more transparent and efficient. With regards to peacekeeping, for example, earlier in the decade the U.N. initiated efforts that reduced the cost per peacekeeper by 18 percent and cut the number of support staff on peacekeeping missions by 4,000 to save on administrative costs, even while the number of uniformed personnel deployed to the field, and the complexity of the activities they were expected to undertake, increased. The U.N. also undertook important efforts to combat sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. personnel, including an unprecedented policy calling for the repatriation of entire units whose members engaged in widespread instances of abuse. More recently, under the leadership of current U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres, the U.N. has made significant progress on achieving gender parity in its senior leadership, promulgated stronger whistleblower protections, and sought to strengthen the role of Resident Coordinators—officials responsible for heading up the U.N.'s development work on the ground—in order to make the U.N.'s delivery of development assistance more streamlined and accountable. In a Wall Street Journal op-ed, the Secretary-General was praised for taking the lead against anti-Semitism.[8] As with so many other things at the U.N., the achievement of these reforms would not have been possible without strong U.S. support and engagement, and while there remains much work to be done on a range of reform-related issues, it's clear that the organization is moving in the right direction. Put simply, the U.N. of today is a world away from the U.N. of nearly 75 years ago.

Nevertheless, that has not stopped some in Washington from advancing certain theories for spurring further progress on reform that, while perhaps well-intentioned, would cripple the organization and nullify our efforts to achieve meaningful and realistic reforms. One such proposal would have the U.N. move from a funding structure that relies on both mandatory assessments and voluntary contributions from member states to an entirely voluntary financing scheme. This approach is problematic for a number of reasons:

- The fact that assessed funding structures require other countries to share in the financial burden is actually beneficial to the United States. All U.N. member

states are required to help shoulder the U.N.'s regular and peacekeeping budgets at specified levels. This, in turn, prevents U.S. taxpayers from being saddled with the majority of these expenses. By contrast, the U.S. often pays more under voluntary funding arrangements.

- Successive administrations and outside experts have recognized the limitations inherent in voluntary funding structures.
  - In June 2005, the House passed The United Nations Reform Act of 2005 which would automatically withhold dues from the U.N. unless certain specific reforms are met, including switching to a voluntary system. The Bush administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) which said that it has "serious concerns" about the legislation because it "could detract from and undermine our efforts," and "asks that Congress reconsider this legislation." Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has stated that "the administration doesn't support those bills."
  - The 2005 Congressionally-mandated Newt Gingrich-George Mitchell report on U.N. reform, for example, noted that such schemes are often slow and lead to U.S. priorities being underfunded.

While the U.S. must continue to push hard for progress on reform at the U.N., it is critical that Congress avoid proposals that will substantially underfund key U.N. activities that are critical to U.S. interests, and could lead to U.S. taxpayers footing a higher proportion of the bill for certain activities.

The U.S.–U.N. relationship has gone through its share of ups and downs over the years. But one constant has been the importance of positive U.S. leadership, and its capacity to steer the organization in a way that both advances U.S. national interests and helps the U.N. live up to the ideals upon which it was founded. Now is no different: this is the time to work cooperatively with U.N. leaders and like-minded U.N. member states to focus on implementation of the Secretary-General's ambitious reform agenda, which has been approved with active U.S. support. It is also the time to ensure that America's voice and presence continues to be heard in New York. Without our steadfast diplomatic engagement and financial support, it is difficult to see how the U.N. will be able to continue all of the important responsibilities it was first invested with nearly 75 years ago.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify about U.N. effectiveness and the importance of a strong U.S.–U.N. relationship.

Notes

[1] Howard, Lise. "Power in Peacekeeping." Cambridge University Press, 2019.

[2] Hultman, Lisa, Jacob Kathman, and Megan Shannon. "United Nations Peacekeeping and Civilian Protection in Civil War." American Journal of Political Science 57(4). 8 May 2013. pp. 875–91.

[3] "UN Peacekeeping Cost Estimate for Hypothetical U.S. Operation Exceeds Actual Costs for Comparable UN Operation." Government Accountability Office GAO–18–243. February 2018.

[4] Lee and Sullivan. "People's Republic of the United Nations: China's Emerging Revisionism in International Organizations." Center for a New American Security. May 2019.

[5] Piccone, Ted. "China's Long Game at the United Nations." The Brookings Institution. September 2018. p. 4.

[6] Lynch and Cramer. "Senior Officials Concede Loss of U.S. Clout as Trump Prepares for U.N. Summit." Foreign Policy, 5 September 2019.

[7] Cheney, Clayton. "China's Digital Silk Road: Strategic Technological Competition and Exporting Political Illiberalism." Council on Foreign Relations. 26 September 2019.

[8] Foxman and Lasensky. "A Righteous U.N. Secretary-General." Wall Street Journal, June 27, 2018.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you, Mr. Yeo, for your instructive testimony.

Finally, we are joined by Ms. Amy K. Lehr. Ms. Lehr serves as the Director of the Human Rights Initiative at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. Ms. Lehr, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF AMY K. LEHR, DIRECTOR OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS INITIATIVE, CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. LEHR. Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, thank you so much for holding a hearing on this important topic and for offering me an opportunity to speak today.

Today, I will talk about how perceived U.S. disengagement at the U.N. at a moment of shifting geopolitics is severely damaging to U.S. influence and to human rights. I will also offer some recommendations on how to reassert leadership. This is really the moment we need to up our game, not be stepping back.

When the administration pulled out of the U.N.Human Rights Council and the U.S. was left without an Ambassador to the U.N. for 9 months, that led to a perception that this was a lack of confidence and interest in the U.N. system. So it had a signaling effect.

This was a mistake. The U.N. is not perfect, but it is still a really important forum for advancing democracy, human rights, and good governance.

And the problem is that U.S. disengagement could not be more poorly timed. As others have discussed today, it has created a vacuum that other governments are using to advance their own interests that are very much counter to human rights and to long-term U.S. values. Faltering U.S. leadership has coincided particularly with the rise in Chinese engagement, which has shifted in its form in recent years, and that engagement is long-term, strategic, and aimed at really altering the rules of global governance.

I am focusing on China due to this increasing leadership in the U.N., but obviously it is not the only government seeking to undermine human rights and other core values there.

So I am going to overly simplify this, but China is advancing several key goals at the U.N. regarding human rights. So first, it is seeking to avoid scrutiny of its own abuses by changing the rules of the game. And second, it is seeking to weaken human rights and global governance by advancing new ideologies at the U.N.

So what does this look like in practice? I will just give a few very quick examples.

So U.N. human rights bodies are struggling to engage in any kind of oversight over what is happening in Xinjiang in terms of abuses against Muslim minorities there. Moreover, 22 countries drafted a letter that they submitted to the President of the Human Rights Council expressing concern about the human rights situation in Xinjiang. I was told that was given to the president of the council instead of read on the floor because no one country was willing to take on that role of really angering China. And in an unprecedented move, China convinced 37 countries to write a rebuttal—this is not normal—praising China's treatment of its Muslim minorities. European governments I have spoken with have expressed the urgent need for the U.S. to reengage in the Human Rights Council so this does not ever happen again.

I do want to acknowledge that the U.S. is providing leadership on human rights in other fora within the U.N.

The U.N. has long provided for civil society organizations to have official consultative status at the U.N., with the idea that this enhances transparency and support for democracy and democratic values. Unfortunately, Chinese diplomats at the U.N. have intimidated NGOs and journalists on U.N. grounds and sought to have them banned. In fact, they tried to have Tibetan and Uighur organizations stripped of their accreditation.

I have described some actions by China to avoid criticism at the U.N., but the U.S. really needs to be focused on the long game. So that is playing out across the multiple U.N. agencies and not just ones that have "human rights" in their titles. This occurs, for example, through the insertion of Chinese ideology into U.N. documents and through senior-level appointments, as has been discussed today.

For example, a recent and successful China-sponsored resolution in the Human Rights Council called for "mutually beneficial cooperation" in human rights. This is a euphemism for state-requested capacity building to be the main means to promote human rights at the U.N. The concept also supports the principle of complete non-interference and would help China and other abusive states reject U.N. oversight over human rights, like in Xinjiang, Tibet, Hong Kong, et cetera. The approach is getting the support of other autocratic states, and of course, China is increasingly making economic threats against other actors so they can benefit from their votes.

Other U.N. bodies also matter for human rights. And the ITU has been discussed here today, but I think technology and technology governance will have enormous implications for human rights. So staying engaged on these standard-setting bodies will be incredibly important, including from a human rights perspective.

I do want to talk about a number of steps the U.S. could take to ensure that the U.N. remains a forum supportive of human rights and democratic governance.

So, one, it is my view, based on the data, that the U.S. should rejoin the Human Rights Council. The data shows that when the U.S. was part of it, the body's membership included fewer of the worst human rights abusers, the number of resolutions targeting Israel dropped significantly, and the Human Rights Council passed more resolutions enabling oversight for abuses in places such as Syria. And many I have spoken to ascribe these positive developments to U.S. diplomacy and leadership in that body. Our large mission just has the ability to do the legwork to get votes on crucial issues that others cannot do.

The U.S. also needs a whole-of-U.N. strategy. The U.S. should really signal that the U.N. matters. The strategy should be principles-based focused on strengthening support for human rights, democratic norms, and rule of law across the U.N. The strategy should not be framed in terms of competition with particular countries. That will not get the support of the allies we need. We have to do it in coordination with likeminded countries. We are not going to be able to do this alone and succeed.

Congress should maintain or increase funding for U.N. agencies, and the administration should not try to cut it.

And last, the U.S. needs to lead by example. Every country in the world can improve its human rights practices. We need to engage with U.N. special rapporteurs that are exercising their oversight functions. Otherwise we make it really easy for other countries to thwart oversight and then cite the U.S. to justify what they are doing.

Thank you so much, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Lehr follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AMY K. LEHR

Chairman Young, Ranking Member Merkley, and distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for holding a hearing on this important topic and offering me an opportunity to speak.

I am the Director of the Human Rights Initiative at CSIS and previously worked for the U.N. Special Representative on Business and Human Rights.

Today, I will address how U.S. disengagement at the U.N. at a moment of shifting geopolitics is severely damaging to U.S. influence and to human rights. I will also offer recommendations on how to reassert leadership.

The administration signaled its lack of confidence and interest in the U.N. system. It pulled out of the U.N. Human Rights Council ("HRC") and the U.S. was left without an Ambassador to the U.N. for 9 months. This was a mistake. The U.N. system is not perfect, but is still an important forum for advancing democracy, human rights, and good governance around the world.

U.S. disengagement could not be more poorly timed. It has created a vacuum that pernicious actors are using to advance agendas that are counter to human rights and thus counter to the long-term interests of the U.S. and its allies. Faltering U.S. leadership has coincided with a rise in Chinese engagement, which is long-term, strategic, and aimed at altering the rules of global governance. In principle, having more countries engaged at the U.N. is positive, but it is problematic when they seek to undermine human rights and civil society there. I'll focus on China due to its increasing leadership in the U.N. system, although it is not the only government seeking to undermine human rights and other core values.

China is advancing several goals at the U.N.[1] First, it seeks to avoid scrutiny of its own abuses. Second, it seeks to weaken human rights and global governance by advancing new ideologies at the U.N.

How does this play out in practice?

U.N. human rights bodies have struggled to engage in any oversight over the situation in Xinjiang, despite the abuses against Muslim minorities there. Moreover, 22 countries drafted a letter that they submitted to the president of the HRC expressing concern about the human rights situation in Xinjiang. In an unprecedented move, China convinced 37 countries to write a rebuttal, praising its treatment of its Muslim minorities. European governments involved in the situation have expressed the urgent need for the U.S. to re-engage so this does not happen again.

The U.N. has long provided for civil society organizations to have official consultative status at the U.N., with the idea that this enhances transparency and is consistent with democratic norms. Chinese diplomats at the U.N. have intimidated NGOs and journalists on U.N. grounds and sought to have them banned. They have tried to have Tibetan and Uighur organizations stripped of their accreditation.[2]

I've described actions by China to avoid criticism at the U.N. But the U.S. needs to be focused on the long game, which is playing out across multiple U.N. agencies. This occurs through the insertion of Chinese ideology into U.N. documents and through senior-level appointments.

For example, a recent, successful China-sponsored resolution in the HRC called for "mutually beneficial cooperation" in human rights—a euphemism for state-requested capacity building to be the main means to promote human rights at the U.N.[3] It supports the principle of non-interference and would help China and other abusive states reject U.N. oversight over human rights. China could then escape U.N. scrutiny for Xinjiang, Tibet, and Hong Kong. This approach easily gains the support of other autocratic states, and China increasingly makes economic threats against other, more democratic nations so that it benefits from their votes.

Other U.N. bodies also matter for human rights. There is a risk, for example, that the International Telecommunication Union ("ITU") will increasingly insert itself into internet governance, especially with the advent of 5G. The ITU is led by a Chinese national, and there are concerns that if the ITU increasingly intrudes into technology governance, this will advance a less free and open internet and society.

The U.S. can take a number of steps to ensure that the U.N. remains a forum supportive of human rights and democratic governance.

—It should rejoin the HRC. When the U.S. was part of the HRC, the body's membership included fewer of the worst human rights abusers, the number of resolutions targeting Israel dropped significantly, and the HRC passed more resolutions enabling oversight for abuses in places such as Syria.[4] Many ascribe these positive developments to U.S. diplomacy, including our large mission that can do the leg work to garner needed votes on particular resolutions. It is clearly better for the U.S. to be in than out.

—The U.S. needs a "whole of U.N." strategy. It should signal that the U.N. does matter as an institution that sets global norms and rules. The strategy should focus on strengthening support for human rights, democratic norms, and rule of law through the U.N.'s many bodies, and deploy our talented diplomats accordingly. We should do this in close coordination with like-minded countries. We cannot go it alone and succeed.

—Congress should maintain or increase funding for U.N. agencies, and the administration should cease trying to cut it.

—Last, the U.S. needs to lead by example. Every country in the world can improve its human rights practices. We must engage with U.N. Special Rapporteurs that are exercising their oversight functions, or we make it very easy for other countries to thwart oversight and then cite the U.S. to justify their actions.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

Notes

[1] For an excellent discussion of these issues, see China's Long Game on Human Rights at The United Nations, Ted Piccone, September 2018.

[2] China's Long Game on Human Rights at The United Nations, Ted Piccone, September 2018.

[3] Is China Winning its fight against rights at the U.N.?, Sophie Richardson, The Hill, December 2018.

[4] Game Changer: the U.S. at the U.N. Human Rights Council, The Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, May 2017.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you, Ms. Lehr.

Mr. Merkley.

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you very much, all of you, for your testimony.

Mr. Yeo, so the U.S. thought 25 percent was a reasonable number to contribute, one-quarter of the total costs, and the arrears you spoke of were because the U.N. continues to assess the U.S. almost 28 percent. I believe that is the main driver of those arrears. 25 percent I think to anyone back home in Oregon sounds like, oh, we are contributing a quarter. Is that not a fair amount?

Mr. YEO. Sounds reasonable to me except that the U.S. voted in December to support an assessment rate for the U.S. of 27.8 percent. So these rates are negotiated every 3 years. We had an opportunity in December of last year to reduce the U.S. rate. And so Nikki Haley was engaged in active negotiations, and they got the rate down from roughly 28.2 to 27.8. But we negotiated this rate. We also have the opportunity to veto any peacekeeping mission that we view is too expensive or too costly. And so when we vote for these missions—and we just voted for the mission in Central African Republic last week. So we vote for these missions. We agreed to this assessment rate, and so it seems to me that under those circumstances——

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you. That is a very interesting piece of information because I am surprised to hear that, that we voted for those rates since we have had a longstanding cap at 25 percent.

I think the United States feels—but I will ask you—that often these peacekeeping missions do a pretty effective job in very difficult places in the world. Is that a fair way to put it?

Mr. YEO. Absolutely. They are operating in countries in which the U.S. and our European allies in general do not wish to operate. So in the case of Central African Republic, the mission there has played a vital role in ensuring the prevention of a genocide between various religious and ethnic groups. And as we approach elections in Central African Republic next year, they would not happen without U.N. peacekeepers, as well as sort of negotiations

that occur to bring all the relevant parties together. So this is just a specific case where U.N. peacekeepers are advancing our interests.

Senator MERKLEY. Do you think we are going to see a lot more challenges as a result of climate chaos and the impact on basic agriculture in the world? For example, in Syria, extended drought resulted in people moving to the cities because they were starving. That created conflict, and it was kind of the roots of the Syrian war. I was just down in the Northern Triangle where extended drought has driven people out of peasant villages. They go to the cities where there is extraordinarily gang-style extortion, and they flee north.

Are we going to see a lot more conflict driven by fundamental challenges for food in the world?

Mr. YEO. Absolutely. We are already seeing it. I mentioned I was in Mali, and a lot of the conflict in northern Mali but also in Central African Republic is due to changed migration patterns and changed herding practices as a result of climate change. So absolutely there is a relationship between what is happening in terms of conflict between villagers that used to get along, groups that used to get along, but no longer do because of tighter resources caused by climate change.

Senator MERKLEY. Are we still in Cyprus?

Mr. YEO. Yes. We have a very small mission in Cyprus. And ultimately the resolution of the mission in Cyprus is dependent upon some sort of broader political settlement. It is not a costly mission. As we think about the drivers and——

Senator MERKLEY. I was going to say it seems like that is not exactly one of the trouble spots in the world right now. It has been pretty stable for a while.

Mr. YEO. Indeed.

Senator MERKLEY. So, Amy, I want to turn to you. I have heard that China has proceeded to try to block certain activists from gaining access to the U.N. premises. Has that happened?

Ms. LEHR. Yes. So there is one particular instance that has gotten news time recently. There is a Uighur organization called the World Uighur Congress, and the head of it was not allowed to join the—there is a permanent forum for indigenous peoples every year, which if you are an indigenous people, this is a very important forum, and it is a very broad group. And the head of DESA allegedly blocked him from participating, although later, my understanding is, the U.S. and Germany intervened and he was able to attend after all. The head of DESA, whether or not this is relevant, happens to be Chinese.

Senator MERKLEY. I hope we are going to make absolutely sure that China cannot play that role.

I had also heard they had tried to block U.N. accreditation for certain activist groups. Is that true as well?

Ms. LEHR. That is my understanding as well.

Senator MERKLEY. Why the hell would be that be possible? Why would one nation be able to block various groups from getting accreditation be part of the conversation?

Ms. LEHR. So I have actually been looking into that. I believe—I can follow up and confirm this—that—so again, I believe accreditation happens through DESA.

Senator MERKLEY. Okay. Well, I would sure like to see us pay a lot of attention to that because it is another example of China's growing role. But the idea that on U.S. territory in New York, the Chinese are controlling who gains access to the premises seems just beyond wrong.

I did want to mention that the strategies that have been revealed that China is using against the Uighurs—is it fair for me to say it is almost like slavery, massive monitoring, facial recognition, close control of communications, directed labor, a really horrific situation if you say here is freedom up here and here is what is going on with the Uighurs and China's treatment of the Uighurs?

Ms. LEHR. Well, it is actually like slavery in the sense that there is a significant problem with forced labor, and my initiative just put out a report on that. So in addition to widespread surveillance and social control, there are people actually being forced to work in significant numbers.

Senator MERKLEY. And significant. Give me a number on that. We are talking a lot of people.

Ms. LEHR. I mean, we are talking—it is hard to get exact numbers there. In the area of Kashgar, which is a Uighur dominated area, an official said the numbers that they said they wanted to put to work of these detainees would be like—I believe it was 20 percent of the Uighur population there. I mean, that would be over 100,000 people. And if you look at the whole area, this is hundreds of thousands of people.

Senator MERKLEY. There are sci-fi movies about extraordinary government control of people that are less scary than what China is doing there. So I hope we will continue to highlight that.

I am concerned that the conversation about trade with China and the interests, the economic conversation, has reduced our attention and amplification of this horrific situation. And I will just invite any of you to speak to that who would like to.

Ms. LEHR. I would just say generally there is more we can do and should be doing and that we really need to be engaging with Europe and other allies on this. It is not a problem we are going to solve on our own. It is a problem that I think does concern everyone. One thing I have heard repeatedly, going back to this topic of the U.N., is from Europeans that they are also concerned. They really feel like if the U.S. is there pushing at the table, including in the Human Rights Council, they are going to be able to do more to push. Like, China is manipulating the Human Rights Council and mechanisms to whitewash its record on Xinjiang. And so that would be, again, talking about why does it matter the U.S. is not present there. This is one of those reasons why having a lack of U.S. leadership there actually matters.

Now, I want to recognize the State Department has pulled together side events on Xinjiang around the General Assembly and has made efforts. So I do not want to discount those.

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Schaefer, did you have something you wanted to add to the topic?

Mr. SCHAEFER. Senator Merkley, I can actually give you some clarification on the NGO issue, if you would like.

Senator MERKLEY. Go ahead.

Mr. SCHAEFER. The Heritage Foundation is an accredited NGO at the United Nations. The process for accreditation goes through an NGO committee comprised of member states. That committee operates by consensus. China is usually a member of that committee. In that position, they frequently will challenge applications for NGOs to be accredited by the organization, questioning them, asking further clarification, delaying the process indefinitely. A lot of organizations give up at that point. That is one mechanism through which they block organizations from being accredited at the U.N.

Also, there is a quadrennial review of organizations. China and other countries will ask questions that delay the approval of that quadrennial report. It is every 4 years. Sometimes that final approval can be delayed all 4 years and then begin again with the next report. I speak from experience.

Senator MERKLEY. So, Mr. Schaefer, thank you for clarifying that. What can we do?

Mr. SCHAEFER. Very little. The organization defines its own rules. A change in the rules will require the member states to adopt those changes. The United States alone cannot force it. As with many different issues at the U.N., the member states are not friendly to NGOs. They are not friendly to transparency, and they are not interested in accountability or being challenged. They use their position as member states to block those organizations that they think might put them in awkward positions. You talk about China being influential. Part of China's influence is that a lot of member states share their perspective on these issues, and that is the key part of the problem.

Ms. Lehr mentioned that without the United States in Geneva, that the member states were unwilling to put a question directly or an application directly to the President of the Human Rights Council.

Ms. LEHR. It was a statement on the floor where someone would have had to read the statement.

Mr. SCHAEFER. And that is really the problem, is it not? Why will a single member state not step forward to assume that responsibility? Must the United States be the only country to do that? Is the United States the only country capable of doing that? No, absolutely not.

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you.

Senator YOUNG. I think we may have stumbled upon an answer actually. And perhaps Ms. Lehr gave us a window into it. I thought your recommendations were thoughtful, Ms. Lehr. But the one you most recently listed just moments ago was deeper engagement with Europe. I would expand that to include our G7 trading partners and allies. Maybe we go to the G20 if we want to include a more diverse array of countries and take a multilateral economic approach to apply pressure to the Chinese and actually develop a teased-out—what the ranking member and I have branded as a global economic security strategy so that we can bring China through the only thing they seem to understand, which is growing

their economy or not growing their economy—bringing them into a position of better behavior. And through that mechanism, I think we could apply pressure. It would be outside of the U.N. construct, but I bet their conduct within the U.N. would improve.

I would welcome the thoughts of any of the witnesses about that idea. Senator Merkley and I collaborated on that legislation. We have been joined by Senators Coons and Rubio.

Mr. YEO. I think that to the extent that the U.S. makes an effort to have systematic high-level dialogue with our key allies on human rights issues and understand how we are going to collectively respond to the human rights challenges posed by countries such as China, the U.N. is just one mechanism that we can work collectively on this.

I think the other suggestion I would make is we need to send our best diplomats to work in the multilateral context, and they need to be trained in multilateral diplomacy. And multilateral diplomacy is a unique bird in terms of understanding how you assemble coalitions behind the scenes to tackle important issues like human rights. So to the extent that we can actually incentivize the State Department to send our best diplomats to work in these settings and then train them well, it can have better outcomes on human rights issues.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you.

Ms. Lehr, do we have the economic clout and the convening power to improve China's behavior not just in the U.N. but more generally?

Ms. LEHR. Sir, first, I completely agree that the U.N. is not the only body that we would want to engage with to improve China's track record.

I do think the economic piece of it is important. It is a piece of the puzzle. And to your point, yes, we need to work with more than just Europe. We have other likeminded around the world, and we should be engaging with them consistently with a strategy.

Just one other piece I would add to that is that the letter I mentioned that was signed by so many countries saying how wonderful China's treatment of its Muslim minorities was signed by a lot of Muslim countries. And I believe we do not have an envoy right now to OIC, and that seems like a lost opportunity to at least try to not have that kind of positive language coming out of countries that you would think would be quite upset about what is going on.

I think the economic leverage—I mean, if we do not have it working with our allies, I do not know who does. So you got to start somewhere.

Senator YOUNG. Thank you.

Mr. Schaefer.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Thank you, Senator.

There are several different issues that you have raised here. One is raising the issue of multilateral negotiations to prominence within the State Department. In some of my papers, I actually suggested creating an under secretary for multilateral affairs to prominently position these issues. Currently the responsibility for international organizations and U.S. policy toward international organizations is spread throughout the U.S. Government over at the Health and Human Services Department, over at the Department

of Commerce, over at the Labor Department, in addition to the State Department. Different parts of the government have a piece of this puzzle. Sometimes in the interagency process an assistant secretary does not have the clout necessary to carry the day, and some of their negotiating partners are going to be at a higher level than they are. The unfortunate reality is that the international organizations bureau inside the State Department is somewhat of a redheaded stepchild. I think that elevating that bureau would elevate the prominence and the cohesion of U.S. policy formulation on international organizations across the U.S. Government. I think that is important because whether we like it or not, increasingly issues of importance to the United States are being addressed multilaterally rather than bilaterally. So that is one issue.

Second, yes, the economic engagement with China is a critical piece to this puzzle. China does not respond easily to moral suasion. I think that you need to be a little bit more direct in your confrontation with China to get it to change its behavior. It is unfortunate that many countries that the United States agrees with off the record, whether they are in Europe or Latin America or Africa or in Asia, are reluctant to speak publicly or take stances firmly inside the international organizations on the record. That is something that needs to be fixed.

And even though my fellow panelists may disagree with me, I think the U.S. withdrawal from the Human Rights Council has forced some of those countries to take stronger stands. For the first time European countries voted against agenda item 7 in the Human Rights Council, which is the anti-Israel agenda item in the Human Rights Council, instead of just abstaining on those resolutions. That is something they had not done before, and it is something that is a marked change in behavior from their past practice.

Thank you.

Senator YOUNG. Colleagues, fellow witnesses, feel free to disagree about the Human Rights Council. We have not had enough disagreement this go-around.

[Laughter.]

Senator YOUNG. Stir the pot a little bit.

Mr. YEO. I would just say that the work of the Human Rights Council has continued. And what has happened is you have seen important measures related to Yemen and North Korea and Syria being adopted in the Human Rights Council even though the U.S. is not a member of it.

The challenge is the U.N. Human Rights Council remains the preeminent global body in which not only countries in Europe but around the world look towards for standard-setting and statements related to human rights. And we are not participating.

Senator YOUNG. Cuba, China, Venezuela, they all had seats on the council. Venezuela was a member in 2015, and the council invited Maduro to speak at a special assembly and he got a standing "O."

Mr. YEO. There is absolutely no doubt about it that these membership rules for the U.N. Human Rights Council create a situation where there are countries on there that do not share our values. That said, all this important work is still happening. We should be participating in this work in the Human Rights Council, advancing

our interests as it relates to Venezuela and to Syria and to North Korea, as opposed to taking a walk and saying, well, we did not get everything we wanted, we are out. I think we need to stay engaged, try to get what we want, continue to push for reform because you are right. It does not make sense that human rights abusers are a member of the Human Rights Council. Let us fix it.

Senator YOUNG. Ms. Lehr, I will ask you quite provocatively before I allow Mr. Schaefer an opportunity to respond. Do we really want to reenter the Human Rights Council? 62 percent of the Human Rights Council members were not democracies, according to my most recent reading. Do we want to be part of that club?

Ms. LEHR. So I actually looked at the data because I do think it is obviously an imperfect body, and I think the U.S. has legitimate concerns about standing agenda items on Israel, the membership, et cetera.

So there is an organization called the Jacob Blaustein Institute that has actually sort of run the numbers on what happens with the U.S. is out of the council and when we are in. It is an organization founded by the American Jewish Committee.

And what they found was, for example, that country-specific resolutions that targeted Israel dropped from 50 percent of the resolutions to 20 percent when the U.S. was in. So there was a significant reduction. Our membership appears to have at least made things meaningfully better. The quality of the countries that we are able to get into the council was better—not good, but better.

I think the other piece is again just looking—so their research focuses in our prior concerns about the council. I think if you look at also the research being done on what is China doing in this council—and so these are new concerns. And what they are trying to do is change the nature of the human rights machinery at the U.N. Right now it is based on this idea that you do not get to just tell the U.N., if you are China, Saudi Arabia, Iran, we do not want you to talk about us. You cannot have any access. There is this idea of oversight by other member states, this collective oversight around human rights, especially around gross abuses.

China is trying to change that paradigm. They just started submitting resolutions in the Human Rights Council in 2017. This is new. And they are submitting multiple resolutions and amendments that, first of all, use terminology taken directly from Xi Jinping speeches like "win-win cooperation" and "mutual respect." It is a problem.

Senator YOUNG. All right, Ms. Lehr. So not a bad answer. But we can give Mr. Schaefer plenty of time for a wind-up and a response.

[Laughter.]

Senator YOUNG. So, look, Mr. Schaefer, you heard the counterarguments. I mean, is there really a viable alternative to the Human Rights Council? Is there any other multilateral fora that we could join to address these sorts of human rights issues?

Mr. SCHAEFER. There are some regional ones, as mentioned by the earlier panel, OAS. There is also the OSCE—I am sorry—the Organization for American States and the Organization for Security and Co-operation and in Europe.

But there is one other one. It is called the Third Committee of the U.N. General Assembly. It has membership of all U.N. member states. They pass resolutions condemning countries every single fall. There is no reason why that body could not convene every few months, in the spring, in the summer, and the other times—or operate continuously to discuss human rights problems.

Senator YOUNG. I wonder why that has not happened. Ambassador Haley went to great efforts to try and reform the Human Rights Council before we left, and that met with no success, which would seem to run against the grain of what the other witnesses——

Mr. SCHAEFER. Not to disparage our fine friend in Central Europe, but having it be in the Third Committee would result in eliminating the Human Rights Council and moving those resources out of Geneva. That is obviously of concern to Switzerland.

Senator YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. SCHAEFER. They want to maintain as many U.N. organizations there as they possibly can.

But the advantage of having it in the Third Committee is that every member state is present. Not every member state is present in Geneva.

Every fall, the Third Committee of the General Assembly receives a report from the Human Rights Council and approves it. It reviews it and approves it. So it is already engaged in these discussions and a lot of these issues before the Human Rights Council. There is no reason why that body could not assume the same responsibilities, hear the reports and hear the testimonies of the human rights experts, have the High Commissioner for Human Rights attend its sessions and provide information for that office as well. There is no reason why the Third Committee could not fulfill these responsibilities.

But I wanted to talk a little bit about the Human Rights Council. Ms. Lehr mentioned that the percentage of resolutions on Israel, condemnatory resolutions on Israel, went down as a percentage. I want to just say that the number of them has not declined. What has happened is that the U.N. Human Rights Council has passed more resolutions on other countries. Every year they pass the same number of resolutions on Israel over and over and over again. It is good that more countries with human rights problems are having Human Rights Council resolutions passed addressing their situations. But it is worth noting that there are a number of countries that are deliberately ignored: China, Cuba, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and other countries never have had a Human Rights Council resolution passed condemning their human rights practices despite ample evidence of them.

Senator YOUNG. Well, thank you, Mr. Schaefer. I know we could continue with this for a long period of time. I welcome continued dialogue with our offices on this really important matter.

I am going to turn it over to Mr. Merkley to ask a final pointed question on an issue that was brought up, and then we will stay on schedule and wrap up. Mr. Merkley?

Senator MERKLEY. So a few days ago, the *New York Times* published an article derived from 403 pages of internal documents from the Chinese Communist Party about how they treat the

Uighurs and Kazakhs. And they noted that based on that, in the Xinjiang area, a million ethnic Uighurs, Kazakhs, and others have been herded into interment camps. And they go on to note the absolute ruthlessness of this. And of course, a lot of this is directed to groups that are Muslims in China and are seen to the rest of China, the Chinese Government as a threat.

So I am still kind of wrestling with what I heard about the Organization for Islamic Cooperation. It has 57 members. 47 members are Muslim majority. And how is it that these Muslim majority countries are saying that China has an exemplary human rights record? I do not get that.

And you mentioned, Ms. Lehr, that we do not have an envoy. Is that because one has not been nominated or we have not confirmed the envoy?

I will just mention both those things because maybe that is something we can follow up on.

Ms. LEHR. So I will be honest and say I am not sure which reason it is. I just know that we do not have one, and I am happy to look into that and follow up with you.

But, yes, I am also concerned about how a number of Muslim countries could come out with a statement like that. And clearly there is an opportunity for us to try to shift that conversation.

RESPONSE RECEIVED FROM AMY K. LEHR TO THE TAKE-BACK QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JEFF MERKLEY

Question. Why there is no special envoy to the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)?

Answer. Secretary Tillerson thought that it would be more efficient to consolidate the position into the role of the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom. He eliminated a number of special envoy positions. Notably, some were not eliminated because Congress had mandated their existence.

Senator MERKLEY. I think it shows—I have to wrap up because I am on the clock, and I am getting kicked under the desk here.

I think it suggests a massive growing influence of China in the world and why it is good we held this hearing. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for doing so. I think we have to keep pondering the dynamics in this world in which I see a Chinese kind of ruthless strategy gaining ground, and we have a lot of work to do. Thank you.

Senator YOUNG. Well, thank you, Mr. Merkley, for your friendship, your comity, and your brevity.

And thank you to all of our witnesses today for their statements and for their willingness to engage in what has been I believe a constructive dialogue.

I will again call members' attention to the fact that the record will remain open until the close of business on Friday, including for members to submit questions for the record.

Thank you to the members of the subcommittee, especially to the ranking member once again, and thank you all to our witnesses.

So this hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:33 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSE OF JONATHAN MOORE TO QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TODD YOUNG

*Question.*One way for the United States to ensure its priorities and values are reflected internationally is to place American citizens in high-level positions within the United Nations system:

What is the International Organizations Bureau doing to place Americans in senior positions? What policies or practices are preventing the placement of more American citizens within the U.N.?

Answer. The United States is dedicated to ensuring our values and interests are represented throughout the United Nations system, and to supporting reform efforts that improve transparency, efficiency and accountability.

The Bureau of International Organization Affairs maintains an American Citizens unit which actively encourages qualified Americans to apply for relevant positions and advocates for the employment of Americans in international organizations. That unit has created a public website (iocareers.state.gov) to make the process of seeking and applying for U.N. jobs more transparent to American citizens. We have scored a number of recent successes, including securing senior positions for distinguished Americans at the Pan American Health Organization, the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism, and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

○