

**UNITED STATES STANDING IN INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND GLOBAL CORPORATE SO-
CIAL IMPACT

OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————
MARCH 23, 2021
—————

Serial No. 117-18

—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

43-786PDF

WASHINGTON : 2021

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York, *Chairman*

BRAD SHERMAN, California	MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas, <i>Ranking Member</i>
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey	CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia	STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida	SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
KAREN BASS, California	DARRELL ISSA, California
WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts	ADAM KINZINGER, Illinois
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island	LEE ZELDIN, New York
AMI BERA, California	ANN WAGNER, Missouri
JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas	BRIAN MAST, Florida
DINA TITUS, Nevada	BRIAN FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania
TED LIEU, California	KEN BUCK, Colorado
SUSAN WILD, Pennsylvania	TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee
DEAN PHILLIPS, Minnesota	MARK GREEN, Tennessee
ILHAN OMAR, Minnesota	ANDY BARR, Kentucky
COLIN ALLRED, Texas	GREG STEUBE, Florida
ANDY LEVIN, Michigan	DAN MEUSER, Pennsylvania
ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, Virginia	AUGUST PFLUGER, Texas
CHRISSEY HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania	PETER MEIJER, Michigan
TOM MALINOWSKI, New Jersey	NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS, New York
ANDY KIM, New Jersey	RONNY JACKSON, Texas
SARA JACOBS, California	YOUNG KIM, California
KATHY MANNING, North Carolina	MARIA ELVIRA SALAZAR, Florida
JIM COSTA, California	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
JUAN VARGAS, California	RON WRIGHT, Texas
VICENTE GONZALEZ, Texas	
BRAD SCHNEIDER, Illinois	

JASON STEINBAUM, *Staff Director*

BRENDAN SHIELDS, *Republican Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
AND GLOBAL CORPORATE SOCIAL IMPACT

JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas, *Chairman*

SARA JACOBS, California	NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS, New York, <i>Ranking Member</i>
BRAD SHERMAN, California	CHRISTOPHER SMITH, New Jersey
ILHAN OMAR, Minnesota	DARRELL ISSA, California
CHRISSEY HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania	LEE ZELDIN, New York
ANDY KIM, New Jersey	

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESSES	
Otero, The Honorable Maria, Former Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, Department of State	7
Hannum, Jordie, Executive Director, Better World Campaign	15
McDougall, Gay J., Senior Fellow and Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence, Leitner Center for International Law and Justice/Center for Race, Law, and Justice, Fordham University School of Law	25
Dugan, Hugh, Former Senior Director for International Organization Affairs at the National Security Council	31
APPENDIX	
Hearing Notice	57
Hearing Minutes	59
Hearing Attendance	60

UNITED STATES STANDING IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Tuesday, March 23, 2021

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GLOBAL
CORPORATE SOCIAL IMPACT,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:02 a.m., via Webex, Hon. Joaquin Castro (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. CASTRO. The Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations and Global Corporate Social Impact will come to order.

Good morning, everyone. It is great to see all of our witnesses and our members here. Thank you to our witnesses for being here today for this hearing entitled, quote, “United States Standing in International Organizations.”

Without objection, the chair is authorized to declare a recess of the committee at any point, and all members will have 5 days to submit statements, extraneous material, and questions for the record that are subject to the length limitation in the rules. To insert something into the record, please have your staff email the previously mentioned address or contact our full committee staff.

Please keep your video function on at all times, even when you are not recognized by the chair. Members are responsible for muting and unmuting themselves, and please remember to mute yourself after you finish speaking. Consistent with remote committee proceedings of H.Res.8, staff will only mute members and witnesses, as appropriate, when they are not under recognition to eliminate background noise.

I see that we have a quorum and will now recognize myself for opening remarks.

Today we will examine America’s standing in international organizations. This includes, first and foremost, the United Nations. It also includes others, like the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and regional organizations, like the Organization for American States and the Inter-American Development Bank, and other key multilateral institutions.

These institutions’ very existence are an American accomplishment, an enduring legacy of the international order that American policymakers built out of the ashes of World War II and hope might prevent another destructive conflict.

While the world has changed immensely since 1945, let us recognize that the U.N. and other international organizations have suc-

ceeded in their primary goal of avoiding a direct conflict between major powers. For 40 years, instead of fighting the Soviet Union in the North Atlantic for the Fulda Gap, we battled them in international organizations and the eyes of the world opinion. Crucially, the United States ultimately prevailed.

Today it seems too many of us take for granted that the cold war did not turn hot, and policymakers have too often failed to communicate the importance of international organizations to maintaining peace around the world. Ironically, it has been the very success of international organizations that has allowed some to doubt their value.

This attitude culminated with the Trump Administration. Former President Trump's hostility toward multilateralism, international organizations, and even many of our allies, is well-known and has had dire consequences for United States leadership.

At the heart of our hearing today will be this question. How can our Nation recover its standing in international organizations after 4 years of unprecedented damage? The task of doing so is more essential than ever. From the COVID-19 pandemic and climate change to migration and the refugee crisis, the challenges our Nation faces are global and will require global solutions.

Former Defense Secretary Jim Mattis said about NATO, quote, "If we did not have NATO today, we would need to create it." The same can be said about the United Nations and other international organizations. If we did not have the U.N. today, we would need to create it.

In this chaotic and challenging global moment, international organizations must be part of our approach. This is not to downplay the real flaws that many international organizations have. It is no secret that the very institutions which help define human rights have members who abuse them and are working to redefine the term "human rights" to meet their own ends.

The actions of China and Russia have too often prevented the U.N. Security Council from being an effective body in addressing atrocities around the world, as we have seen again and again in Syria. These are real concerns with the United Nations and other international organizations, with Democrats and Republicans both making these arguments. Yet the solution cannot be for American to abandon them and cede control of them to our adversaries.

As with the cold war, the new era where the United States finds itself competing with China and Russia for influence makes international organizations a first order issue.

We must redouble our engagement and commitment to leadership. Wherever important global issues are being decided, America must have a seat at the table. Similarly, the United States must take up the battle of ideas in a court of global opinion.

I commend President Biden for beginning that work, rejoining the World Health Organization and restoring funding to key U.N. agencies are crucial, commonsense moves that will increase American influence around the world.

We here in Congress must continue that work and build a stronger foundation for American participation in international organizations. The stakes are simply too high for us to fail.

With that, Ranking Member Malliotakis, please go ahead with your opening remarks.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Thank you, Chairman Castro, for calling this important hearing. I look forward to working with you and the rest of the committee members to conduct important oversight of our engagement with the United Nations and other international organizations.

The creation of the subcommittee comes at a pivotal time. In recent years, we have seen the post-World War II international order challenged, as countries like China and Russia seek to rewrite the rules in ways that advance their nationalistic agendas and undermine State sovereignty in places like Ukraine and South China Sea.

At times, there have been voices advocating for withdrawal of the United States from the international stage. I can certainly understand their frustration with the abuse of the United Nations system by malign actors.

As we saw in the early stages of COVID-19, international organizations are not perfect. The World Health Organization routinely parroted Chinese Communist Party talking points that conflict with statements made by our own experts. The WHO's medical advice during the pandemic has routinely lagged behind scientific consensus.

As an example, the WHO did not recommend the use of masks for the general public until June 5, 2020, 137 days after finally confirming that COVID-19 was spreading via human-to-human transmission. In comparison, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention here in the United States recommended masks in early April of last year.

Despite widespread evidence of the CCP suppressing the genomic sequence of the virus that causes COVID-19, arresting doctors and journalists and censoring social media discussions of the outbreak within China, Director General Tedros praised the CCP for its transparency and setting a new standard for outbreak response.

The WHO's embrace of CCP propaganda directly impacted how Americans view the virus. Lawrence Gostin, a professor of global health law at Georgetown University, who also provides technical assistance to the WHO said, "We were deceived. Myself and other public health experts, based on what the World Health Organization and China were saying, reassured the public that this was not serious, that we could bring this under control. We were given a false sense of assurance."

However, I do not believe the correct response to these missteps by the WHO is the United States to withdraw. The United Nations, and international organizations more broadly, are not perfect. They are consensus bodies that reflect the countries who engage with them. As such, I believe the only way the United States can push back against the behavior and fight for true reform is by having a seat at the table.

At the same time, the U.S. engagement should be tempered and clear-eyed. Recently, President Biden announced that the United States will be rejoining the U.N. Human Rights Council and running for a seat on the Council this fall.

The U.N. Human Rights Council is a deeply flawed body, with a terrible track record of protecting dictatorship and despots and covering up the crimes of the world's worst human rights abusers.

Current members of the Council include China, who is actively engaged in carrying out genocide against religious and ethnic minorities in Xinjiang; Russia, who has carried out nerve agent attacks on political opposition leaders, like Alexei Navalny; and Venezuela, when Maduro-backed forces have killed more than 20,000 people for resistance to authority; and even countries like Cuba that have a horrible record, decades of oppression of its own people.

Despite this, the Council has focused its efforts on persecuting Israel, the only country permanently featured on the Council's agenda as its own item. I appreciated that Secretary Blinken raised some of these issues publicly when he addressed the Council last month. However, I believe reforms to address these issues should be a prerequisite for the U.S. seeking election to the Council, not a hopeful goal left to be achieved some time in the future.

When the United States engages with the United Nations, its agencies, or other international organizations, we bring not only our values but also our financial contributions. The U.S. accounts for roughly one-quarter of both the regular and peacekeeping budgets of the U.N.

Chairman Castro, I look forward to working with you to conduct rigorous oversight on U.S. engagement with the United Nations and other international organizations. We must be at the table, but we have a duty to the American taxpayer to ensure that our engagement with IOs is targeted, strategic, and maximizes the positive impact of the United States abroad.

Again, I look forward to working with you and thank the witnesses for being here.

Mr. CASTRO. [Speaking off microphone] First, the Honorable Maria Otero, former Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, and I will also note a Latina trailblazer in American foreign policy, who was the first Latina under secretary at the State Department.

Mr. Jordie Hannum, Executive Director of the Better World Campaign and a strong advocate for America's key role in the United Nations.

Next we have Ms. Gay J. McDougall, a Senior Fellow and Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence at the Leitner Center for International Law and Justice, as well as the Center for Race, Law, and Justice at Fordham University School of Law, as well as the former vice chairperson of the U.N. Committee of the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

And, finally, Mr. Hugh Dugan, the former Senior Director for International Organization Affairs at the National Security Council, who was deeply involved in setting U.S. policy on issues during the last Administration, the Trump Administration.

I want to thank each of you for being with us today to share your expertise and wisdom, and I will now recognize each of the witnesses for 5 minutes. And without objection, your prepared written statements will be made part of the record.

And I will first call on Ms. Otero for her testimony. Ms. Otero, you have 5 minutes.

**STATEMENT OF MARIA OTERO, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY
OF STATE FOR CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, AND
HUMAN RIGHTS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

Ms. OTERO. Thank you, Chairman Castro, and members of the committee. I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today in this very important subcommittee on the issue of international organizations.

I believe that to protect American prosperity, security, and health, to promote our values around the world, and guard our national security, we must pursue mutually beneficial partnerships with nations. And one way is through the multilateral organizations.

Let me suggest three categories of multilaterals. Those focused on development in which member countries make contributions and are part of their governance. The World Bank and regional banks are an example. Those focused on the most vulnerable and exposed—refugees, populations in conflict areas, people that are trafficked, human rights defenders, women, and children. Many United Nations organizations fall into this category. And those whose member countries vote on specific issues, such as the Human Rights Council and the Organization of American States.

My testimony focuses on the first category. Development of multilaterals support economic growth, a foundational goal. In other countries, as at home, prosperity is the bedrock on which all other strengths depend. Multilaterals help countries grow their economies and invest in the well-being of their people. More prosperous, stable, better-run societies are less likely to fray and either export their problems outward or create persistent challenges for our country.

Development of multilaterals offers several comparative advantages. First, they invest in the private sectors, and they fortify free market economies. Their structure facilitates their deep engagement with the private sector. Your financial arms—the IFC and the World Bank, IDBInvest, and the Inter-American Development Bank—channel billions of dollars in investment loans and guarantees to the private sector.

Second, they leverage resources. In addition to members' contributions, multilaterals access billions of dollars on the global capital markets, which allow them to punch above their weight. Even the World Bank's IDA, which provides interest-free loans and grants to the poorest countries, issued its first IDA bond in 2017 and is raising billions of dollars from the capital markets to increase the funds going to the poorest countries.

Growing these private sectors is firmly in line with our own interests. Our absence or lukewarm participation in multilateral organizations attracts other countries to fill that space. China has moved aggressively to provide long-term capital and uses its Belt and Road Initiative to increase its influence and to grow trade. When the U.S. pulls back, China cheers.

Third, social inequity is a priority for multilaterals. Creating opportunities for skills and jobs for the least advantaged, including women, improves their well-being and keeps them from seeking a better life outside their countries. I note that migration to our border comes from the poorest, the most fragile countries in Central

America, which offer very few opportunities, a situation which is aggravated by the region's violence and corruption.

And, finally, multilaterals focus on urgent global issues and seek global solutions. Today's acute and pressing challenges are the COVID pandemic and climate change. The U.S. can be part of a global response, as we have been in the past.

In closing, let me just draw briefly from my professional experience with multilaterals to illustrate their role. Tiny businesses known as microenterprises predominate in developing countries—women selling vegetables and street food, carpenters, shoemakers, metalworkers, fashioning their products with rudimentary tools and on their dirt floor workshops.

These entrepreneurs need working capital for their business, but lacking collateral, they do not have access to bank loans. Loan sharks lend them 5 in the morning and collect 6 in the evening. In the 1980's and 1990's, my organization, ACCION, and others experimented with making microenterprise loans and getting them repaid.

We faced two challenges: meeting the high demand for capital among the poor and covering our costs of lending. We needed a sustainable model. We tested these innovations in several countries, and our efforts required financial support. Developing the right model took time.

For more than 10 years, the Inter-American Development Bank provided ACCION with grants and soft loans, which allowed these transformative experiments in Latin America to reach fruition. Today, with IDB support—and let me say with USAID support as well—we have built commercial microfinance banks around the world that make millions of loans to businesses, including women, and provide a safe place for people to keep their small savings.

These banks finance their activities, as banks normally do, without one penny of donor money. I sit on the board of BancoSol, a microfinance bank in Bolivia, which today has over one million clients—borrowers and savers—in a country of 11 million people. Women in bowler hats and traditional indigenous dress enter through the bank's front door with confidence and dignity and with a Smartphone in hand.

Their increased income improves their lives, livelihood, and educates their children. The multilaterals have the tools, the patience, and the vision to contribute to this type of success.

Our active participation in multilaterals not only aligns with our highest values but also with our national interest. Standing by our funding commitments gives us a strong voice in allocating their considerable resources and in improving the quality of their performance.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Otero follows:]

Prepared Testimony of María Otero
Former Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights
Submitted to the U.S. House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Development,
International Organizations and Global Corporate Social Impact
“United States Standing in International Organizations”

March 23, 2021

Members of the Subcommittee:

I am honored to present this testimony on the importance of international organizations and the U.S. role in them.

I am a former Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, in which capacity I oversaw U.S. foreign relations on issues ranging from democracy and human rights to citizen security, including humanitarian and refugee assistance, organized crime, trafficking in persons, violent extremism and countries in conflict, serving from 2009 until February 2013. It was my privilege to be the first Latina Under Secretary in the State Department’s history, and at the time I left the Department, I was its highest-ranking Hispanic official. Before joining State, I was President and CEO of ACCION International, a pioneer organization in the field of development, specifically in microfinance. I have worked for USAID in its Women in Development office, and I have served on various boards, including the U.S. Institute of Peace (Vice Chair) and the Inter-American Foundation (Chair)—both Senate-confirmed presidential appointments—the Calvert Foundation, Oxfam America, Bread for the World, and BRAC in Bangladesh. I am a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The subject of this hearing is the standing of the US in international organizations and the corresponding question of our country’s level of engagement with them. Let me first take a step back and assert the importance of international engagement broadly. As a nation, we engage with the rest of the world—in particular, we promote international development in the form of peace, prosperity, health, and well-being—not only because it aligns with our highest values, but also because it aligns with our national interest. Simply put, when our neighbors enjoy the fruits of peace and prosperity, we are more likely to do so, too. And as we have been reminded all too forcefully over the past year, in the ultra-connected small world of the 21st century, that neighborhood can be as nearby as our southern border or as far away as Wuhan, China, the forests of west Africa, or wherever the next “spillover” event may occur.

America must always be strong, militarily and otherwise. But the idea of “Fortress America” withdrawn in isolation behind its land borders is outdated and untenable in the era of global travel, digital technology, international trade and commerce, multinational supply chains, transnational crime organizations, virulent pandemics, and planetary climate change. To protect America’s prosperity, security, and health—and yes, to promote our values around the

world, which is its own form of national security—we must pursue mutually beneficial partnerships with nations - and one way is through multilateral institutions.

The leading edge of America’s engagement overseas has always been its bilateral, state-to-state diplomacy and development assistance, the latter implemented through agencies such as USAID, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), and the U.S. Development Finance Corporation. These agencies implement programs to support the development objectives of our bilateral partners, and in doing so seek to win their appreciation and trust as we cooperate toward mutually beneficial aims. Our agencies also design their own development strategies, giving priority to health, food security, climate change, humanitarian aid and promotion of our democratic values. We work in areas of conflict, violent extremism and natural disasters. We use a range of tools – grants, contracts, loans, debt financing, equity investment, guarantees and others- to deploy our resources. We channel our bilateral assistance through each country’s public, private and civil society sectors, and we use development contractors, non-profit organizations and public-private partnerships to deliver our targeted assistance.

Our engagement in international development spans a continuum that begins with bilateral assistance and proceeds to our engagement in multilateral organizations. Multilateral organizations are varied and wide ranging in their objectives and structures and while they share much in common, I would suggest three categories to organize my testimony:

- 1) Multilateral organizations that focus on development, in which members hold a governance position, and in which the voting power is commensurate with the capital subscribed by each member. Regional banks such as the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the World Bank are examples.
- 2) Multilateral organizations that focus on the most vulnerable, exposed populations such as refugees, populations in conflict areas, persons trafficked, human rights defenders, women and children. Many United Nations organizations fall into this category. The U.S. makes an important contribution to this important work.
- 3) Multilateral organizations in which we participate as members, help set the agenda, vote on issues presented, and make a monetary contribution. Examples are the Human Rights Council (HRC), the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR).

Let me focus this testimony on the first category. These multilateral organizations complement and expand our bilateral work. While their efforts are necessarily wide-ranging, let us start with their support for economic growth. Economic development assistance is foundational because in overseas countries, as at home, prosperity is the bedrock on which all other strengths depend. And crucially, prosperity on the international stage is not a zero-sum game. We invest in programs that enable foreign countries to grow their economies and invest in the well-being of their people. And these programs *work*. As Brookings economist Steve Radelet summarizes in a comprehensive review of the literature on this topic, [“recent research concludes that aid supports growth.”](#) Put simply, more prosperous, more stable, better-run societies are less likely to fray and either export their problems outward or create significant challenges for us as we are witnessing at the southern border today.

Our engagement and full funding of multilateral organizations enables us to reap from the comparative advantages they provide:

Support to the Private Sector

Multilateral organizations focus on supporting and working with each country's private sector. They help build more competitive industries, promote businesses innovation and improve financial and productive capacity. Growing the private sector creates jobs and fortifies the free market economy in these countries. Because small and medium enterprises predominate in many countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa, these multilateral organizations have developed tools and financial instruments to support their growth. Their successful work in developing microfinance lending and financial inclusion attests to their capacity.

Multilaterals have structured themselves to facilitate their outreach to the private sector. For example, the World Bank's International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the IDB's financial arm, IDBInvest, make equity investments, and provide loans and guarantees to businesses, many of which are not able to access capital from the international markets. They also provide technical assistance to strengthen an industry - energy, agriculture, transport, technology and others - and to expand their respective export capacity. In 2020, the IFC invested \$22 billion in the private sector around the world, in spite of the challenges presented by COVID-19. IDBInvest manages over \$12 billion in assets in over 340 projects comprised of investments and loans. Additionally, the IDB's third arm, IDB Lab, also known as the Multilateral Investment Fund (MIF), focuses on supporting pilot business models and helping scale up new industries. Because the regional multilaterals organizations know their regions thoroughly, they are able to customize financial solutions.

Growing the private sector in developing countries is an objective firmly in line with our interests. Our solid engagement in development multilateral organizations opens doors for our own interaction with growing industries and enhances improved relationships with U.S. companies. Our absence or lukewarm involvement in multilateral organizations only attracts other countries to fill the space. China in particular has moved aggressively to become a major source of long-term capital. Through its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), its flagship foreign infrastructure and investment program, and its investment in sectors ranging from transport, energy and mobility, China seeks to increase its political and economic influence, grow trade and align industries in developing countries to its priorities. China cheers when the U.S. pulls back.

In an America where more than 1 in 5 jobs are tied to international trade, and 1 in 3 manufacturing jobs are tied to U.S. exports these arguments hit home. Most of the world's fastest-rising economies are in the developing world. PwC's latest [World in 2050](#) report projects Vietnam, Nigeria, and the Philippines as the fastest rising economies—all partners in U.S. assistance programs and supported by multilateral organizations.

Leverage Resources

Our engagement with multilateral organizations allows us to take advantage of the resources made available by all their members. Because our contribution to these organizations is considerable, often the largest, our voting power is strong, and allows us to help direct these resources in a way that supports our own priorities and objectives. This effort complements strongly our own bilateral support and cuts across all development activities.

Additionally, multilateral institutions leverage resources from the global capital markets, especially for debt financing, which increases their influence and ability to punch above their weight. Of the \$22 billion mentioned above that was invested by the World Bank's IFC in 2020, over \$10 billion were mobilized from other investors. This practice, implemented by all multilateral organizations, is of growing importance in their ability to leverage funds, and can only be enhanced by the active and strong membership of the U.S.

Address Social Inequality

Among the most urgent challenges the world must tackle is the growing inequality within societies, especially in developing countries. COVID-19 has exacerbated the level of extreme poverty globally, as you have heard repeatedly in this subcommittee. Social protests and turbulence in many countries have at their core the demand for jobs, equal opportunity, improved wages and investment in human capital. Multilateral organizations focus their programs to promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, to address the needs of women and other vulnerable populations, to promote financial and digital inclusion among the poorer sectors, and to put in place various modalities for provision of social services.

Helping create equal and sustainable societies is not only the morally right thing to do, it is also the way in which inclusive societies offer opportunities for skills and jobs to the least advantaged who, lacking access to an improved life, seek it outside their countries. I note that migration to our border comes from the countries that are most fragile, violent and corrupt in the region. Multilaterals organizations work with governments and other partners to address these very complex and difficult issues. The World Bank's IDA, for example, through its interest free loans and grants reaches the poorest countries, mostly in Africa. It is worth noting that the first IDA bond, issued in 2017, raised funds from the capital markets to complement its traditional donor funding, thereby increasing resources for poorest countries and demonstrating IDA's leverage potential.

Focus on Urgent Global Issues

Two particularly acute and pressing collective challenges stand out to me today: the coronavirus pandemic and global climate change.

Let's take just the former. The COVID-19 pandemic has been a catastrophe in so many ways. Looking at it solely from the economic perspective, Harvard experts estimate [the disease will cost our own nation \\$16 trillion](#), even if it is brought under control by the fall. But that is a very big "if." Because the stark reality is that until every country is safe, none of us is safe. To the

extent that we leave unvaccinated countries unprotected, we are leaving the door wide open for proliferation of coronavirus variants that may, if unchecked, undo much of the progress our vaccination programs make possible in richer nations.

Solving that problem will be made easier by a common understanding of the problem; global agreements on resource sharing motivated by enlightened self-interest, such as COVAX; and targeted technical assistance in places where health systems capacity, improved governance, and other attributes essential to the vaccination mission are lacking. The United States can be a big part of that global solution, as we have been in the past. But we cannot do it alone.

Additional Considerations

Multilateral assistance is not an alternative to bilateral programming, but an essential complement to it, enabling us to amplify our impact on issues of strategic importance to the United States, including long-term problems and more immediate transnational concerns such as pandemic preparedness and climate change. Since voting power in these institutions is often determined by member countries' level of financial buy-in - or in the case of multilateral development banks, by the amount of capital contributed - as presented in a report on MDBs by the Congressional Research Service, the United States has historically held considerable [sway over multilateral institutions' entire funding streams](#), enabling us to direct support to U.S. development priorities.

For example, Congress has enacted into law directives that ensure the U.S. Executive Directors at multilateral development banks oppose loans to countries whose governments violate internationally recognized human rights (such as Myanmar), or support international terrorism, or fail to cooperate in the suppression of illegal drug trafficking or trafficking in persons. Needless to say, we need to be at the table to exert this influence.

Chinese nationals now lead four of the 15 UN Specialized Agencies—far more than any other country. And in 2020, China campaigned for one of its nationals to lead the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), thwarted only at the last minute [by U.S. and European diplomacy](#). China is directly [leveraging its Belt and Road Initiative](#) (BRI) investments - [estimated to reach \\$1.2 trillion by 2027](#) - to win support in multilateral institutions; it linked its BRI economic and development commitments for Uganda and Cameroon, for example, to their support of its WIPO candidate. If the United States plays a diminished role in these institutions, rival powers will continue to press the advantage to shift world order in their favor and undermine democratic norms and desired diplomatic outcomes.

That said, there are opportunities for improvement in the multilateral system. As the Honorable Bonnie Glick testified before this committee last week, understanding the comparative advantage of a given multilateral institution and steering it to focus on that “lane” is an important starting point. Improving their bureaucracy to make them nimbler and more efficient continues to be a challenge.

Both Congress and the Administration have roles to play. Congress can and has passed legislation to incentivize multilateral reform. The FY2010 Consolidated Appropriations Act, for example, [stipulated](#) that 10 percent of funds appropriated to the Asian Development Fund would be withheld until the Treasury Secretary verified that the Asian Development Bank advanced reforms aimed at combating corruption. Similar “payment by results” conditions are [applied by the United Kingdom](#) in its contributions to UN humanitarian agencies, so that Great Britain made as much as 30 percent of its core multilateral funding conditional on progress against reform commitments. And while it is commendable that the U.S. Treasury Department reports annually to Congress on multilateral activities, such as actions taken by recipient countries to strengthen governance, the Administration could go further to conduct reviews of multilateral institutions’ efficiency and effectiveness, with condition that it be evidence-based and uses peer reviewed research. Both the United Kingdom and Australia have conducted such multilateral aid reviews.

There is obviously much more to be said on the importance of international engagement, international development, and the role multilateral organizations can play in advancing U.S. priorities. I look forward to the Committee’s discussion of this topic. Let me close here by observing the particular virtue of multilateral organizations lies in giving us a forum to address problems that require collective action and collective resources.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Ms. Otero, for your testimony.

I will now call on Mr. Hannum for his testimony, please. It looks like you are still muted there, Mr. Hannum. Yes. I get confused by switching—there you go.

**STATEMENT OF JORDIE HANNUM, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
BETTER WORLD CAMPAIGN**

Mr. HANNUM. There we go. You would think a year in I would have it down. Sorry.

But anyway, thank you, Chairman Castro, Ranking Member Malliotakis, and members of the subcommittee, for allowing me the opportunity to testify today.

I work with the Better World Campaign, the advocacy arm of the United Nations Foundation, and I will use my time this morning to explain how U.S. standing in international organizations has suffered over the last 4 years, and why engagement and funding for the U.N. is in our country's best interest.

Let me frame this conversation around the four Cs—credibility, competition, cooperation, COVID-19. For the first C, in President Biden's maiden foreign policy speech, he spoke of renewing our role in global institutions and reclaiming our credibility and moral authority. Over the last 4 years, the U.S. downgraded its engagement with the U.N. system in several ways. This included underfunding, defending, or outright withdrawing from U.N. agencies and activities.

Of particular concern, we currently owe more than \$1 billion for U.N. peacekeeping, which means we are underfunding troop-contributing countries like Bangladesh, Ghana, and Indonesia. These arrears have accrued over just the last 4 years.

During her Senate confirmation hearing, Ambassador Linda Thomas-Greenfield stated, and I quote, "We need to pay our bills to have a seat at the table, and we need to make sure that we are there to push back on those who would have malign intentions at the U.N." And certainly for many "malign intentions" refer to China and Russia's actions.

The reality is that both countries have used our massive arrears, our planned withdrawal from the WHO and Paris agreement, to say that we are not interested in helping countries solve the complex transnational challenges that confront us all. These actions have contributed to the reputation of the United States plummeting to its lowest point in 20 years.

With respect to China, even though its own record is checkered to say the least, because they are investing more resources at the United Nations, engaging in U.N. bodies, active and bilateral developments for initiatives like Belt and Road, their influence is rising in multilateral organizations. There has not been a takeover by any stretch, but our prior absence meant there was no effective counterweight.

In fact, the Trump Administration itself realized that its approach of withdrawal and withholding was not working when it appointed a special envoy to counter China's growing influence within international bodies. But it will take more than one person to fix the problem.

In short, the opposite of withdrawal and withhold is engage and invest. This means no longer playing chess—no longer playing checkers while they play chess, i.e., we should increase support for the State Department and USAID, continue to rejoin key U.N. bodies that we walked away from, and it means paying our dues on time and paying back our arrears, because if China and Russia are really the greatest threat to America today, as many members of this committee have stated, then our approach should follow suit and we should counter them on every playing field that exists and marshal available resources.

Of course, countering Russia and China at the U.N. would be most effective if the organization is fit for purpose. As former Secretary of State and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Madeleine Albright noted, and I quote, “The failure to pay our old U.N. bills undermines our ability to recruit allies with the kind of structural reform that Congress demands.”

For example, in 2013, when we were in good standing, the U.S. worked with the U.N. and allies to create the Human Rights up Front Initiative to ensure that all U.N. entities were prioritizing human rights in their field operations. It is one reason why the U.N. mobilized so quickly to protect civilians in South Sudan after the civil war broke out.

But, in 2018, China and Russia successfully lobbied a range of other countries to disband the initiative, using our absence and U.S. budget cuts as a pretext. How is that in our interest to have it eliminated?

Alternatively, we have seen the positive results when we work in collaboration with the United Nations, both in terms of management reform and in terms of realizing results on the ground. For example, in October, the U.N. World Food Programme, headed by former South Carolina Governor David Beasley, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, which I might add was the twelfth time a U.N. entity has received the prestigious prize.

Of course, the U.S. is the most generous donor to WFP, but our contributions are also leveraged by other nations to tremendous effect. Cooperation will also be key in combating COVID-19. This can only be done in partnership with the international community and entities like the World Food Programme and World Health organization.

As it stands, the WHO is at the center of a global cooperative effort to distribute COVID-19 vaccines equitably worldwide, which research has shown would, besides the global health and humanitarian rationale, benefit the U.S. economically more than any other nation. As more vaccines become available, most of humanity will get it through efforts backed by the WHO and international partners. This is what will ultimately end the pandemic, and this is why investing in the U.N. is so essential.

Thank you for your time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hannum follows:]

Testimony of Jordie Hannum
Executive Director, Better World Campaign
House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global
Corporate Social Impact
“United States Standing in International Organizations”
March 23, 2021

Chairman Castro, Ranking Member Malliotakis, Members of the Subcommittee—thank you for the opportunity to testify today about America’s standing in international organizations. I’m Jordie Hannum, Executive Director of the Better World Campaign, an organization whose mission is to support a strong and constructive U.S.-UN relationship by educating policymakers about the importance of the UN’s work and how it advances U.S. interests.

Nearly 76 years ago, in the wake of the deadliest and most destructive conflict the world has ever witnessed, the United States and 49 other countries came together to establish the United Nations. Tasked with preventing and suppressing threats to international peace and security, encouraging respect for human rights, and facilitating cooperation on a broad suite of international economic, social, and humanitarian issues, the UN became a core component of the international order that the U.S. helped build and lead after World War II. And while the world has changed significantly since 1945, the UN’s role as a force-multiplier for the U.S.—a key mechanism for multilateral diplomacy to mitigate conflict, as well as for marshalling the necessary resources and political will to address challenges that no country can resolve alone—remains as vital as ever.

To frame this conversation on U.S. standing at the UN and the importance of U.S. engagement, I believe it would be helpful to talk about the U.S.-UN relationship in terms of what I call the 4 C’s: Cooperation, COVID, Credibility, and Competition.

- **Cooperation:** As noted above, no country, no matter how large or powerful, can hope to resolve the world’s problems alone. We need alliances, partnerships, and burden-sharing arrangements like the UN to accomplish that. The importance of these types of force-multipliers was recently expounded upon by Secretary of State Antony Blinken and Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin in an op-ed for *The Washington Post*. In it they write that through such arrangements: “We’re able to achieve far more...than we could without them. No country on Earth has a network of alliances and partnerships like ours. It would be a huge strategic error to neglect these relationships. And it’s a wise use of our time and resources to adapt and renew them, to ensure they’re as strong and effective as they can be.”
- **COVID:** This is particularly salient when we talk about the COVID-19 pandemic. The last year has demonstrated that a disease outbreak in one country can spread rapidly beyond its origin point, becoming a threat to the health, prosperity, and well-being of every person on the planet. Addressing these issues requires engagement with international standard-setting bodies like the World Health Organization (WHO), which has been working from the outset to provide vital equipment and testing supplies to countries with weak health systems; develop and disseminate technical guidance for preventing the spread of COVID-19; supporting international efforts to research therapeutics; and create a mechanism for distributing vaccines equitably to end the pandemic once and for all.

Unfortunately, the UN’s ability to act as a force-multiplier is jeopardized when we fail to meet our commitments to the organization. The last four years have witnessed a dramatic and troubling erosion of U.S. engagement with the UN: we have pulled out of key UN bodies and agreements that have been working to advance our interests, while

simultaneously racking up more than \$1.1 billion in peacekeeping arrears alone. These policies have negatively impacted our ability to resume a leadership position on the global stage.

- **Credibility:** When we shun our responsibilities, other countries take note. According to the Pew Research Center, unilateral actions such as those described above have contributed to the image of the United States reaching its lowest point in twenty years, even among our allies. But credibility is not just a popularity contest; it is key to our ability to advance our national interests and values on the world stage and push back against countries who seek to subvert them. In her testimony during her Senate confirmation hearing, U.S. Ambassador to the UN Linda Thomas-Greenfield addressed this issue head-on in the context of U.S. arrears: "Not paying our bills really does diminish our power and it diminishes our leadership. We need to pay our bills to have a seat at the table... We know that when we cede our leadership, others jump in very quickly to fill the void and we need to make sure that we're there to push back on those who would have malign intentions at the UN."

Our diminished credibility has helped create a strategic opportunity for those with malign intentions and global competitors, particularly Russia and China.

- **Competition:** China is now the second largest financial contributor to the UN's assessed budgets, the tenth largest contributor of troops to UN peacekeeping missions and has expanded its influence in a range of UN specialized agencies and other entities. As the U.S. has stepped back, China and Russia have become even more assertive in challenging aspects of the UN's work that advance American interests and values, particularly human rights. If the U.S. does not act quickly and decisively to restore its standing in the UN, these countries' ability to fill the vacuum will only accelerate.

As outlined below, I will discuss in greater detail the importance of the UN's force-multiplying work, how it advances U.S. interests, as well as further address concerns related to the U.S.'s standing and our competitors' ongoing efforts to expand their own profiles at the organization.

Confronting COVID and Delivering Humanitarian Relief

The last year has highlighted just how crucial the work of international organizations like the UN are to ensuring the health and safety of Americans. Last March, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic. Since then, more than 120 million people around the world have fallen ill, and close to 2.7 million have died, including more than 540,000 Americans. The pandemic has seriously curtailed global economic activity, leaving many of the world's most vulnerable people on even more precarious footing: the UN has warned that 235 million people require humanitarian assistance this year—a 40% increase over 2020 that is almost entirely related to the fallout from COVID-19.

The WHO has been an essential partner in formulating and implementing a collective international response to this disaster. As the global standard-setter on public health issues, integrated into the health ministries of more than 150 countries, the WHO's reach and depth is unmatched. From the outset of the crisis, WHO has distributed diagnostic kits and PPE to dozens of countries with weak health systems; formulated technical guidance for communities, hospitals, private sector partners, and public health authorities; carried out public awareness campaigns in dozens of languages in 149 countries; and, through its "Solidarity Trial," worked to enable rapid and accurate research on the effectiveness of potential therapeutics.

Of particular note, the WHO's early decision to focus its pandemic response on testing—deeming it the "backbone" of any response—proved to be key to saving lives and reducing the virus's spread. It must also be noted that had the

United States not tried to go it alone and instead adopted the WHO test – [which the organization made public on Jan. 13](#) and several countries wasted no time in implementing – [more lives in this country would have been saved](#).

Overall, WHO's invaluable assistance was one reason there was such widespread opposition to the Trump Administration attempt to withdraw from the organization. [Groups representing infectious disease doctors, pediatricians and general physicians](#) all protested the decision, as did the Chamber of Commerce. [Even the Heritage Foundation announced](#) its opposition to defunding, stating that slashing our contributions may be interpreted as abandoning vulnerable countries in their time of need and it would play into the hands of countries, like China, who would seek to distract from their role in the outbreak and portray the U.S. as uninterested in helping nations combat COVID-19.

Going forward, the WHO is at the forefront of efforts—working with partners like the Global Fund, Gavi, the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI), and others—to ensure equitable global distribution of COVID-19 vaccines. Through a new coordination initiative known as COVAX, these entities are working to distribute two billion vaccines, along with essential supplies like syringes, to low and middle-income countries by the end of 2021. While access to vaccines in the U.S. is increasing, as long as COVID-19 circulates unchecked, it remains a threat to the health and safety of Americans. For example, we could see the emergence of variants that compromise the effectiveness of our vaccines, to say nothing of further disruptions to the global economy caused by continued cycles of outbreaks and lockdowns abroad. Put simply, the only way we will ultimately defeat the virus in this country is by fighting it overseas as well, and COVAX is a key mechanism to help us do that.

Beyond confronting the health-related aspects of the pandemic, the UN is also playing a central role in addressing the severe humanitarian dislocations caused by the virus. For example, in Yemen - currently the world's worst humanitarian crisis, where 80% of the population is dependent on aid in order to survive - the lifesaving work of the UN is especially pronounced.

Last year, the World Food Program (WFP) scaled up its operations to provide more than 10 million people with monthly food assistance through direct food distributions or vouchers and provided nutritional support to over 1 million pregnant or nursing women and children under 5. With one of the highest maternal mortality rates in the Arab States region, the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) is working to improve the availability and quality of reproductive health services in the country. During 2020, UNFPA was able to reach nearly 3 million people in need and trained more than 300 midwives to provide safe deliveries and care for pregnant women displaced by the conflict. Meanwhile, UNICEF and WHO have played a crucial role in responding to a cholera epidemic, while the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) provides housing assistance to families who have been forced to flee their homes due to violence.

These types of efforts are not confined to Yemen. Throughout the globe, UN humanitarian agencies act as a kind of 9-11 service, deploying to some of the most dangerous and challenging operating environments to bring life-sustaining relief to the world's most vulnerable communities. Due to its high degree of international legitimacy and capacity to operate in places beyond our reach, the UN is an indispensable implementing partner for the U.S. government's own efforts to address significant global humanitarian and health issues.

Protecting International Peace and Security

The main reason that the U.S. and its allies decided to create the UN in the first place was to prevent conflict and address threats to global stability. The most visible manifestation of the UN's commitment to these goals is its peacekeeping operations. Currently, there are 12 UN peacekeeping operations deployed to hotspots on three

continents, tasked with separating warring parties, protecting civilians, supporting democratic elections, and providing a foundation on which fragile states can work towards a more sustainable peace. Peacekeeping operations are authorized by the UN Security Council, on which the U.S. has a permanent seat and veto power. As a result, American diplomats play a decisive role in determining each mission's mandate, its force levels, and the duration of its deployment.

Decades of data have shown peacekeeping to be beneficial in a host of ways. For example, one study examining civil wars in sub-Saharan Africa found that in places where no peacekeeping troops were deployed, average monthly civilian deaths totaled 106. In situations where at least 8,000 UN troops were present, by contrast, civilian deaths dropped by 98%. The study concluded that ensuring UN peacekeeping forces "are appropriately tasked and deployed in large numbers" is critical to their ability to protect civilians.¹ In subsequent years, an additional "avalanche of evidence" has made clear that peacekeepers protect civilians, save lives, shorten the duration of conflicts, contain the geographic spread of war, reduce their likelihood of reoccurrence, and reduce sexual and gender-based violence.²

What is also remarkable is that this lifesaving work is being done at such a relatively low financial cost. With nearly 86,000 personnel—soldiers, police, and civilians—currently serving around the world, UN peacekeeping is the second-largest military force deployed abroad (after the U.S.). And yet, the total budget for the UN's peacekeeping activities is just \$6.5 billion, less than 1% of what the U.S. will spend on its own military this year. Moreover, a 2018 report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office found that deploying UN peacekeepers is eight times less expensive than U.S. forces.³

Finally, UN peacekeeping is an excellent example of international burden-sharing. The UN has no standing army, and therefore depends on Member States to voluntarily contribute uniformed personnel to serve on these missions. Despite its pivotal role on the UN Security Council, the U.S. provides very few of its own uniformed personnel: currently just several dozen out of nearly 75,000. Dozens of other Member States—including Tanzania, Jordan, Indonesia, Bangladesh, and Nepal—provide the bulk of the rest, ensuring that no country undertakes the burden of carrying out these missions alone.

The State of U.S. Engagement and the Rise of Strategic Competitors

Over the last 7 decades, the U.S.-UN relationship has gone through its fair share of peaks and valleys. Nevertheless, the last 4 years witnessed a particularly dramatic and troubling erosion of U.S. engagement and standing at the UN. During the Trump Administration, the U.S. pulled out of the Paris Agreement; withheld funding from the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), UNFPA, and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights; withdrew from the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) and the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); and attempted to pull the U.S. out of the WHO amid the COVID-19 pandemic. Finally, Congress and the Administration worked in tandem to enforce an arbitrary 25% cap on U.S. contributions to UN peacekeeping operations, meaning that we have not been paying our dues in-full, even though U.S. diplomats signed off on our assessment rates at the UN. As a result, the U.S. has accrued more than \$1.1 billion in arrears on our peacekeeping assessments since Fiscal Year 2017.

¹ Hultman, Lisa, Jacob Kathman, and Megan Shannon. 2013. "United Nations Peacekeeping and Civilian Protection in Civil War." *American Journal of Political Science* 57(4): 875-91.

² Morjé Howard, Lise. "Give Peacekeeping a Chance." Oxford Research Group. <https://www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk/blog/give-peacekeeping-a-chance>. 29 May 2019; https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/fp_20210211_africa_peacekeeping_transcript.pdf

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.

U.S. underpayments to the regular and peacekeeping budgets are contributing to yawning cash deficits at the UN, what has been deemed a financial crisis for the organization. For countries who participate in peacekeeping missions, they are not being fully reimbursed for their contributions of personnel and equipment. This creates significant challenges for troop-contributors, most of whom are lower-income countries that rely on reimbursements to help sustain complex longer-term peacekeeping deployments.

These systematic underpayments also occurred as U.S. competitors like China and Russia have expanded their own roles within the multilateral system, filling vacuums left by the U.S. and using their newfound influence to challenge the dominance of American interests and values. As I noted earlier, China is now the second largest financial contributor to UN assessed budgets, providing 12% of the UN regular budget and more than 15% of the peacekeeping budget. It is also the 10th largest contributor of uniformed personnel to peacekeeping operations, outpacing all contributions by the other four permanent members of the Security Council combined. Beyond financial and troop contributions, China has also aggressively pushed to expand its role in a range of UN-affiliated institutions, successfully pushing for the installation of Chinese nationals at the helm of four of the organization's fifteen specialized agencies.

A more assertive China and Russia has implications for a wide swathe of our multilateral agenda, but it is perhaps most concerning with regards to the UN's work on human rights. Unfortunately, the U.S.'s absence from the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) over the last 2 ½ years has given Russia and China greater opportunities to shape the institution in a way that more closely hews to their own policy priorities and values. Specifically, these countries have become more aggressive in promoting a state-centric vision of human rights that is at odds with the UN's founding principles: one that devalues minority rights, elevates "state sovereignty" over the rights of the individual, gives primacy to economic and social rights over crucial civil and political rights, and mutes criticism of individual countries' human rights records, particularly their own. Sadly, they have found willing allies for these efforts: in 2019, for example, China was joined by 37 other countries in a statement at the Council extolling Beijing's treatment of Uighur Muslims in Xinjiang. Unfortunately, because the U.S. has largely been on the outside looking in, our ability to push back against these efforts has been limited: a counter statement criticizing China's treatment of Uighurs and calling for the UNHRC to investigate the issue received just 22 signatories.

These efforts to undermine human rights norms extend beyond the UNHRC. In 2018, for example, Russia and China pushed for the elimination of a number of human rights monitoring and civilian protection posts in UN peacekeeping missions. Of note, their efforts in this case were premised not on any public rejection of human rights mandates in peacekeeping missions per se, but rather, on the budgetary limitations caused by the Trump Administration's focus on funding cuts. That same year, China and Russia teamed up again and successfully sought to cut funding for the Human Rights Upfront Initiative, a program in the Secretary-General's office that worked to ensure that all UN entities are prioritizing human rights in their field operations. While these efforts have met with varying degrees of success, the fact that they have even been tried in the first place is evidence of emboldened authoritarian regimes that are increasingly willing to use their influence—particularly, in the case, of China, its growing financial clout—to tilt the field in order to achieve the policy outcomes they desire.

Over the years, the U.S. has criticized the UNHRC for maintaining a disproportionate focus on Israel. It has also pointed out that some countries with seats on the Council have problematic human rights records that should disqualify them from serving in such positions. In 2018, when the Trump Administration resigned the U.S. seat on the Council, it cited these two factors as principal reasons for doing so.

These criticisms are certainly understandable and need to be addressed by the U.S. in concert with the rest of the UN's membership. However, despite the Council's imperfections, the record has clearly shown that we are much better served when we are at the table and participating in the UNHRC's work than when we withdraw. During the Obama Administration and the first 18 months of the Trump Administration, when the U.S. adopted a policy of principled engagement with the Council, the proportion of country-specific resolutions targeting Israel decreased considerably. When resolutions targeting Israel did come up, fewer countries voted for them: in March 2018, just three months before the U.S. withdrawal, the State Department itself reported that the Council saw "the largest shift in votes towards abstentions and no votes on Israel related resolutions since" its creation. Just as importantly, the UNHRC broadened its repertoire in a number of areas, establishing independent mechanisms to investigate human rights violations and push for accountability in Iran, North Korea, and Syria. The Council also adopted groundbreaking resolutions on cross-cutting thematic human rights issues, including LGBTI rights and freedom of expression on the Internet.

If the U.S. does not act fast to reassert its traditional role of leadership at the UN and undo the damage to our standing that has built up over the last four years, we will leave a void that our geopolitical competitors have shown they are more than willing, and increasingly able, to fill. That could mean a very different UN than the one the U.S. sought to create 76 years ago—one where U.S. foreign policy objectives and values are increasingly sidelined.

UN Reform & Strengthening

Before wrapping up my testimony, I would like to say a few words about the issue of reform. In recent years, the UN has undertaken a number of measures to make its operations more transparent and efficient. With regards to peacekeeping, for example, 10 years ago, the UN 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. The UN also undertook important efforts to combat sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel, 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 UN's development work on the ground—in order to make the UN'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.⁴

As with so many other elements of the UN, the achievement of these reforms would not have been possible without strong U.S. support and engagement. That means keeping our seat at the table, including paying our dues. As former Secretary of State and U.S. Ambassador to the UN Madeleine Albright has noted, "The failure to pay our old UN bills undermines our ability to meet critical U.S. foreign policy objectives...and to recruit allies for the kind of structural reform that Congress demands."

Nevertheless, that has not stopped some in Washington from advancing proposals that would cripple the organization, antagonize our own allies, further undermine our standing, and nullify our efforts to achieve meaningful and realistic reforms. One such idea would have the UN 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 several reasons:

- The fact that assessed funding structures require other countries to share in the financial burden is actually beneficial to the United States. All UN member states are required to help shoulder the UN's regular and peacekeeping budgets at specified levels. This, in turn, prevents U.S. taxpayers from being saddled with the

⁴ Foxman and Lasensky. "A Righteous U.N. Secretary-General." Wall Street Journal, June 27, 2018.

majority of these expenses. By contrast, the U.S. often pays more under voluntary funding arrangements. Successive Republican and Democratic administrations have recognized the limitations inherent in voluntary funding structures.⁵ In addition, a Congressionally-mandated Newt Gingrich-George Mitchell report on UN reform, for example, noted that such schemes are often slow and lead to U.S. priorities being underfunded.

The Path Forward

Addressing the challenge posed by Russia and China and ensuring that the UN continues to advance American interests requires more engagement, not less. Fortunately, the Biden Administration has already moved to renew our relationship with the UN. In just the last two months, the Administration has rejoined the Paris Agreement, halted the U.S. withdrawal from the WHO and paid arrears to that organization accrued under the Trump Administration, announced that it will run for a seat on the Human Rights Council when membership elections take place in the General Assembly later this year, and moved to restore U.S. funding for UNFPA. Crucially, President Biden has also restored the U.S. Ambassador to the UN as a Cabinet-level position, signaling the important role multilateral diplomacy will play in his Administration moving forward. My organization welcomes these significant policy shifts and believes they need to continue. But reengagement doesn't stop there. We believe that Congress and the Administration should also work together to:

- Repeal the 25% legislative cap on peacekeeping contributions and provide additional funding to pay back the more than \$1.1 billion in peacekeeping arrears we have accrued since FY'17.
- Resynchronize our payments to the UN, so that they come early in the Calendar Year rather than at the end of the U.S. Fiscal Year. Since the 1980s, the U.S. has paid the bulk of its UN assessments in the fall, even though the UN's fiscal year begins in January. This creates delays in payment that have contributed to an ongoing financial crisis at the UN, made proper budgeting and forecasting difficult, undermined U.S. reform messaging, and necessitated undesirable austerity measures like hiring freezes around positions that the U.S. generally supports. It also sets a poor example: other countries, such as Brazil, have begun to follow suit by delaying their own dues payments.
- Pay back more than \$90 million in arrears accrued in recent years due to the prior Administration's policy of withholding assessed funding for the Human Rights Council and High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Mobilize support for equitable COVID-19 vaccine distribution to low and middle-income countries through COVAX. Research has demonstrated that the "U.S. would be likely to gain more than any other country" via equitable distribution through multilateral partners.⁶
- Restore funding to UNRWA commensurate with our pre-2018 contributions, following up on President Biden's announcement from late January.
- Rejoin the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

⁵ In June 2005, the House passed The UN Reform Act which would automatically withhold dues from the UN 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."

⁶ <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/ending-the-covid-19-pandemic-the-need-for-a-global-approach>

- Prioritize U.S. engagement in UN forums, to include the Commission on the Status of Women, Generation Equality, the Conference on Population and Development, and the Global Compacts on Migration & Refugees.
- Nominate and appoint diverse candidates with multilateral backgrounds for positions at State/USAID/HHS.
- Congress and the Administration should also work together to provide more robust financial resources to the State Department and USAID. The U.S. international affairs budget makes up just over 1% of federal spending but plays an outsized role in advancing U.S. interests overseas. There are a number of proposals that Congress could potentially adopt, from increasing State and USAID budgets by \$12-16 billion, to doubling funding for foreign assistance over the next four years, to matching the proportion of GDP (0.6%) spent on foreign assistance during the Reagan Administration, versus the percentage (0.2%) we spend today. Regardless of what path we take, we need to ensure that our diplomatic and development efforts receive necessary resources to successfully take on the immense challenges we face today. In the midst of a pandemic that will cost \$28 trillion in lost output and has exacerbated poverty, famine, and instability, there really is no viable alternative.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Mr. Hannum.
I will now call on Ms. Gay McDougall for her testimony. Ms. McDougall.

STATEMENT OF GAY McDOUGALL, SENIOR FELLOW AND DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR-IN-RESIDENCE, LEITNER CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW AND JUSTICE/CENTER FOR RACE, LAW, AND JUSTICE, FORDHAM UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Ms. McDOUGALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we all agree that this is a moment of great urgency, both in our country and worldwide, and that these are challenges that cannot be solved without active U.S. engagement in international institutions.

I commend the Biden Administration for reengaging with the U.N. Human Rights Council and taking steps to repair our very badly frayed reputation in those bodies. After all, the work of promoting and protecting human rights is a uniquely American contribution to the United Nations initiated by Eleanor Roosevelt. And while we have often failed to make it our overarching priority, the cause has rarely advanced without principled U.S. leadership.

For more than 2 years, the United States has been absent from the Human Rights Council, and for an unprecedented period there have been no American experts on the human rights treaty bodies, and we cannot afford to not be in those rooms or to not be at those tables.

When the United States is present, important work can get done. One excellent example is the Cross-Regional Joint statement on Racism led by the U.S. and joined by 155 nations which was submitted last week as part of the general debate during the 46th session of the Human Rights Council. Only U.S. diplomacy could have achieved that broad consensus document on fighting racism.

The U.S. leverages its credibility most powerfully when it leads with honesty, humility, and commitment to principle. So as we reengage with the U.N.'s human rights systems, the U.S. must be honest and transparent about the failures of our human rights enforcement here at home. To deny the obvious would be self-defeating.

And with honesty we must also be willing to submit to international scrutiny of our shortcomings in the same way that we seek to hold other countries accountable for their own failures. Without that mutual transparency and accountability, the U.N.'s system to protect the rights of people around the world is made into a charade.

Our U.N. Ambassador displayed the impact of honesty so effectively last week in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly when she offered a moving personal reflection on her own life growing up in the segregated south and the deep structural racism that continues to undermine our democracy.

When we lead with that kind of honesty and humility, as our Ambassador did last week, we set a tone and example for other countries to follow. Further, the project of promotion and protection of human rights globally fails if it becomes merely another tool in the struggles of geopolitics. Human rights protection must be conducted in a safe space in which principles of objectivity, fairness,

impartiality, truthfulness, and good faith dominate. These are principles that should be upheld by all of the stakeholders.

Let me conclude by saying that the United Nations today is under attack on many fronts. Too many governments, including the U.S., withhold or delay dues, leaving crucial U.N. offices crippled and unable to fulfill their missions. Too many governments attack the U.N.'s independent human rights experts for exposing difficult truths and block the U.N.'s institutions from addressing effectively the most desperate human rights issues in the world today.

But with the support of Congress and the Biden Administration, I think there is an opportunity to safeguard these institutions for the survival of the United Nations. We cannot afford to let the U.N. fail.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ms. McDougall follows:]

Committee on Foreign Affairs
Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations and
Global Corporate Social Impact

International United States Standing in International Organizations

Testimony by Gay McDougall
March 23, 2021

We must all recognize the urgency of this moment. This is being called a time of reckoning. We face multiple pandemics—structural racism, towering inequality within and between countries, extreme poverty, health systems that are too fragile and inadequate to contain a viral spread, and racist hate speech fueling authoritarian governments in countries on almost every continent. The most challenging problems of our era cannot possibly be solved without active U.S. engagement in international institutions. Racism, antisemitism, anti-LGBT hate know no borders. Nor do more traditional plagues, including AIDS and Covid-19.

I am happy that the Biden Administration is re-engaging with the United Nations Human Rights Council and taking steps to repair our badly frayed reputation in those bodies. After all, the work of promoting and protecting human rights is a uniquely American contribution to the United Nations initiated by Eleanor Roosevelt. And while we have often failed to make it our overarching priority, the cause has rarely advanced without principled U.S. leadership.

For more than two years the UNITED STATES has been absent from the Human Rights Council and for an unprecedented period, there have been no American experts on the Human Rights Treaty Bodies. This reflected a disregard for the important work being conducted by those bodies to impact some of the most challenging problems of our generation. We cannot afford to not be in those rooms and at those tables.

When the UNITED STATES is present, important work can get done. One example was the U.S. initiative to expand the work of the Human Rights Council to create a United Nations expert position focusing on human rights abuses directed at individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identity.

Another excellent example is the **Cross-Regional Joint Statement on Racism** led by the US and joined by 155 nations which was submitted last week as part of the General Debate on Agenda Item 9 during the 46th session of the Human Rights Council. Only US diplomacy could have achieved that broad a consensus document on fighting racism.

Today I would like to offer some perspectives on how the US might best regain credibility at this time that US leadership is of crucial importance. The US leverages its credibility most powerfully when it leads with honesty, humility, and commitment to principle.

Testimony of Gay McDougall
 U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs
 March 23, 2021

As we re-enter the Human Rights Council and re-engage with the U.N.'s human rights systems, the U.S. must be honest and transparent about the failures of human rights enforcement at home. To deny the obvious would be self-defeating. For example, the video of the killing of George Floyd was viewed by millions around the world. As thousands of Americans poured out into the streets in protest, those protests were joined by thousands more in over 50 countries. Honesty requires that we submit to international scrutiny of our failures in the same way that we seek to hold other countries accountable for their own failures. Without that mutual transparency and accountability, the United Nations system to protect the rights of people around the world is made into a charade.

Our U.N. Ambassador displayed this so effectively last week in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly when she offered a moving personal reflection on her own life growing up in the segregated South and the deep structural racism that continues to undermine our own democracy. So many Americans share that story and that pain, myself included, and the rest of the world relates to it. Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield had the simple grace to admit that our nation has "[d]eep, serious flaws. But we talk about them. We work to address them. And we press on, in hopes that we can leave the country better than we found it."

When we lead with humility and honesty like Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield did last week, we are far more effective in our diplomacy. And we set a tone and example for other countries to follow. The credibility of the U.N. human rights system depends on the willingness of each country to engage honestly and openly – and the U.S. is no exception.

As the Asian American Pacific Islander Community grieves in Atlanta and other US cities, and as FBI hate crimes data continues to spike, the US must be open to international scrutiny of its compliance with our human rights obligations, just as we demand that the U.N. hold other countries to account for their own human rights failures.

Further, the project of promotion and protection of human rights globally fails if it becomes merely another tool in the struggles of geo-politics. Human rights protection must be conducted in a safe space in which the principles of objectivity, fairness, impartiality, truthfulness, and good faith dominate. These are principles that should be upheld by all stakeholders. Challenges for world dominance are a constant theme of the global order. But if nothing else, the rise of the international human rights system over the past 70 years must represent a global consensus concerning the importance of placing human lives first.

Finally, when my last session of service at the U.N. concluded in 2019, the treaty body system was facing an existential crisis relating to resources. While others on this panel will speak in more detail about issues relating to the US budgetary support for the U.N., it goes without saying that if this is a system that we rely on as vital to the long-term protection of human rights here at home and abroad, then we must ensure that it has the resources to function adequately. The UNITED STATES is badly in arrears.

Testimony of Gay McDougall
U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs
March 23, 2021

We must pay our share. Our fair share of dues to the United Nations is a small percentage of the overall budget of the United States.

Let me conclude by saying that the United Nations today is under attack on many fronts. Too many governments – including the United States – withhold regular dues or fail to pay on time, leaving crucial U.N. offices crippled and unable to budget properly to achieve the goals that are important to all of us. Too many governments attack the U.N.'s independent human rights experts for exposing difficult truths and block the U.N.'s institutions from addressing effectively the most desperate human rights situations in the world today. But with the support of Congress, the Biden Administration has an opportunity to lead by example to safeguard these institutions and ensure the survival of the United Nations. We cannot afford to let the United Nations fail.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Ms. McDougall, for your testimony. And our final witness, I will now call on Mr. Hugh Dugan for his testimony.

Mr. DUGAN.

STATEMENT OF HUGH DUGAN, FORMER SENIOR DIRECTOR FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS AT THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. DUGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your invitation to appear before the subcommittee, which is a privilege. It is a distinct pleasure to see Gay McDougall. I had the pleasure of serving as her campaign manager while a U.S. delegate to the United Nations, when she was successfully elected to the U.N. mission for the elimination of racial discrimination.

I held one of the longest tenures on the U.S. delegation to the U.N.—26 years—followed by a professorship at Seton Hall University. I then resumed as Acting Special Presidential Envoy for Hostage Affairs, and most recently at the National Security Council as its Senior Director for International Organization Affairs.

My career in this realm spanned six presidencies, 11 U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations, and most importantly for today, 16 sessions of the House of Representatives. A highlight in my career was leading the U.N. reform program that brought together Senators Helms and Biden to fund our \$1 billion U.S. arrears to the U.N. in the year 2000.

It bears repeating for students of world affairs today what this subcommittee understands: that politics must end at the water's edge.

Congress has much in common with an international organization. Both are membership-based, both seek to leverage their values into policies, and they appreciate the force multiplier effect of working together.

The title of today's hearing is "U.S. Standing in International Organizations." There our goal is to stand with others to promote shared ideals and to stand out as an example in pursuit of shared interests through cooperation. Otherwise, the U.S. risks merely sitting uncritically, expecting to be appreciated as some sort of diplomatic goodwill.

If the U.S. is seen as indulging international bureaucrats, we will discover yet again that our pieces on the U.N. chessboard will not move themselves. In that game, each member State quietly calculates, does this international organization work? And, second, does it work for us and our shared interests?

Our adversaries have supersized their efforts, not only to best us on issues, but to hijack the whole platform. Exhibit A, the World Health Organization, which is misnamed, frankly, instead of "World" read "Chinese," instead of "Health" read "Political," and as for "Organization," it took over 1 year to arrange a fact-finding trip to the Wuhan Laboratory while America produced three vaccines in warp speed time.

Today our look at U.S. standing should not merely give itself over to foreign judgments on the United States. Rather, it needs to flag that our standing is only as good as the knowledge, skills, and abilities of Team USA in current times.

The fact is, our best game against eroding U.S. standing in international organizations is a strong U.S. team on the field, U.S. delegates, U.S. citizens in the secretariats, and in leadership positions, such as the World Food Programme. This team has to be guided by dedicated D.C. policy leadership all having each other's backs.

Alternatively, any game plan merely to take down our opponents is woeful. Alarmingly, I come to report to you that America's talent bench for mastering international organization politics has never been thinner. It needs emergency recruitment, training, and 24/7 policy guidance, not for 1945 but for 2021. A major study on this issue will be released by the Center for Strategic and International Studies later this year.

Regrettably, where I sit, the U.S. is abandoning leverage developed by the previous Administration. That it pressured for more accountability from U.N. programs in need of reform. An elaborate reform proposal shared widely by the U.S. with allies was ignored by WHO managers and apparently deep-sixed by the current Administration.

Also, a major review of the Human Rights Commission is on the U.N. agenda this year. Whether reform is only possible if the U.S. is a member was disproven over many previous years of our membership in most world organizations. We shall see what the Administration plans, none of which has been put forward yet.

Other policy reversals undertaken, such as resuming as a priority to the Joint Comprehensive Program of Action, likewise appear planless. The U.S. is serving this month as president of the Security Council, which would have provided every opportunity to set the agenda and work from the high ground.

However, Vice President Harris last week opted to make her premier at the U.N. for a little than a victory lap and a pep talk at the Commission on the Status of Women. March was a missed opportunity for a Nikki Haley moment at the United Nations, one of focusing on U.N. accountability, instead of deleveraging hard-earned U.S. momentum there.

In recent years, the Chinese Communist Party has surmised the U.N. as a supersized world trade organization opportunity, ripe for China's plundering, hijacking, and reprogramming to its authoritarian—

Mr. CASTRO. Hello? Mr. Dugan, it looks like we may have lost you. I hope it is—I am assuming it is not just my internet. Let me see, we will take about 10 seconds to see if we can get him back. There you go.

Mr. DUGAN. All right. Am I back?

Mr. CASTRO. You are, yes.

Mr. DUGAN. Thank you. I will resume, and I am almost finished.

In recent years, the Chinese Communist Party has surmised the U.N. as a supersized world trade organization opportunity, ripe for China's plundering, hijacking, and reprogramming to its authoritarian, hegemonic ambitions. Throughout, Beijing is remaining Beijing. The rest of us are learning to suffer.

China is now opting for open hostility in its dialog with us and others, as we saw this last weekend in Alaska. It is a wolf warrior diplomacy versus our U.N. Ambassador's self-styled gumbo diplo-

macy. Unless we strengthen our pots, is there any question who will be eating whose lunch in the U.N. cafeteria?

In good form, the Biden Administration has said it would continue a tough-on-China stance. So job one for the U.S. mission to the U.N. is to organize like-minded States to face down the CCP's grab at the world order's dashboards and passwords.

Another chore is the selection of the next U.N. Secretary General this year. A key test for Canada is managing the new moments of advancing authoritarianism upon the organization.

The U.N. will need resilience to stem Russia's tactic to degrade and erode U.N. principles and even stronger resolve to counter China's game plan to superimpose its interests over those of the U.N. charter and eventually replace the spirit of openness with one of jealous authority.

And, in closing, the U.S. has promoted U.S. values in force-multiplying ways at the U.N. and other international organizations. By standing and not sitting in international organizations, the U.S. must continue contributing to the liberal world order and further rise and champion others to defend it.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Dugan follows:]

Innovating to meet the needs of young children and their caregivers in every context

Testimony submitted for the record
April 16th 2021

House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations and Global Corporate Social Impact hearing on
Innovation in Development Policy: Maximizing Impact and Results

Emily Garin, Senior Director of Advocacy, Sesame Workshop (emily.garin@sesame.org);

Katie Murphy, Acting Deputy Director of the Education Unit and Senior Technical Advisor, Early Childhood Development, International Rescue Committee (katie.murphy@rescue.org)

Chairman Castro, Ranking Member Malliotakis, and Members of the Subcommittee,

On behalf of Sesame Workshop and International Rescue Committee, thank you for convening this session to focus on such a crucial topic. We also are grateful for the chairman's leadership on the Global Child Thrive Act, a truly innovative approach for working across the U.S. government to better the lives of children.

For more than 50 years, Sesame Workshop has been committed to helping kids become smarter, stronger, and kinder. Whether in the classroom, on screen, or in communities, we are doing everything we can to meet the needs of young children in more than 150 countries.

Founded at the request of Albert Einstein, the International Rescue Committee responds to the world's worst humanitarian crises and helps people whose lives and livelihoods are shattered by conflict and disaster to survive, recover, and gain control of their future. In more than 40 countries and over 20 U.S. cities, we provide clean water, shelter, health care, education and empowerment support to refugees and displaced people.

Sesame Workshop and IRC are working around the world to ensure that the best evidence drives investment for early childhood development. Current collaborations include Ahlan Simsim, which supports children affected by the Syrian crisis, and Play to Learn, which is focused on children and communities affected by the Rohingya and Syrian refugee crises in Bangladesh and the Middle East.

We know from decades of tackling some of the toughest challenges facing children that if we reach them early, we can help change their trajectories.

Across the globe, one in every six children lives in a conflict zone; 71 million children under the age of 5 have lived in conflict areas for their entire lifetimes. For the youngest children, experiences with crisis and conflict come at a particularly critical point in their lives. From birth to age 3, the brain develops faster than at any other time, forming up to one million new connections every second. By age 5, up to 90 percent of a child's brain has already developed. Missing this window of opportunity can mean irreversible losses for a child.

To address these challenges, the ways we reach children and caregivers have evolved over the past five decades, teaching us time and again that necessity can be the mother (and father) of invention.

Our work during the COVID-19 pandemic has brought the need for that flexibility and innovation into ever sharper relief. While face-to-face services are on hiatus, we are providing resources for educators and families through WhatsApp, strengthening access to our content through new partnerships and television distribution channels, and creating content on COVID-19 to support early learning and help families navigate the wide range of challenges they are facing.

Lessons identified and examples from the field

Through these and other partnerships, our most recent experiences in innovation have shown us the value of tapping both the newest and oldest of resources: technology and human relationships.

Our adaptations have demonstrated an unprecedented leap in the capacities of caregivers, educators and other service providers to make use of new technologies to support children's learning. We have also seen a more understanding and collaborative relationship between caregivers and educators. **Maintaining and fostering these working relationships will be essential for building the base of trust and capacity needed to confront new challenges and explore innovative solutions.**

Our experience has also demonstrated that **innovative approaches to programming need not be high tech**. In some cases, our innovative adaptations have actually moved from newer but less-contextually-appropriate technology to more traditional communication media, such as radio and television, which, due to their territorial scope, facilitated more democratic access to learning materials. As in all aspects of our work, **innovation should be demand- and context-driven, rather than supply-led.**

The changes that COVID-19 has necessitated are key reminders of what we should always be doing by design: **developing human-centered, context-appropriate solutions alongside the communities we hope to support.**

Many of our adaptations offer lessons for future innovation opportunities in both crisis and non-crisis contexts:

- In the **Syria response region**, our Ahlan Simsim programming has pivoted from school and in-person service delivery to adaptations such as digital dissemination and audio interventions. We are implementing a new mass messaging program to be distributed by WhatsApp and other mobile programs that allow caregivers to select which age-tailored content they would like to receive and foster two-way communication between staff and caregivers. Lessons on foundational literacy, numeracy and social-emotional learning originally designed for children in classrooms have been changed into 5–10-minute videos, with each lesson's complementary activities distributed to caregivers for use the home.
- In **Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Uganda**, PlayMatters supports the development of cognitive, creative, social, emotional and physical skills in children. While the program's primary focus is on strengthening play-based learning within Originally designed for classrooms, the pandemic forced PlayMatters to pivot and convert its content for distribution to children and their caregivers at home. A strong example of how "no tech" or adaptive innovations can have significant impact, the program developed a series of paper-based home learning guides tailored

to young and primary school-aged children, their caregivers and educators. Guides for children and caregivers recommend daily routines and fun activities and suggest ways that caregivers can turn daily interactions into teachable moments. Those designed for educators provide guidance on how to check in with families remotely and ways they can support their own well-being during this challenging time.

- Sesame Workshop and IRC are also driving solutions in **Central and South America**. The combination of COVID closures and pre-existing access challenges for Venezuelan children displaced across the region calls for a response that is versatile and able to reach these young people where they are.

The IRC has developed an innovative radio program called Play Well, designed for children ages 3 to 12, with a focus on developing social-emotional learning skills. The IRC is also currently developing a new program called Audioclass, which will aim to provide engaging educational content across a variety of platforms including radio, mobile phones, smart phones and tablets. Primarily relying on audio but also including video and interactive content, Audioclass works directly with Colombian educators to create lesson plans that can be distributed and accessed by students beyond school buildings and classrooms.

Sesame Workshop is working through two new distribution models in the region: our Jardín Sésamo device and the Sesame ChatBot. Jardín Sésamo is a state-of-the-art Sesame intervention built around a small plug-in device that broadcasts engaging, age-appropriate and education-driven content over free local WIFI access in selected spaces. Simple instructions explain how users can connect over WIFI on a personal smartphone, tablet or laptop at no data cost and how to connect the device to a television set or projector for collective use. Families are also able to access the content and download it for future use. Through our local brand, Sésamo, we have integrated content into a WhatsApp chat response system (ChatBot) to reach families with trusted educational content tailored to meet families' current needs. The Sésamo resources are designed to support children's learning across our whole-child curriculum, from physical and social-emotional wellbeing to academic skills and mutual respect and understanding. Adult-facing resources also support caregivers' adoption of positive parenting practices and tools to

Recommendations for improving outcomes in U.S. development investments through innovation

Support to early childhood development programming is the cornerstone for maximizing impact and results of U.S. investments in international development and crisis response. Evidence shows that quality support in the early years can provide tremendous returns – up to 13% per year – through improved education, health, and economic outcomes.¹ To capitalize on that potential, future U.S. investments should:

- Facilitate innovation by allowing grantees the flexibility to adapt their programming to meet rapidly evolving implementation conditions;

¹ García, J.L., Heckman, J.J., et al. "The Life-cycle Benefits of an Influential Early Childhood Program" NBER working paper (2016).

- Strengthen coordination across humanitarian and development actors through implementation of the Global Child Thrive Act;
- Prioritize multiyear, flexible funding for early childhood interventions that support young children and caregivers in crisis contexts, who face the most immediate threats to their well-being and to their long-term development;
- Reach those families through the most context-appropriate innovations, sometimes relying on less technology rather than more; and
- Build on the core principles from decades of best practice: community-driven, context-appropriate solutions that build on the strong networks and relationships already in place around the world.

Finally, we encourage the U.S. government to continually realign its investments with the growing evidence base on effective early childhood innovations and interventions. As we continue to build these lessons into our own programming, we are grateful for the opportunity to share them with you and learn alongside our partners across the U.S. government.

Thank you.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Mr. Dugan, for your testimony.

I will now recognize members for 5 minutes each. And pursuant to House Rules, all time yielded is for the purposes of questioning our witnesses.

Because of the virtual format of this hearing, I will recognize members by committee seniority, alternating between majority and minority. And because it is a little harder to tell who is where on video, I may ask the staff to help me out.

I can only call on you if you are present with your video on. So I know that there are a few members who have had their video off. If you all would please turn your video on now. If you miss your turn, please let our staff know, and we will circle back to you. If you seek recognition, you must unmute your microphone and address the chair verbally.

And so I will now start our round of questioning by recognizing myself. So, you know, these issues that we have been talking about—and thank you, everybody, for your testimony. It was fascinating testimony from everyone. But the issues can seem sometimes arcane or esoteric, especially when we are discussing organizations that most people, including the American people, haven't heard of.

And I would like to ask you to give us an example, and I will open it up to anyone, give us an example of how international organizations have had a concrete effect on our foreign policy, if we can give Americans a concrete example of that. And so, for example, has the election of a Chinese national to lead the International Telecommunication Union affected global policy toward 5G, cybersecurity, or emerging technologies? I welcome other examples as well.

I point that one out because we have been talking about how engaged the United States should be in these international organizations, whether we should vie for leadership positions, for example. And so does not being at the leadership table, not being the leader, does that make a concrete difference? I open it up to the panel.

Mr. DUGAN. May I speak, please?

Mr. CASTRO. Please.

Mr. DUGAN. Chairman, thank you very much for a very insightful question. Yes, it does matter who is in leadership positions throughout the organization, both among the delegations and certainly the leadership of the specialized agencies. As you have rightly described, the ITU is critically involved with monitoring and establishing norms and standards of telecommunications. 5G is central to that.

There is an entire professional community that looks at this, too. The stakeholders throughout civil society are multiplying on this very issue. So while the ITU has a critical role to play, it must also learn how to involve all of these other non-State actors who have real skin in the game.

So, yes, leadership in these organizations is going to have to be more accommodating of not just member States' participation but reaching out to the significant stakeholders and actors who in fact have a great deal of authority in these various functional areas, such as the ITU.

I would like to point out, as Jordie mentioned earlier, the World Food Programme took the Nobel Prize this year, which was a remarkable accomplishment, for its work on stemming hunger, especially the use of hunger in war situations.

The United States has always been the leading contributor; over 40 percent of the budget of the World Food Programme since its inception in 1960. And it has always had an American in its leadership position.

The prior Administration placed the current leader, David Beasley there, and his efforts are what for the most part brought the attention of the Nobel Committee to recognize the World Food Programme.

So to a great extent, the Nobel Prize Committee was recognizing America's ongoing contribution to a systemic problem of food shortage and the use of food as a weapon in the world over generations, and U.S. leadership that comes to the organization. The U.S. has always been—has always looked at these organizations that work well. And when they work well, we work well with them. When they do not work well, as major steward, we have to take the lead among our member State colleagues, to make them better.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Mr. Dugan. Let me see if the other—I know some of the other panelists I think may want to chime in as well.

Mr. HANNUM. Yes. Mr. Chairman, if I could just say, I mean, you raise a great point on kind of specialized agencies. And this is a key area where we have seen China gaining influence. They now head four U.N. specialized agencies, and we head one. And one can say quite confidently—like you brought up food, but one can say quite confidently that the head of the FAO is there because we were disengaged and not aligned with our allies.

In addition, we know that a couple of years ago that because of cuts to State Department, IO Bureau, that the number of people working on getting Americans at the U.N. was cut to zero. We had five, and we went to zero.

China makes a concerted effort to get their diplomats positions, so we need to be engaged.

We certainly talk about the importance of paying arrears. And this year is incredibly important. There are nine positions for the head of specialized agencies coming up this year, and five on the agency programs and funds. You talked about the World Food Programme. It is a great example. But this is a key year for us to be engaged and demonstrated in a variety of different ways, as they talked about. But, you know, staffing up State Department, staffing up IO, and certainly supporting payment of our dues.

Mr. CASTRO. Well, thank you. I have only got 20 seconds left. I do not know if Ms. McDougall or Ms. Otero wanted to chime in real quick.

Ms. OTERO. I would just say quickly that, from the perspective of multilateral organizations, they really are a continuum to our bilateral assistance and allow us to access the billions of dollars the multilateral agencies have in order to be able to influence the way that those resources are spent.

China, as others have mentioned, is in there trying to influence these multilaterals as well and ensuring that those resources go for areas and for factors that increase their global power.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you.

Okay. I am going to start the round of questions, moving on from myself. We will go to Ranking Member Malliotakis, please. Please.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman, for—you know, there are so many questions I actually have, and I would love to speak at some point offline with those who are testifying today. But I want to focus my—I guess my question on the U.N. Human Rights Council, since that is something that is imminent and going to be approaching us rather shortly.

Is there somebody else speaking there?

Mr. CASTRO. Yes.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Oh.

Mr. CASTRO. Darrell, your microphone is on. Can the staff mute Darrell's microphone? All right. I think you are clear.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Tell Darrell I am taking a minute of his time.

So, you know, I just want to focus, since the United Nations is obviously—this is something that is imminent, and the President has already declared that he wants to reenter the United Nations Human Rights Council, you know, my concern is obviously this is an organization that has given some of the worst offenders of human rights a platform, including Nicolas Maduro, who spoke at the very first meeting of the UNSC—I mean, U.N. Human Rights Council.

My question I guess is, what could we be doing to try to push the narrative and push our agenda to try to ensure that we are spreading, you know, freedom, democracy around the world. We want to protect human rights of these individuals, some of whom are members, member countries represented on the Council. How can we use reentry as leverage? And what advice would you have to try to address some of these human right violators?

Mr. DUGAN. If I may answer? Thank you very much for the good question. As I mentioned in my statement, there is a scheduled review of the Human Rights Council this year. It is done every 5 years, and it is part of the establishment of the Council.

So the U.S. has an opportunity in the General Assembly, which is the world's parliament, to raise these issues in a very serious way with a look at holding HRC more accountable and perhaps passing resolutions to amend its means of doing business and going forward.

Thank you.

Ms. OTERO. One issue that I would raise related to the Human Rights Council would be when I was Under Secretary of State, I participated as a representative of the U.S. in the Human Rights Council. And I noted that in—even though we have members in the Human Rights Council that are authoritarian and human rights violators, there are many other countries that are not.

And we can form alliances, we can work closely with them, we can help channel the agenda that gets sent, and we can diminish some of those issues that are counter to our beliefs. And that allows us to also have a way in which we can develop relationships with organizations and seek a mutual path with our leadership.

And when I was there, I remember doing this very clearly on certain issues that kept coming up at the Council for a vote.

Ms. MCDUGALL. Yes. If I can just get in a word here. I was on mute. I did not realize that. You know, I think that the first thing we do is be there, and be there with a sense of openness to hear all arguments and honesty, as I said in my testimony, but where else to form the kind of coalitions that can can push back on authoritarian regimes?

As I mentioned, this coalition that has just been formed by the Biden Administration at the HRC of 155 governments. That is quite, you know, record-setting. So we have got to be there, we have got to listen, we have got to form those coalitions, and we—we have more interference on the line. And good work can be done that way.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Thank you. If I had time—at some point, Mr. Dugan, I would love to speak to you more about the WHO. And I am also a Seton Hall grad, by the way, so I look forward to speaking to you again in the future.

Mr. CASTRO. Actually, Ranking Member, do you want to take an extra minute? Because I know you got interrupted at the beginning.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Okay. Thank you. Yes, we can take Darrell's time. That is right.

Just, Mr. Dugan, you know, you mentioned the World Health Organization. I agree with your comments regarding that China has basically taken over this organization. Any other insight you could share with us on what—how we should be handling WHO going forward?

Mr. DUGAN. Unfortunately, we agreed to rejoin and are paying \$200 million right now without establishing any consequences for bad behavior in the past. We have squandered, this just last couple of weeks, the opportunity and the leverage that was created by the previous administration, which in fact had put forward a very detailed reform proposal on what WHO needed to do, and publicized it widely among many of our allies, many of whom adopted it for their own, only to find the WHO ignoring it and giving us the cold shoulder throughout.

So the Administration gave the WHO plenty of notice and warning and incentive to come to the table. They did not—they, in fact, stalled by not even having a trip to Wuhan. I think what we need to do right now, not just as an organization, but with the pandemic, is to take our mind off of the focus on why this thing evolved where it did and realize that the pandemic, the spread of the pandemic, is what we really need to address.

There is no doubt that it spread from Wuhan. Whether it originated in the lab or nearby is academic. It spread from Wuhan, and that is undeniable, and we need to trace that and get more accountability for that. Whether the WHO is the actor to do that, I think it has not shown itself capable and we need to rally other resources in the world to do that for us.

Thank you.

Mr. HANNUM. If I could just weigh in quickly here, I know there is not much time, but just because our organization does a lot with WHO. I would just like to say briefly that WHO had made mis-

takes, which they acknowledged. They welcome reform. There is an independent panel right now.

But I do think it is clear to say there was not support for withdrawal. In fact, there was almost unanimous opposition to it. When it was announced, all of the major public health associations were against the move. So was the Chamber of Commerce. Even the Heritage Foundation announced its opposition.

Last July, Senate Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing on WHO and pandemic preparedness. All four witnesses—the Republican choices and the Democratic choices—were unanimous in saying that the WHO’s work was needed, of critical value, and there was no appetite for some alternative.

Thank you.

Mr. CASTRO. All right. Okay. Thank you.

I will go next to the vice chair of our committee, Ms. Sara Jacobs.

Ms. JACOBS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair, and thank you to our witnesses for being here. I used to work in peacekeeping at the U.N. and at UNICEF, so I know the important work that the U.N. is doing, and I appreciate you talking about that with us today.

Almost all of you mentioned in your testimony the need for reform, and while the U.N. is incredibly important, how important it is to make sure that we are reforming, so that it can actually address the challenges that we are facing. And I wanted to ask you about that.

I think we have seen recent gridlock at the United Nations, for instance, just recently in the situation in Tigray, and it has become pretty difficult to envision the U.N. Security Council really being able to play the kind of constructive role in responding and mediating conflict that I think we all envisioned it to be.

And so I think as we are in this new moment of U.S. global engagement, how can we seize on it for reform and maybe even move away from the traditional U.N. Security Council framework, which, as presently constructed, obviously has not done what we need it to in Tigray or in Sudan or even in helping mediate dialog in Syria and Afghanistan? And I would open it to any of the panelists for thoughts on that.

Mr. HANNUM. Congresswoman, one, thank you. Thank you for the question. And I would say a couple of things just in terms of reform. One, I do think it is important to say that the Secretary General, one of the reasons he kind of was chosen is that he has a track record on reform at UNHCR and made some real significant changes in terms of moving more operations into the field, reducing costs.

Under his leadership, they have achieved gender parity, issued new whistleblower protections, pushed for annual budgets. And so they—he has made a couple of key reforms. I think it is also important to show that the record shows that when the U.S. is engaged, and that means kind of being a member in good standing, paying our dues, that we are much more able to achieve significant reforms. And I kind of talked about what former U.S.—U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright noted.

But peacekeeping is a great example. A few years ago when the U.S. was engaged—this was during the Obama Administration—but they made real important changes in terms of field capabilities

in turn that the missions would move more quickly, and also reducing costs, bringing the costs for a peacekeeper down by 18 percent, for example. But that was a time when we were fully engaged and paying up, and in general I think we are more likely to see significant changes.

Human rights is another perfect example. This is a clear case where the U.S. absence, China and Russia are pushing a very different—very different narrative. And so we need to be engaged, and we need to be at the table, and then much more likely to advance our interests.

Thanks.

Mr. DUGAN. May I also venture an answer? On reform, I think, as I mentioned in my statement, we need to reform our own capacity to manage, and we need to reform our bench of talent. We need to build expertise within the U.S. Government on U.N. matters.

Over my 26 years or so at the Mission, I noticed a decline every year in our expertise. And it is not owned by any political party or personality. It is just a fact of life that we have not invested in how to manage effectively in multilateral organizations.

It may be a function of our American reluctance to participate all together in foreign matters of these sorts, as George Washington warned us when he spoke. But the fact is that we need to invest in manpower that is not up there for 6 months or 2 years at a time and treats it as a trip abroad.

The Russian ambassador—I am sorry, the Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov served three separate postings at New York in various stages of his career, up to Ambassador and now he is the foreign minister. That is true in many cases around the world where diplomats go on to become ministers, or they cycle out into other more important posts. And they have a keen understanding of a working ability about the U.N.'s properties and processes and politics, and our country has never invested in it that way.

The State Department culture has never rewarded a multilateral officer's career development. It is seen as a place that was secondary, and we need to change our culture and invest in our manpower.

Ms. JACOBS. Thank you. And my time has almost expired.

Ms. MCDUGALL. And if I can—sorry.

Ms. JACOBS. Please. Quickly. Sorry, Mr. Chair.

Ms. MCDUGALL. If I can. I think it is really critical that the State Department and all of our faces abroad represent who we are as a Nation in terms of all of our diversity. And I think that that also highly improves our ability to function in very diverse circumstances and with what is a very diverse world, and to learn to set policies that are credible in those interactions.

I know that there is a report—the Truman Report is about to come out on diversifying the personnel in State Department and upgrading the training, et cetera. But I think that is a critical point.

And, again, I bring us back to our new Ambassador to the U.N. in New York and what is going to be her incredible ability to negotiate the many—not just cultures but the political values of different people around the world in a way that makes her even more effective than she would have been elsewhere.

Ms. JACOBS. Thank you. And I will note our chair was a big part of that report and diversifying the State Department.

Ms. MCDUGALL. Yes.

Ms. JACOBS. I have to give him credit for that, since I took extra time.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you all. All right.

Let's go to Ms. Tenney—

Ms. TENNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASTRO [continuing]. For her questions.

Ms. TENNEY. Thank you. It is a honor to serve with you, and thank you again for your work with me in helping the Rohingya people in Myanmar and Burma a couple of congresses ago. We did a special orders, and I am grateful to you for continuing to recognize that terrible situation.

I have a district that is home to 4,000 Burmese refugees who are very active in the terrible situation going on in Burma with the military coup. So I thank you, and I appreciate the opportunity.

Thank the ranking member for her questions. I think they are vitally important, to talk about the Human Rights Council and why the Biden Administration did not leverage its ability to get back in the Council by helping us on the American side.

And also, thank you to the witnesses for your service and for being here in this important meeting.

I guess a couple of questions have been addressed. I would like to talk a little bit—maybe, Mr. Dugan, since you have so much broad experience, and I do appreciate your comments—I was a former employee with the Yugoslav Consulate which existed many years ago, worked a lot with the mission to the U.N. through Yugoslavia. And so I got to see firsthand just how it works from another perspective, since I worked for a foreign consulate.

But I just have a question about the value of the U.N. and how you view it. I mean, is, in your opinion, the United Nations a values-neutral institution? Or does it or should it stand for things like freedom and human rights? And do you believe China's growth poses a direct threat to the rules-based liberal order that underpins the U.N. system? And if you could comment on that, I would really appreciate it.

Mr. DUGAN. Thank you very much for your very thoughtful question. When we talk about U.N. reform, thankfully, nobody talks about reforming the U.N. charter. It stands as a model of principle, of purpose, of respect for freedom around the world, and for the promotion of prosperity, peace and security, and human rights.

So, thankfully, the core principles of the U.N. are not in question. It is the manipulation of those principles which we have to worry about. And, once again, China has invested enormously since about—for about 15 or 20 years now in the U.N. It always ignored the U.N. It was afraid of the U.N. buying in too much and then having to let the U.N. into China to look at some other things that China does that it does not want the world to see.

So it is always a very—I am against any type of intervention, and even though the intervention would reveal things such as you found with the Burmese situation, abuse of human rights, et cetera.

So it is the manipulation of the charter, of the organization, and I refer you to almost the hijacking of the moral authority of this organization branded by China going forward that is of most concern to me.

So, again, we need to develop our skillset. We need to be as bright and as hardworking and take the advantages that are due us up there. Congress has a special role in managing oversight in U.N. budget matters, since we are still the major contributor.

Thank you.

Ms. TENNEY. Would you say that that—well, and then toward that, you know, the U.N. specialized agencies, you know, the United States, Britain, and France combined only lead four, yet China—the Chinese Communist Party actually leads four itself. And would you say that is the result of manipulation in the United Nations, or is that something that they achieved, you know, by some kind of Democratic principle to get there in that position?

Mr. DUGAN. Well, to be brief, they play by the rules and they play very well and very hard. As I said, they really did not give the U.N. much notion until about 15 or 20 years ago. So they have grown into their skin. They have an appropriate role. They are a large country. They make a big contribution. They represent millions and millions of people.

So, yes, they are playing the game better and harder than we are; fairly, yes, by the letter, but not by the spirit.

Ms. TENNEY. Well, what you would you suggest we do as a nation to—sorry about that. I lost you. What would you say we do as a nation to combat that and to get in the game and to be the leader? Since we are supposed to be the beacon of freedom around the world to hold that order. What would your suggestion—I only have 40 seconds left, but I know Ms. McDougall wants to comment. But it is up to the chairman, so please comment if you will.

Thank you.

Ms. MCDUGALL. Well, I take a bit—I am sorry.

Mr. DUGAN. Go ahead.

Ms. MCDUGALL. I am sorry.

Ms. TENNEY. I would love to hear from you both. It is up to the chairman.

Mr. CASTRO. Please go ahead, both of you.

Ms. MCDUGALL. Go ahead, Mr. Dugan.

Mr. DUGAN. I just wanted to say that the previous administration established an office in the State Department called U.N. Integrity, which is—which has the writ of trying to address exactly what you are describing. It is an office that needs to be a bureau, and perhaps soon, as departments in the U.S. Government. We need to develop more resources and expertise, as I have mentioned a few times now, to quell the onslaught of authoritarian overtake of our liberal international order.

Ms. TENNEY. Thank you.

Ms. McDougall, I think you—

Ms. MCDUGALL. Yes. I would just say that in terms—in terms of the human rights area, yes, you know, there are governments that have consistently put forward their views about human rights being culturally based and relative to various—to the voices of our

colleagues. But they have always consistently been pushed back on those views by, you know, human rights bodies and individuals.

And, you know, to the extent that there is concern about China and what violations in human rights have been done in Wuhan—I am sorry, in Xinjiang to the Uighur community, is the CERD—the committee that I sit on—that called that out, if you will, on the international stage and started the global publicity about it and condemnation about it.

So there is as much pushback as there is, you know, positions being continuously put forward from their point of view. What we have got to maintain is that we have got a principle to push back that is, you know, in those rooms, sitting in those seats.

Ms. TENNEY. So you agree that—with Mr. Dugan that we could have an experienced, dedicated institutional voice in there to make sure that China is held accountable on human rights and other issues?

Ms. MCDUGALL. Absolutely. In this particular case, Mr. Dugan helped to run the campaign. They need that voice in that room in that seat to call China out about what was happening to the Uighurs.

Ms. TENNEY. Thank you so much. I know my time has expired. I really appreciate all of you.

Mr. CASTRO. And Ms. Otero had something she wanted to add. And, you know, we have got a little bit of time here because, you know, we have time.

Ms. OTERO. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a very brief addition to this. I think it is really important to recognize that China is making the case that their system works better than a democratic system that is based on a market economy.

This is enormously important. They are being vocal about that, and it is basically an argument that they are putting before the world and that they are using through agencies like the U.N. Our role is to be at that table and to argue that our system, our democratic values, the values of the United Nations charter are the ones that we must uphold.

And this is an issue that spans many countries and the world. And so our effort to be able to form those alliances and create those coalitions and create what you would call situations of strength within the U.N. is one way in which we can really push back in not only a crucial way, but I would even say in an urgent way.

Ms. TENNEY. Thank you. Great. I appreciate that.

Mr. CASTRO. All right. Representative Tenney asked the most popular question.

Ms. TENNEY. Thank you.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CASTRO. All right. We are going to go now to Representative Houlahan.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you, Chairman. And my question is actually for Ms. Otero and Mr. Hannum.

I want to bring us back to 2017 when the United States cutoff funding for the UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund, which of course supports reproductive health for women and girls around the world, along with implementing programs to help pre-

vent child marriage, gender-based violence programs, female genital mutilation.

I was hoping if we could start with Ms. Otero, if you could describe the impact that this has had on the UNFPA and its ability to protect the health of women and girls around the world, as well as against fighting practices like female genital mutilation and child marriage.

Ms. OTERO. Thank you for that question, a very important one, and one that I have worked in personally in my career. There is no question that the UNFPA works on the ground helping create the capacity of even the traditional birth attendants in Africa to be able to deliver maternal health, to deliver the kind of support that children need, in countries where malnutrition and lack of access to health is so prevalent.

If our commitment is really to help this vulnerable population, especially women, and especially address women's not only health but also their ability because they are in good health, to be able to be educated and to be able to participate in their societies, then we really are not living up to the values that we propose.

There is no question that some of the practices that are imposed on young girls and on women, like genital mutilation, in fact, more and more countries are seen as very problematic and very unacceptable, and it is through these institutions that we are able to move those arguments forward to instruct people to help educate.

So cutting those resources directly affects the way which women around the world live, especially those that are among the poorest on the planet.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you, Ms. Otero.

Mr. Hannum, would you be able to add any more color to this?

Mr. HANNUM. Yes. Let me just make three quick points. One, I think it is important just to again stress, you know, as you noted, that UNFPA as an organization, you know, seeks to help women safely deliver children each day.

So as an example, in the large Za'atri Refugee Camp in Jordan, which I have been to, but UNFPA ran the maternity ward over a period of a few years. Ten thousand children were born, you know, without one maternal death. It is remarkable, and that is a program they used—the U.S. used to support but stopped.

And actually, to put a finer point on that, it used to be when a new child was born, there would be a little sticker on the bassinet with the U.S. flag. You know, and think about what a lasting image that was for a new mother. And then the Trump Administration revoked our funding and, you know, they removed those stickers, so that is just one example of their work.

You asked about impact of cuts. Let's look quickly at Yemen and Venezuela, obviously areas Congress has been focused on. But before 2017, the U.S. had been the second largest donor for UNFPA's emergency response there. The funding was used to help mothers access health care, supports violence, gender-based violence.

In 2019, after another year of Trump Administration withholdings, this fund ran out of money in the middle of the year. And it is in places like these that, you know, UNFPA is leading the effort. It is not viable to switch to some other U.N. entity or other partners.

And then, finally, just in terms of child marriage, female genital mutilation, you know, one can look at Central Sahel. Right now violence between armed groups has forced over 100 health centers to close, and this disruption has been compounded by COVID-19.

And as it stands, UNFPA's humanitarian operations there have only received 28 percent of 27 million that is needed for humanitarian assistance. And this is a region where 90 percent of women or girls have undergone female genital mutilation in Niger, which I have been to, about 75 percent of girls were married before age 18.

So it is—you know, our resources could have made a difference, and so we would certainly welcome the decision to restore funding because it is desperately needed.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Yes. And I look forward to reintroduction of legislation to allow and support that as well.

And I know I only have 20 seconds, Mr. Chair. Am I able to ask one more question? Okay. Thank you.

Mr. CASTRO. Of course.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you. And this is for Mr. Hannum as well regarding U.N. peacekeeping operations and the role that, of course, they play in stabilizing conflict zones.

My specific interest is in women and what role and what else can be done with the U.N. to better integrate women into peacekeeping forces, and how can we, as a Nation, be helpful in supporting those initiatives and efforts and reforms.

Mr. HANNUM. Thank you. Yes. So, one, I would just say in peacekeeping in general, I do think it is important to know because there is a lot of talk, understandably, on Capitol Hill about challenges with peacekeeping. But it is important to remember that we now have two decades of data that shows that peacekeeping works. It saves lives and shortens conflicts.

Across the board, you know, within peacekeeping operations in countries, the United Nations, there needs to be more, you know, women engaged. And this is something the U.S. called for in the Women, Peace, and Security Act, and I will say the U.N. is actually ahead of some other nations, chiefly the United States, in terms of having women engage. And there is data to show what that means. Women troops often are able to talk more with kind of local community, get information.

So you have seen examples, and Liberia is a good example. We have been there, and a number of kind of women contingents, battalions, which make an important difference. But this needs to be increased because, again, the data shows the important benefits that come from it. And I think the Women, Peace, and the Security Act, which Congress passed, there needs to be an effort using that to increase the numbers, both here and within U.N. missions.

Ms. OTERO. If you permit me to add—

Ms. HOULAHAN. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. OTERO [continuing]. Mr. Chair, I would only just focus on the fact that in areas of conflict, women, through gender-based violence, suffer the most. Raping women is a way of acquiring that territory, and this happens in all of the areas of conflict. I have visited and met with women in the Republic Congo, in areas where they can attest to not only this happening outside of the refugee

campes where there would be a conflict, but also all around in the areas of conflict.

So women are not only important as security and peacekeeping force part of that effort, but they are also the ones that are suffering the most. And gender-based violence is something that we absolutely have got to address in the strongest of ways through these institutions.

Thank you.

Mr. CASTRO. All right. I see—

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. CASTRO. Oh, yes. Thank you, Ms. Houlahan.

I see that Representative Issa is on, but his video is not on. And so I will wait for his video to come on before I call on him.

In the meantime, let's start another quick second round. And, you know, every time we do a second round—if you have a question, please feel free to ask it. If you do not have a question, do not worry. Sometimes I have been on the dais and they say, "Oh, we are going to do a second round," and then you feel like "I have got to ask something." You know, if you have a question, you know, please, a question or two, feel free. If not, it is Okay. All right?

But let me start with mine. And, again, when Darrell comes on, I will jump to him. All right?

So I want to start with Ms. McDougall because I know that you work squarely on these issues. I want to ask a question about how we can use the United Nations and other international organizations to combat a lot of the challenges that we see here domestically. And chief among those, for example, is structural systemic racism in nations.

And, obviously, while the dynamics in each country vary, the issue of structural racism is not something that is only particular to the United States. You know, we have also spoken about how we make issues like the rights of women, the rights of indigenous, the rights of workers; foreign affairs issues, how the United States can leverage its position in the international organizations to press these issues even more.

So, you know, we can start with the structural racism issue, but then also consider the other issues. And then, Ms. McDougall, if you want to go first, and then we will open it up.

Ms. MCDUGALL. Okay. Well, I think that it is very important—and it is very important to people of color in this country—to understand that structural racism has a transnational component, and it is everywhere. And that the U.N. represents an ability to join the forces and the issues on structural racism and come out with solutions that can be offered, suggested, what have you, to all, primarily through the committee that I have sat on and will again hopefully, the U.N. Committee on Racial Discrimination.

And there are also certain very useful occasions that have been hosted—organized and hosted by the United Nations like the Third World Conference Against Racism and the—this year—next year, sorry—this year, I believe, is the 20th anniversary. And there will be a number of gatherings and events around that.

The U.N. really needs—I mean, the U.S. really needs to engage fully and vigorously with all of these efforts, because it States to other nations where there are now a tremendous number of, for ex-

ample, African descendant populations, that the U.S. is actually on their side, and the U.S. needs to engage bilaterally with those countries about what we know about racism and solutions and what we know about the mistakes of trying to create solutions, and, you know, foster more exchanges of activist groups, of warriors, of advocates, from both countries.

We have got—and we recognize it—a tremendous amount of knowledge, certainly a history of centuries of trying to, you know, approach this issue, one of the weightiest in America's history. And we are recognized in that regard.

So, for instance, the statement that was just read by the U.S. and submitted to the 46th session of the Human Rights Council on countering racism. That was signed onto by 155 countries. No other country could have achieved that.

And so I think that what we need to do is to make it as much a part of our foreign policy as our domestic policy. But we have to be honest, and we have to be vigorous in both respects. So I think there are a lot of opportunities that have so far been missed by all administrations.

And with leadership such as yourself in Congress, we might be able to do more in that regard.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you. Uh-huh?

Mr. HANNUM. Mr. Chairman, I would only add, since Professor McDougall is well more versed on these issues than I, but just one example I think of, you know, kind of the importance of some of these global bodies that we talked about and also our absence being a challenge.

But, you know, in the last year, about a year ago, in the wake of George Floyd's death, you know, the U.N. Human Rights Council held a session on systemic racism and police violence, which was particularly important. Again, it is—you know, it

[inaudible] of the Council's work. And it adopted a resolution calling for the High Commissioner for Human Rights to prepare a global report on the issue. And Human Rights Watch, other organizations, noted that this resolution was a step in the right direction, but also that it could have gone further.

And I think this is an example of, you know, where if the U.S. had been there, just in general, when the U.S. is engaged, we can push the narrative. And so I think this is, again, an example why being part of the Council—and I would just say there have been a number of comments on the Council.

I would just think it is important to say that we have now 10 years of data to show that when the U.S. is engaged at the Council that it is much more likely to hold, you know, repressive regimes accountable and to push important reforms, whether it be—or important concepts that we believe in, whether it be LGBT issues, freedom of assembly, freedom of association. So the data is clear. We should be engaged.

Thanks.

Mr. CASTRO. All right, you all. Thank you all. I am going to go now to—it looks like Representative Issa got his camera on and everything, and we drove with him in the car for a minute, and now he is in his office. So, Darrell, please.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. And I apologize. We all are multitasking, and on the West Coast I am afraid we are doing a lot of it.

Two categories of questions. And the first one I think—during the last Administration, there was an attempt to partially consolidate our competition to the Belt and Road with, you know, recognizing that, you know, you have EXIM Bank, TDA, and USAID. You have a series of, both in and out of the State Department, agencies that are part of foreign development.

I would love to hear your thoughts on whether or not that should go further if we are going to have a U.S. united ability to bring dollars and U.S. companies and the like into successfully competing—to help develop the world against what, you know, I think can only be said China's self-serving development program.

Mr. DUGAN. If I may answer that. Thank you very much for that very thoughtful question, Congressman. And, indeed, China has tried to masquerade its ambitions on Belt and Road by saying that they are fully in support and that they are tantamount to advancing the U.N.'s strategic development goals, which is very much the Bible of U.N. development these days.

So they are undercover of advancing those goals. They are, in fact, enriching their own infrastructure project around the world.

Since we speak of international organizations today, we should note the international financial institutions among them, and China still is represented within those and considered a developing country for the sake of receiving benefits and resources and benefits of the doubt all around. So they play back very well, as I described earlier. They play within the rules, and they play them very hard, maybe not within the spirit but within the letter of the law. And we need to call them out when we think that they are taking advantage of the largesse and goodwill of an international liberal order that is rules-based and that assumes the best in others.

I think we discovered that WTO needs a great deal of reform as well. That is another organization that—and thanks to China driving a truck through the WTO, once they were allowed in, they decided to take that big truck and back it up to the U.N. and load it up for Beijing.

So I quote understand your question, and, yes, we need to re-evaluate their qualification as a developing country status within the international financial institutions. We should not be subsidizing this grand scheme of theirs.

Thank you.

Mr. HANNUM. And, Congressman, I might just add one other point there, and I would just say I think there is already a model that we know which works, which is, you know, countering Russia during the cold war. And, you know, President—former President Reagan, you know, talked about kind of peace through strength.

And so one of the things we need to do—you know, what China has done—is invested significantly in economic development, in diplomacy. And the U.S., you know, only spends about 1 percent of the Federal affairs budget on diplomacy and development. Of course, we need to use our dollars wise.

But during the 1980's, we spent far more as a percentage of GDP on diplomacy and development than we do now. So that is what

China is doing. We know it worked, and so we absolutely need to support additional resources for State and USAID to—you know, to compete.

Mr. ISSA. And I agree with that, and we will continue to push for that. But the question is more narrow. You know, the Chinese intervention around the world, and particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, is not a gift. Their programs—their development programs are much closer to something akin to EXIM Bank, leveraged with maybe Trade and Development Agency, because they are bringing in their companies. As you know, they are bringing in their own workers even.

And they end up, in many, many cases owning these assets. But in all cases, it is not really foreign aid in the sense of any kind of a gift. And that is where they are competing successfully against us.

You know, I will just take one that most people do not think about. If they put in a telephone system in a developing nation, there is no question in anyone's mind that that is a conduit of espionage back to Beijing. They have full transparency as to the government and private sector operations as a result, and that is separate from the large bridges, roads, and port projects that most people see. But they work hand in hand, and those programs dwarf all of our programs combined.

And I do not think the American people are ever going to give a trillion dollars in foreign aid, but the question is, can we and should we look at a program—and I will just call it a trillion dollars—in potential loans and projects that are self-funding in the long run. Should that be a goal? Because right now, during the last Administration, as you know, EXIM Bank was effectively shut down and we were out of even the small amount of competition we had historically done.

Ms. OTERO. If I could—thank you for that question, if I may proceed with it. There is no question that China is repeating all the benefits of the last few years of our withdrawal from working in these organizations and in these manners, and has moved forward with its own set of priorities, with its own efforts in trade, and with its own way of getting countries—giving countries support, the response of countries supporting them in their own priorities, such as, for example, when they wanted to head up the intellectual property rights organization, they wanted total support.

I think we need to remember that working through multilateral organizations, such as the World Bank and the regional banks, allows us also to be able to work with organizations that are leveraging billions of dollars from the global capital markets. And they are channeling these resources directly to the private sectors of existing developing countries.

Part of our role in this work, of course, is to be able to help increase the—if you will, the punching of these multilateral organizations in spite of the problems that they may have, and not really just rely on member contributions. The global capital markets are the big players in here, because we can access enormous resources if we bring them forward.

They are part of the world financial system, one that we dominate, and this is one way which we can avoid thinking about having to put forth a trillion investment ourselves.

We can work with other countries, and we have the structures. And it is interesting that the IFC at the World Bank or the IDB invest in the international—Inter-American Development Bank. If you look at the resources that they are making available, they are one way to counter what China is doing.

Second, our trade in the introduction of U.S. companies into the developing world relies on us being present, being at the table, paying our dues, and being able to open the space for them to counter the threat that China is proposing and gaining ground on.

Mr. CASTRO. All right, you all. Thank you.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you. I am going to go to Ms. Omar, and then we will go to the ranking member, Ms. Malliotakis. Ms. Omar.

Ms. OMAR. Thank you, Chairman.

Ms. McDougall?

Ms. MCDUGALL. Yes.

Ms. OMAR. Sorry if I pronounced your name wrong. I think that a lot of Americans are actually sometimes really shocked when they learn about the number of human rights conventions that the United States is not a party to. In the last Congress, I introduced a resolution calling on the Senate to ratify the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child.

We are the only country in the world to not have ratified that Convention, and there are many, many others that we haven't done so. What does this do to our credibility on human rights and asking other countries to abide by international obligations when we refuse to ratify these treaties and conventions ourselves?

Ms. MCDUGALL. Well, thank you for that question. You know, I think that it is a gaping hole in our credibility. We cannot—this is a system that actually the U.S., you know, initiated, as I said, through Eleanor Roosevelt.

We very quickly decided that for reasons that I do not think most Americans know, nor would agree with if they did, that it did not serve all the purposes of structural racism actually in the country at the time that the decision was to not ratify most of these conventions.

And as a result, it set up a system that hasn't allowed others through, such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child. I mean, who could be against that? We are the only ones that seem to be in the world.

So, you know, I think that it is a—you know, it is a byproduct of a system in our country that has allowed—that has been created in many ways over a long period of time to protect those States that want to maintain structural rights for slavery and end structural racism. And so it has created power in the hands of a few.

So the outcome is that, you know, in situations like the treaty system, which by and large operates in our favor across the board, why are we not part of the convention on the elimination of discrimination against women? What about the convention on the rights of disabled people that was very much modeled after our own widely popular national law?

We need a total rethink in a different framework, a different maybe congressional framework—

Ms. OMAR. Right.

Ms. MCDUGALL [continuing]. For a decision as to how we enter these other treaties, human rights treaty systems.

Ms. OMAR. Yes. For the rights of the child, it was very fascinating to me because I was in Somalia, which was one of the last two countries besides us, and they ratified it in 2016, and I was sent to celebrate that happening.

And I remember sitting with our U.S. Ambassador, who was there and cheering this on, and who helped fund, you know, that campaign to make it happen, without us actually realizing that we ourselves have not participated in that.

And then I wanted to maybe get your take on something that I think is a really good idea. I have been pleased to see that the Biden Administration is intending on reengaging with the U.N. Human Rights Council. I think that is the right thing to do.

But the Council's detractors have a point, right? A lot of the countries that are a party to have appalling human rights records. And I am wondering what you think of our engagement and membership on the Human Rights Council to promote human rights.

Ms. MCDUGALL. Well, I am very much in favor of the Biden Administration reentering the Human Rights Council. It gives us an opportunity first of all to listen, to make sure we fully understand all of the arguments around the room, and then to make more informed choices, to form coalitions that we can work with, coalitions of other governments, that can maybe create better outcomes.

But, I will tell you, you know, it is truly a dilemma, this question that the U.N. has had to tussle with for a long time. Is the worst outside or inside? Do you want them in a—you know, another dimension where they cannot hear what you have to say, or to be subject to whatever power you may coalesce against, you know, their practices, et cetera.

I think it is a difficult decision. I think so far the U.N. has come down correct on the best possible side of that decision. But it does lend itself to—it is, you know, sometimes uncomfortable for, say, short-term outcomes.

Ms. OMAR. Thank you, Chairman. I would like to ask—when we do our second round, maybe I will get an opportunity to ask the other members the same questions.

Mr. HANNUM. And can I just—10 seconds, just one point there, Congresswoman, just to say in terms of the—in terms of engagement, what we have found is that countries—our adversaries are delighted when we are not part of the organization. They welcome—and there are examples, most notably Russia in 2016, where we helped mobilize countries to block them from joining. So we are much more likely to block countries with terrible track records by being engaged than not.

Ms. OMAR. Chairman, you are muted.

Mr. CASTRO. Sorry. I saw Ms. Otero had her hand up, so I am going to go to her for a second. But after that, we are on our second round, so I am going to go to Representative Jacobs and then back to Representative Omar, unless somebody else has questions, other representatives.

And then we are trying to close by noon Central—or, I am sorry, noon I guess Eastern. And so, you know, I am going to—do not think me rude, but I may keep people on time as we are answering these questions. OK?

Ms. Otero, your final comment on this question.

Ms. OTERO. Thank you. Actually, my comment was on the previous question, if you would permit me—

Mr. CASTRO. Yes.

Ms. OTERO [continuing]. About children. I would say that, if the American people had any idea of the conditions in which children live around the world, as they are laborers with incredible levels of exploitation, as they are trafficked for sexual and other things, as they are working in the mines in the Congo and in other places, as they are put in refugee camps.

And I have been several times to Dadaab on the Somalian border and to the Rohingya Bank camps where it is full of children. If we had, there would be enormous outrage, as there was when families were separated from their children in our southern border.

And the American people I think need to have more information about these factors, and we need to make sure that we are able to communicate because the goodness of the American people, the kindness of their spirit, the values that they give to family and to their own children, are factors that we need to be able to demonstrate and the way in which we interact with other countries and in the conventions that we sign and we do not sign.

And so I think these are really important concerns that we also need to build into the way in which we project our country's efforts in the rest of the world.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Otero.

All right, you all. So I think our final two questions will be Representative Jacobs and then Representative Omar, and then I will close. I would just ask everybody to be on the grid view and look at the 5-minute timer for these last two questions, all right, so that we can close on time.

Representative JACOBS.

Ms. JACOBS. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So my question is for Ms. Otero and Mr. Hannum. I was wondering if you could talk a little bit about what you think the most important reforms would be to the United Nations, whether that is the Security Council reforms that I kind of mentioned in my previous questioning or otherwise. But in terms of really being able to address the kinds of challenges we are facing now, what you think the most impactful reforms might be.

Ms. OTERO. Please, Mr. Hannum, go ahead, since you live—

Mr. HANNUM. Sure.

Ms. OTERO [continuing]. And breathe it every day.

Mr. HANNUM. Yes. Happy to. Congresswoman, let me start I guess with an issue I think near and dear to your heart, which is around peace-building. I mean, this is something that the Secretary General feels very strongly about because there is just, of course, quite a bit of data about how much—you know, if you can invest in peace-building efforts, how much it saves you down the road.

The problem is, as we all know, you know, people generally—it is hard to do kind of upstream efforts. It is kind of only—only when

a crisis is coming that there is an impetus to do more. And so I think there—I mean, this is where I think U.S. engagement could be particularly important and, quite honestly, funding. And, I mean, again, the data shows how much an investment in peace-building would save down the line.

So just looking at 2020, I mean, there is a peace-building fund which mobilized about \$180 million. But those resources are now depleted and must be finished. So, one, of course, that is significant. But in the—you know, when we are talking about the 20 trillion that has been lost because of COVID, and how that has exacerbated extreme poverty, and you have seen the first increases in 20-plus years, there needs to be more investments along these lines. It is critically important.

And then I would also say, just in terms of COVID—cannot talk in 2021 without talking about COVID—there has got to be U.S. and others mobilizing support around equitable vaccine distribution. I mean, everyone is talking about vaccines, but also many—a number of countries—I mean, we still need to make sure countries have personal protective equipment and therapeutics.

And so there needs to be right now, you know, a coalition that comes together. Seventy-five countries haven't even gotten a single dose. We need to come together. The U.S. has begun this, which is welcome, but need to come together and support this. We know the economic returns, but the health and humanitarian reasons are there. So I would say kind of peace-building and then an all-hands-on-deck around COVID.

Ms. OTERO. I would only add to this that, you know, when we think about the U.N. writ large and we say, oh my gosh, you know, why should we put any resources in that; you know, it just goes into a black hole and we cannot really see them. In fact, these institutions that we have created and that have operated for 40 years or more do need reform, and reform does need resources.

And I think it is very important to be able to take each piece of the organizations—for example, if you just use the U.N. High Commission on Refugees, and you look at what has happened to humanitarian aid, to displaced people, to refugees, just in the last few years, they have grown to be more than 80 million people that are displaced around the world.

How can we create reforms in the structure that we use to address humanitarian aid? It begins with the U.N.

And so my suggestion is that we look at each arm of the United Nations, and we put resources into figuring out the best ways in which we can reform them. And it is easier to do this with those that are delivering services to the vulnerable and to all the populations around the world that need them. It is harder to do this with the U.N. Security Council, but also necessary.

So I think we really need to think about reform as an activity that requires our leadership and resources from everywhere to be able to carry out.

Mr. DUGAN. If I may add, just briefly, on that. This year is the selection of the Secretary General. It is a wonderful opportunity for us to come forward with our vision of the organization, with our need for accountability as a management tool, and with our plans to beef up our team as—

Mr. CASTRO. Mr. Dugan, I have to interrupt you. We are out of time in this question, and I have got to keep us on time, so that we finish by noon Eastern. But you want to make 5 seconds of closing remarks there on that question?

Mr. DUGAN. Yes, just to say that we have a unique opportunity this year with the selection of the Secretary General to broadcast what we expect and what we need from the organization and to commit our resources to creating a team that understands and works the organization well on the ground.

Mr. CASTRO. Sure. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for those remarks.

It looks like Congressman Issa is back on, and he has got—you have a question, Darrell, I assume? I think you are on mute. But, Darrell, I am going to keep everybody to the 5 minutes.

So, please, panelists and members, watch that 5-minute clock. Let's stick to the 5 minutes. So we will go with Representative Issa, then Representative Omar, our last questioning, and then I will close real quick and we will be done.

All right. Representative Issa.

Mr. ISSA. Yes. I am trying to unmute.

Mr. CASTRO. There you go. There you go.

Mr. ISSA. Excellent. Thank you. I want to followup on the 80 million figure of refugees and asylum allocation. I do not think—I would be kidding you if I said that there was an interesting ambiguity going on right now at our southern border.

We receive hundreds of thousands of applications for asylum every month from what is disproportionately found after the fact to be economic refugees, people seeking a better life at our southern border. Less than 5 percent of them will be granted asylum, but that will still dwarf the amount of asylums that—and/or refugee, you know, visas that will be granted to people in those tens of millions of refugee camps around the world.

How would you propose that we right size or rectify the fact that these camps have become places that do not—people do not leave them as a percentage, they are becoming more and more permanent camps, and the world in general is taking—and including the U.S.—is taking a relatively small portion of these refugees, and their host—their former countries are in many cases, even after conflict, are not taking them back.

How would you suggest that we make a major overhaul in what has become a very large and ever-growing problem of permanent refugees and the lack of asylum and refugee allocations by member countries of the United Nations, us included?

Ms. OTERO. Thank you, Congressman, for that incredibly complex and important question that I do not know if we can answer fully here. However, let me just add one thing. One is that, for example, if we look at our southern border, the countries that people are coming from are those countries that are the poorest, the ones that offer the least opportunities for people, but are also the ones that are mired in violence and in corruption.

So you might think you have an economic refugee. But if that economic refugee is one who is in his or her little place, has a tiny little business, that then has to pay a weekly amount to someone that is threatening them to do that, or a child is—

Mr. ISSA. I apologize. I wasn't implying that. I was simply using the ratio that our courts have found of those who come versus those who are granted. And the bigger question, which is these countries do not have, for the most part, those 80 million people that are in refugee camps that are becoming permanent.

I am not disagreeing that we have a problem south of our border and that we need to engage. I am simply saying that that is getting the focus of the media, both here and around the world, this permanent problem. I visited the camps in Jordan, in Lebanon, and, you know, some of them dating back to 1948, others more recent. And as I have seen these grow, I have become concerned that we have gotten good at allocating resources to refugees but not very good at finding solutions to their status.

Ms. OTERO. Just to add to that, there is no question that one of the reasons that these camps have a protracted presence in them is because conflict continues. Somalia is a perfectly good example. Dadaab Camp between Kenya and Somalia is the second largest city in Kenya. However, the Somalians, their country is still in upheaval and have nowhere to be able to go.

And so you are right, Congressman, there are these situations, and I have meant people in refugees camps that were born in refugee camps and that have lived and learned what they could there. So I do think that those camps reflect the enormous displacement caused by conflict around the world. And, again, this is one of the areas that is so connected to the role that we play in developing countries and in the overall global scene.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you. All right. Thank you.

Mr. ISSA. I want to—I will just quickly in closing say, you know, some of the camps I visited—the camps that have been there since the 1940's—reflect the fact that it is not about one Administration. I do think that this committee needs to take a look at the permanent refugee status around the world and to help develop a plan to change that.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you. Thank you, Congressman Issa.

And then our final question from Congresswoman Omar.

Ms. OMAR. Well, first of all, I would like to thank Congressman Issa for that question. I and my family sat in a refugee camp in Kenya called Utango that is closed now for 4 years waiting for asylum. I was one of the very fortunate ones to have gotten that.

I did go back in 2016, 2011, to the Somali-Kenyan border and was in the Dadaab and remember seeing young people who were in that Utango camp with me who did not get to relocate and start—get an opportunity to get asylum elsewhere but went back into another refugee camp. And they—as I have had children, had an opportunity here in the United States, got an education, they have lived in that camp and have had their children in those refugee camps.

And so, yes, we do have a responsibility and should have a conversation. It was devastating to watch the last 4 years our numbers of admitting refugees dwindle to like 18,000, so I am delighted to hear that we might go up to 125,000. So that is part of our responsibility, and I do hope the Congressmen will join us in advocating for those increased numbers.

But I wanted to go back to Ms. McDougall. Earlier you mentioned something in regards to racial justice, and I know that a lot of activists in the United States, from Malcolm X to Puerto Rican independent activists, have drawn on the U.N. system and human rights in their own struggles here at home. What do you see as the relationship between the international community and our struggle for racial justice here?

Ms. MCDUGALL. Well, I think it is, first and foremost, a continuing inspiration. And it leads people, as it lead me to believe when I was young and growing up in Jim Crow south, that out in the international community there are different rules, rules about equality.

And as W.E.B. Du Bois saw the U.N and said, "This is going to create new forums for African Americans to plead their case for equality." I think our challenge is to make sure it is that, in fact, and that is why I do the work that I have done with the Racism Committee, Anti-Racism Committee, and as a special rapporteur on minorities around the world.

Are we living up to these hopes of being the—of speaking to and supporting the claims for equality of people, not only black people in the United States but minorities around the world? That is our responsibility, and we have got to constantly question if the U.N. is fit for that purpose.

Ms. OMAR. Appreciate that. Thank you, Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Congresswoman Omar. And thank you to our witnesses for your testimony, and to our Members of Congress for all of your questions.

I have just some closing remarks real quick, and then we will conclude. You know, after today's testimony, it should be clearer than ever to this Congress that international organizations and our participation in them play an indispensable role in advancing American values and defending American interests.

We were instrumental in the creation of these institutions of the international order. We must be just as instrumental in leading them through the 21st century. And it is also clear that if we do not, other nations will, to our detriment and I believe to the detriment of the world.

Working through international organizations, even when acting alone might be quicker or more advantageous in the short term, will make our global leadership stronger and more impactful in the long run.

And with that, I want to say again thank you to all of our very distinguished panelists, our witnesses, to the Members of Congress who participated.

We are adjourned. Thank you all. Take care, everybody.

[Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

**SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128

**Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations and Global
Corporate Social Impact**

Joaquin Castro (D-TX), Chair

REVISED

March 19, 2021

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to be held by the Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations and Global Corporate Social Impact virtually via Cisco WebEx. The hearing is available by live webcast on the Committee website at <https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/>.

DATE: Tuesday, March 23, 2021

TIME: 10:00 a.m., EDT

SUBJECT: United States Standing in International Organizations.

WITNESSES: The Honorable Maria Otero
*(Former Under Secretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy, and
Human Rights, Department of State)*

Mr. Jordie Hannum
Executive Director
Better World Campaign

* Ms. Gay J. McDougall
Senior Fellow and Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence
Leitner Center for International Law and Justice/Center for Race, Law,
and Justice
Fordham University School of Law

* Mr. Hugh Dugan
Former Senior Director for International Organization Affairs at the
National Security Council

*NOTE: Witnesses have been added.

*NOTE: Further witnesses may be added.

By Direction of the Chair

To fill out this form online, either use the tab key to travel through each field or mouse click each line or within blue box. Type in information.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Note: Red boxes with red type will NOT print.

MINUTES OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GLOBAL CORPORATE SOCIAL IMPACT HEARING

Day Tuesday Date 3/23/2021 Room Cisco WebEx

Starting Time 10:00 am Ending Time 12:00 pm

Recesses 0 (to) (to) (to) (to) (to) (to)

Presiding Member(s) Chairman Joaquin Castro

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session [x] Electronically Recorded (taped) [x]
Executive (closed) Session [] Stenographic Record [x]
Televised [x]

To select a box, mouse click it, or tab to it and use the enter key to select. Another click on the same box will deselect it.

TITLE OF HEARING: United States Standing in International Organizations

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: See attached hearing attendance form.

NON-SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: (Mark with an * if they are not members of full committee.) None

HEARING WITNESSES: Same as meeting notice attached? Yes [x] No [] (If "no", please list below and include title, agency, department, or organization.)

STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD: (List any statements submitted for the record.)

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE or TIME ADJOURNED 12:00 pm

Clear Form

Note: If listing additional witnesses not included on hearing notice, be sure to include title, agency, etc.

JV Subcommittee Staff Associate

WHEN COMPLETED: Please print for subcommittee staff director's signature and make at least one copy of the signed form. A signed copy is to be included with the hearing/markup transcript when ready for printing along with a copy of the final meeting notice (both will go into the appendix). The signed original, with a copy of the final meeting notice attached, goes to full committee. An electronic copy of this PDF file may be saved to your hearing folder, if desired.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

*SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND GLOBAL CORPORATE SOCIAL IMPACT HEARING*

<i>PRESENT</i>	<i>MEMBER</i>
X	Joaquin Castro, TX
X	Sara Jacobs, CA
	Brad Sherman, CA
X	Ihlan Omar, MN
X	Chrissy Houlahan, PA
X	Andy Kim, NJ

<i>PRESENT</i>	<i>MEMBER</i>
X	Nicole Malliotakis, NY
X	Darrell Issa, CA
X	Lee Zeldin, NY
X	Claudia Tenney, NY