
Partnerships for Peace, Human Rights, and Development

By

Kim R. Holmes

Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs

[The following are excerpts of the remarks presented to the World Affairs Council of Northern California San Francisco, California, 30 September 2004.]

Our country truly faces new challenges to peace, as well as old problems. Terrorism, Iraq, dirty bombs, ethnic cleansing, human immuno-deficiency virus and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS) these are critical issues. The way forward is not always clear. What is clear to everyone is that this nation needs partners in today's world partnerships with other nations and partnerships with international organizations to solve our problems. To us in this administration, there is no more important strategy for securing peace than building strong partnerships. That is also true for protecting human rights, and for promoting sustainable development.

The United States participates in organizations like the United Nations not only to serve and promote American interests and values. We do so as well to fulfill the hopes and dreams of people in all corners of the globe. We enter alliances like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to protect international security. We establish partnerships like the Proliferation Security Initiative to counter the spread of weapons of mass destruction. And we give generously to fight diseases like human immuno-deficiency virus and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS). This is not foreign policy window dressing. Partnerships are an essential element of our national strategy. They are as important to us as the Golden Gate Bridge is to the life of San Francisco a bridge bringing people together to solve problems a two-way avenue of exchange and commerce, serving a common purpose and realizing individual dreams.

Please read the President's *National Security Strategy*. Each chapter relates the importance of partnerships to our national interests. It shows how we must work together to face down the threats of terrorism or natural disasters. And how we must cooperate to address the despair caused by failed states, famine, or disease. Partnerships are not panaceas, however, they are effective only when they are rooted in the right principles, have clear purposes, and translate these principles into practice. Tonight, I would like to share with you some of the ways this Administration fosters effective partnerships for peace, human rights, and development.

No Other Path But Partnering

America's position in the world is unmatched. Americans seek not to conquer territory. Instead, we seek to expand freedom. We know that freedom and prosperity are blessings to share. Freedom is not some shop-worn ideology belonging only to us. It belongs to everyone. And for those who think otherwise, I only ask them two questions: Who in this world truly desires to be unfree? Who in this world would you want to be unfree? As complicated as international life may be, no one should doubt that in every heart beats this very longing to be free from oppression, to be free from want and disease, and to be free to express oneself and to choose one's own government.

America's strategy of partnerships is rooted in this transforming power of liberty, as the President calls it. "America," he said, "must stand firmly for the non-negotiable demands of human dignity: the rule of law; limits on the absolute power of the state; free speech; freedom of worship; equal justice; respect for women; religious and ethnic tolerance; and respect for private property."

New Partnerships For Peace

At this time in history, the United States is indispensable to achieve these goals. Some may wish it were not so. Others may envy our position. But no one can deny that these goals will only be realized by other countries and organizations with our help, and with our leadership. In no other area is this demand for American leadership and for our need to partner with other nations more evident than in keeping the peace.

Since the end of the Second World War, it is clear we need new solutions to solve new problems. Traditional hard power alliances to deter state aggression were not set up to deal with terrorists. Many of our traditional organizations do not deter insurgents who want to prevent progress and peace. Neither have they deterred every tyrant or regime that wanted nuclear weapons. Today, most people understand the terrible threat that could be posed by terrorists possessing weapons of mass destruction. The possibility requires new partnerships for peace.

One such partnership came together after September 11, 2001. Since the Global War on Terror began, eighty-four nations have stepped up to work with us to make the world more secure from that threat. Former antagonists collaborate to uproot and destroy al Qaeda and other terrorists. We are partnering, for example, with Pakistan, a state that once supported the Taliban. In the same vein, we are working with Libya to dismantle its weapons of mass destruction. We are working with the European Union, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and others to discourage Iran from pursuing nuclear weapons. We are doing the same with China and others for North Korea.

In the Security Council, we recently spearheaded and achieved a historic resolution on non-proliferation. Among other strong measures, it calls on all states to cooperate to prevent trafficking in weapons of mass destruction. That is exactly what the President's Proliferation Security Initiative is all about. Our partners in this initiative agree to board ships on their way to countries of concern, and seize any materials that could be used to develop nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons.

In Iraq and Afghanistan, coalitions are working with the United Nations (U.N.) and non-governmental organizations (non-government organizations) to help these two states hold their first free elections in the next few months. It is an important step to securing peace. We were pleased that our allies in NATO recently decided to boost assistance to Iraq's security forces. They also will establish a training center in Iraq. Such action is unprecedented. It shows these twenty-six nations understand the link between fighting terrorism and promoting democratic institutions and the rule of law. In today's security environment, we also recognize the threat posed by failed states. It is no accident that three of the safe havens for al Qaeda, the Sudan, Somalia, and Afghanistan were failed states. Such states also provide operational bases for organized crime, are breeding grounds for diseases like HIV/AIDS, and strain the economies of their neighbors. Another area where partnerships are crucial is international peacekeeping. Once the fighting stops, the United Nations and other organizations can help build the peace with peacekeeping and humanitarian operations.

Americans gave \$1 billion this fiscal year (which ends today) to support peacekeeping efforts in such places as Kosovo, Liberia, the Congo, Haiti, and Burundi. But we often do more than just give money. We often take the military and diplomatic lead to set up these operations. This is what we did in Liberia. After the all-African force brokered a settlement, a U.S. Marine force assisted the regional peacekeepers on security. We are supporting efforts to develop a civilian police force there as well.

We did the same thing in Haiti. As rebels neared the capital, we worked with our other "Friends of Haiti" at the U.N. with France, Canada, Chile, and Brazil to craft an international response. U.S., French, Canadian, and Chilean troops went in first on an emergency basis. Then

a U.N. approved stabilization force followed. Since the hurricane devastated so much of Haiti, we have sent millions of dollars to the World Food Program to get more food in to the Haitian people, and we are supporting non-government organizations there like the International Federation of the Red Cross as well.

Another important example of partnering on peacekeeping is in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We are negotiating this week in the Security Council to expand the United Nations peacekeeping mission there to help stem the violence that flares up occasionally in the eastern part of the country. Framing that mission to fit our funding constraints is not easy. Peacekeeping operations are very expensive. Congress is very watchful of our peacekeeping budget. But by working with the United Kingdom and France, we are approaching a compromise that will not only make the U.N. operation in the Congo more effective and flexible, but do so with a much more moderate price tag. As these cases show, peacekeeping operations need careful collaboration during the design stage. They must have clear goals, adequate funding, exit strategies, and take into account reconstruction and reconciliation needs. And since all relevant actors can contribute to these needs, regional support and coalitions of the willing are vital considerations. To that end, we are pleased the G-8 industrialized nations came together to create a new Global Peace Operations Initiative. We have agreed to train 75,000 peacekeepers, initially from Africa, for operations on that continent and elsewhere, if needed. We also will lend this force deployment and logistics support. The crisis in Sudan cannot wait for that force. More urgent measures are needed. That is why we support the African Union's decision to send monitors to Sudan to help bring stability. We hope this force will shine a light on what the government of Sudan is doing to end the atrocities.

We took the lead in the U.N. Security Council on the issue of Sudan. And we are proud that we did so. We expect now that the government of Sudan will comply with the resolutions of the Security Council to stop supporting militia violence against the people of Dafur; to bring those who perpetrate such violence to justice; and to cooperate with the African Union and the international community to allow aid workers to end the misery in that war-torn region.

Partnerships for Democracy and Human Rights

What is true for peace is true for democracy and human rights. Principles, purposes, and practice matter. And what better place to discuss partnerships to advance democracy and human rights than in San Francisco, where the founders of the United Nations met more than a half-century ago to establish a principled partnership steeped in democratic values. Those founders believed democracies share a commitment to peace, human rights and freedom. Secretary-General Kofi Annan put it this way: The founders, he said, "knew that no foundation of peace would be sturdier than democratic government." It is a troubling that, while there are more democracies in the world today than at the time of the U.N.'s founding, the U.N. pays so little heed to the principles of democracy and liberty. There is, I believe, a democracy deficit in the U.N. today. Undemocratic countries like Cuba and Iran have way too much influence over the outcomes of U.N. activities. There are caucuses and groupings to promote every cause under the sun in the U.N. And yet until recently, there has been no caucus to promote democracy. To remedy this shortcoming, we are supporting the development of a Democracy Caucus at the United Nations. It is an outgrowth of the Community of Democracies, a global network of democracies working together to strengthen democratic movements and institutions worldwide. The focus of the Democracy Caucus is to advance democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in U.N. programs and policies. We hope our efforts can improve the character and work of the U.N. General Assembly, for example, and the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

The purpose of the Commission on Human Rights, of course, is to protect and promote human rights. Yet our efforts to secure good resolutions targeting human rights abusers too often are

stymied by the members nearly 40 percent who are human rights violators. We initiated a Democracy Caucus this spring at the Commission on Human Rights, and we saw it bear fruit. Human rights abusing countries could not stop a resolution calling on the U.N. to establish a focal point for its democracy work. Introduced by Peru, Romania, East Timor, and the United States, the resolution collected seventy-three co-sponsors. That is more than the number of members on the Commission. And it was adopted by a vote of 45 to 0 with 8 abstentions. A small step perhaps but an important step taken for the cause of democracy. We have since reprogrammed \$200,000 to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to pay for the democracy-coordinating office ushered in by that resolution. We plan to do even more. Just two weeks ago, President Bush, in his speech to the U.N. General Assembly, proposed that a new fund be created at the United Nations to promote democracy. He offered to provide seed money to create a U.N. Democracy Fund. We have been very pleased with the reactions we have heard so far to his proposal. We think of it as a voluntary fund and also a resource bank of expertise, if you will. It could offer to countries in transition to democracy the expertise or training then need to institutionalize the rule of law, or to set up independent courts, a free press, political parties, or trade unions. The broad array of expertise and programs the U.N. has to offer in the areas of democracy, rule of law, and civil society would support international efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, for example, in support of elections.

One of the reasons insurgents in Iraq are trying to interrupt the elections is because they fear the freedom that elections represent. They know that given half a chance, the people of Iraq will build a free and prosperous nation. They fear that President Bush is right that in fact the people of Iraq not only long to be free, but to govern themselves democratically, as other free peoples do in the world. Just as the people of the Middle East long to be free, so too do the women of this region as do women in other parts of the world. That is why we introduced a resolution at the U.N. to increase the participation of women in elections and politics. It gathered so much support last year that by the time it was adopted at the U.N. General Assembly, it had 110 co-sponsors. Yet, resolutions are not enough. Women need real support on the ground. They need training programs to help them learn how to protect and promote themselves by building a civil society.

In Afghanistan, we have over 200 programs that build on public-private partnerships. Some of them are designed to educate women and girls. Some will improve their access to health care. Others create new economic opportunities. Still others increase their political voice.

Our \$10 million Iraqi Women's Democracy Initiative provides training in political leadership, entrepreneurial, and media skills. Its purpose is to help ensure Iraq's women gain their rightful place in the emerging democracy. Our new U.S. and Iraqi Women's Network will broker public-private partnerships to advance women in business, government, and media. As in the cases of women's programs in Iraq, we find that we can be more effective when we, as a government, form partnerships with people in the private sector. We find that their experience, expertise, and insights can multiply the effectiveness of many of our programs. A good example of this is the G-8's Forum for the Future. As part of its Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative, the G-8 is discussing ways to work with the private sector to strengthen democracy, improve education, and expand opportunity. We are looking at how to enable the private sector to create more jobs. And we are looking at ways to increase public participation and to empower women in that region.

We find that we can also improve our effectiveness by working with international organizations. We are working for example with United Nation Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which we rejoined last year, to advance literacy and rebuild educational systems in post-conflict areas. We are also collaborating in that forum to promote tolerance and boost civic, math, science, and engineering education. We are sharing scientific advances, and

working to conserve cultural treasures. And we are promoting human rights, like freedom of expression and the press.

We worked with another U.N. body, the International Labor Organization, to secure a new international convention to ban the worst forms of child labor. To date, 150 countries including the United States have ratified that important convention. And we continue to support its International Program for the Elimination of Child Labor (IPEC). Because of IPEC's efforts, many children in Latin America and the Caribbean, in Africa and Asia, and in the Middle East and Europe have been taken out of the workplace and placed in school. And their families have been given new ways to generate alternative income.

Partnerships for Development

Our goals for economic development are clear: We support policies that produce economic growth for all people. We believe that economic freedom, good governance, and the rule of law are the best recipes to eliminate poverty and protect the environment. I could not describe our compassion for the poor better than the President. "We fight against poverty," he explained, "because hope is an answer to terror. We fight against poverty because opportunity is a fundamental right to human dignity. And we fight against poverty with a growing conviction that major progress is within our reach."

Hope, opportunity, human dignity these are what motivate us to contribute to international organizations that try to eliminate persistent poverty and famine. We donated over \$2 billion in food aid last year alone. No one else donated more. We are, in fact, the world's largest supporter of the World Food Program. Last year, we donated over \$1 billion to its important work. Here again, we need partners. And our partnerships for development must be rooted in purpose and principles just as clearly as they are for peace or democracy and human rights.

In 2002, world leaders meeting in Monterrey, Mexico, reached a consensus about development. They said that more advanced countries should help developing nations, but developing countries must help themselves as well. They cannot merely depend on rich countries providing them aid. They must adopt political, economic, and social policies that nurture an environment for growth, especially if they want to see the flows of private capital and trade that turn their economies around. Only if they take this path can foreign assistance help. President Bush calls this a "new compact for global development." It links greater contributions from developed nations to greater responsibility and greater stewardship of those contributions from developing nations. We work international organizations like the U.N. Development Program and the U.N. Environmental Program to make sure their policies also reflect these principles. But we are doing more. We have introduced a revolutionary new approach to foreign aid that reflects this newly found consensus of Monterrey. The President has launched the Millennium Challenge Account. It will give grants, not loans, to countries that govern justly, invest in their own people's education and health, and have the economic practices that can rightly put foreign aid to good use. Congress funded this program with \$1 billion for its first year of operation. Already, sixteen of the world's poorest countries have been selected to participate.

The United States also supports the international program to help Heavily Indebted Poor Countries. Debt is a heavy burden for developing countries, and we are doing something about it. Whereas the twenty-seven countries now in the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries program will have had some two-thirds of their debt forgiven, the United States will forgive 100 percent of the debt they owe us. In the G-8, we are working towards extending this program for two more years. And we are asking international financial institutions to consider our model of giving grants, rather than loans, to developing countries. But even if all the debt is forgiven, all the hard-won progress in African countries is threatened unless people are healthy enough to work and take care

of their families. As all of you know, one of the greatest health scourges today is the pandemic of HIV/AIDS. No other disease does more to wreck the lives of people and create social and economic instability in Africa and other places. That is why President Bush has established our Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. It is a \$15 billion plan for prevention, treatment and care. It brings together all U.S. government HIV/AIDS activities. It fosters partnerships with non-government organizations, faith-based and community-based groups, and businesses. And it focuses resources on the fifteen countries hardest hit by the disease.

Here, again, as was the case with human rights, you can see this practice of public-private partnerships which I would submit is a leitmotif of this administration's approach to solving international economic and social problems. We leverage public-private partnerships in many areas, in fact. In 2002 alone, we established or joined over 200 results-oriented partnerships to promote sustainable development. And they are having quite an impact. Let me give you a few examples. Take our Safe Water System Partnership. Working with health ministries in seventeen developing countries, with United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, the World Bank, businesses, and non-government organizations, this program has distributed over eight million bottles of disinfectant. Just one bottle provides one person with enough safe drinking and cooking water for six months. Then there is our Clean Energy Initiative. It has helped sixteen million people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America leave behind their reliance on wood, dung, or crop residue for cooking and heating. And our Partnership for Cleaner Fuels and Vehicles has helped eliminate lead from gasoline in nine Sub-Saharan African countries in just two years.

It is true that the problems of the world are great. But it is also true that the human will to overcome them is greater. Unfortunately, sometimes leaders lack the political will to act. Sometimes they become paralyzed by complexity, or become too timid out of fear. Great countries are those no matter their size, their military force, or their gross domestic product that act boldly in the face of adversity. That has been the American way now for over two centuries. And in this day and age, facing as we do so many new sets of challenges and threats, we know that we must not walk alone.

I know that some think that this administration acts only by itself. That it is too unilateral. As I have shown tonight, the truth is otherwise. Whether it is the many nations joining us in the coalition in Iraq and Afghanistan or the war on terrorism, or the hundreds of programs and millions of dollars this government pours into international programs, this administration values partners who value us and our principles.

Last week, before the United Nations General Assembly, President Bush laid out a broad agenda to advance human dignity and enhance security. He mentioned the defeat of terror, the protection of human rights, the spread of prosperity, and the advance of democracy goals that he said "call us to great work in the world. Each of us alone can only do so much. Together, we can accomplish so much more."

We believe in partnerships. As Secretary Powell has said, "partnership is the watchword of U.S. strategy in this administration." This is not about deferring to others; it is about working with them. It is about offering leadership in great and common enterprises. And that is just what America is doing. That is multilateralism at its best. In the service of American interests and values. And in the service of peace, human rights, and economic growth.