UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-3011

+ + + + +

The Imperative for Action

+ + + + +

An Update of the Report of the Task Force on American Interests and UN Reform

+ + + + +

Tuesday, November 22, 2005

+ + + + +

Renaissance Mayflower Hotel
Colonial Room
1127 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C.

Speakers:

NEWT GINGRICH Co-Chair, Task Force

on United Nations

GEORGE MITCHELL Co-Chair, Task Force

on the United Nations

ROD HILLS Task Force on the United

Nations Member

MALCOLM WALLOP Task Force on the United

Nations

RICHARD SOLOMON Ambassador, and President,

United States Institute of

Peace

This transcript was produced by Neal R. Gross Court Reporters and Transcribers from audio files provided by the United States Institute of Peace. The document is an un-edited transcription, and may contain grammatical errors.

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

PRESENTATIONS	PAGE
Senator George Mitchell	7
Speaker Newt Gingrich	18
Senator Malcolm Wallop	31
Mr. Rod Hills	36

3

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

AMBASSADOR SOLOMON: Good morning. Wе appreciate substantial this very turnout on unfortunately a rather gloomy, gloomy fall day but with the holidays coming, it should brighten us all up. think many of you know that it was just about a year ago that Congress directed the U.S. Institute of Peace to establish a bipartisan task force to look at issues of United Nations' performance and reform, and the hope was that we could find a way to strengthen the ability of the institution to meet the high purposes of its charter which, of course, was drafted 60 years ago.

And we were asked to report to Congress six months after the establishment of the task force, which we did in June of this year and this publication, which may be rather familiar to many of you by now is available in stacks at the back of the room.

Now, I also might note that the initiative and the congressional leadership for this effort came from Congressman Frank Wolf, Chairman of the House Science State Justice Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee, who just happens to be in charge of the Institute's annual appropriation, and we're very

fortunate to have here this morning the distinguished Co-chairs of our task force, Speaker Newt Gingrich and Senator George Mitchell.

As well, we have a number of other members of the task force, Senator Malcolm Wallop, Rod Hills, Danielle Pletka, I believe is going to be joining us shortly and also several members of the task force expert group, two individuals who are absolutely critical to the writing of both that report and the follow-up effort today, Vince Haley and Lee Feinstein.

Now, out task force report in June made a number of concrete actionable recommendations for reform. And the report came out at the time, of course, when there were revelations of a range of serious management problems and it was in that context that the report was very well received by the Congress, the Administration and even by a good many up at the United Nations and I should say especially by the Secretary, by Secretary General Kofi Annan and the task force report reinforce many of Kofi Annan's own recommendations for reform and there seemed to be a widespread recognition of the need for making some major changes in the way the Institution is managed and there was also a heightened

sense of motivation.

So our hope was with this mood, with the revelation of serious problems, there could be a significant reform process take hold. Now it was in that context that this past September there was a United Nations summit meeting to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the organization and while I don't want to pre-guess some of the discussion that we'll hear this morning, I think it's fair to say that there was a good deal of disappointment that the so-called outcome document of that summit did not come to grips with many of the needed reforms that were identified in the task force report and, indeed, reforms that had been proposed by Kofi Annan himself some months earlier.

So it was in that situation that urged on by Congressman Wolf and others to keep the efforts of this task force alive, that we instituted an assessment of where the UN reform process was heading to take the June reform recommendations that were in our initial report and match them against what had come out of the summit meeting in the so-called outcome document.

And so we asked the experts from the six public policy institutions who were the collaborators in

this task force; the American Enterprise Institute, Brookings, the Center for Strategic International Studies, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Hoover Institution and the Heritage Foundation, to assess the outcome of the summit in relation to the reform recommendations.

And their assessment also available in the back of the room is now in public and will be the focus of our discussion this morning. I just also might observe that we're not the only ones tracking the process of reform. The UN Foundation represented here this morning by Kathy Bushkin, is also doing that kind of an assessment and on their website Unfoundation.org, you will find a matrix in which the Foundation is also assessing prospects reform.

But today we're here to give Speaker Gingrich and Senator Mitchell and our other colleagues a chance to give their own take on the status of the reform effort. And let me just note that the June task force report put forward as a major proposition the quote "firm belief that an effective United Nations is in America's national interest", unquote.

And the sense that we have following the

September summit is that it will take considerable concerted leadership by the United States, acting together with out countries who see the need for an effective United Nations to insure that the opportunities for reform that may have been missed that were not given enough weight at the September summit are not lost.

So with that as a welcome, let me turn the podium over to Co-Chair Senator Mitchell and the we'll hear from Speaker Gingrich.

George?

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: Thank you very much, Dick, not just for your introduction today but for the outstanding work of the United States Institute of Peace in connection with this task force report and in a wide range of other activities. The USIP is proving to be a powerful spokesman for peace, stability and prosperity and we're pleased and honored to be associated with your organization.

The Speaker and I have routinely alternated the order in which we would appear and today is my turn so I'm going to make a brief statement. We have agreed on and distributed to you today a joint statement by the

Speaker and I. We will not attempt to read that to you since we are confident of your ability to read it yourselves. We will make individual statements that supplement the joint statement and of course, in some areas overlap with it.

Following our statements, we're honored to have other members of the task force here, former Senator Malcolm Wallop and Rod Hills and assuming she arrives before then, Danielle Pletka. Each of them will be offered the opportunity to make comments and then, of course, we'll take questions on any aspect of the report, both the initial report and the follow-up report that's being distributed today.

The American people continue to support a United Nations that plays an important role in building as safer, freer and more prosperous world. As you know, the Speaker and I were privileged to serve as cochairman of the Bipartisan Task Force on the United Nations which was authorized by Congress. The task force spanned a wide range of political and ideological perspectives reflected by some of the task force members here today.

After six months of fact-finding and

the task force deliberations, issued а 126-page consensus report. We were not able to agree everything and we still don't agree on everything but we do support and stand by both the initial and the follow-But as we say in the statement we're up reports. releasing today by the speaker and I, what was most striking was the extent to which we were able to find common ground, including on the task force's important finding which was, and I quote, belief that an effective United Nations is in America's interest".

Given these high hopes, it should not be surprising that there has been disappointment and even frustration in the United States with the results of last month's summit meeting in New York. As we note in our report, the so-called outcome document was not the sweeping package of reforms called for in the Secretary General's report of March, in Larger Freedom. It lacked the boldness and vision of the report of the high level panel on threats, challenges and change. And it fell significantly short of the recommendations made by our own task force.

But I believe it is far too early to write

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

off the effort to reform the United Nations. That would misjudge the kind of sustained effort that will be required to succeed in overhauling the Institution meet the very different threats and challenges of this The problems of failed new century. states, catastrophic terrorism, the persistence of crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing and the promotion of democracy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It would also, frankly, let the member states of the United Nations off the hook. "While it is easy to blame the UN auote. institution for some of the problems we confront today, we must recognize that ultimately it is its member take action and therefore, states that must Those are the words of Ambassador responsibility". Bolton in recent testimony before the House International Relations Committee.

UN reform is a daunting challenge, but genuine and deep reform is possible if there is a coalition of democracies, the United States centrally among them that will persevere in the development of an accountable and effective United Nations. I will now turn briefly to the outcome document and what we believe

remains to be done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The task force's experts have provided a balanced assessment of September's summit agreement and these are included in the materials that have been distributed to you today. I thank them for their continued and invaluable efforts. Without addressing each of their points, I will highlight four areas that I think are of special significance; genocide prevention, management reform, human rights and development. Unquestionably, the most important achievement of the September summit was the strong endorsement of the principle that be the has come to known responsibility to protect. This principle has two parts. First, that every government has the responsibility to protect those within its borders from atrocities. Our task force called on the US Government to press for acceptance of this language, pleased to say they were largely successful.

The outcome document was clear on this point and it is worth restating its language. It reads, quote, "Each individual state has the responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This

responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes including their incitement through appropriate and necessary means. We accept that responsibility and will act in accordance with it", close quote.

The second element of the responsibility to protect goes to the moral responsibilities of the rest of the world. In certain circumstances, a government's abnegation of its responsibility to its own people is so severe that the responsibility of others to take action cannot be denied. The outcome document embraced this point as well. I would also add that although the outcome document calls for action through the Security Council, its language is not inconsistent with the further finding of our task force that the failure of the Security Council to act must not be used as an excuse for the world to stand by as atrocities continue.

Of course, embracing the concept of a responsibility to protect does not insure that the nations of the world and the UN will live up to their responsibilities. A good place to turn principle into practice is Darfur where recent attacks on peacekeepers and other indicate the precariousness of the current situation. Our task force recommended a series of

immediate initiatives for the United States, the United Nations and others, including establishment of a no-fly zone over Darfur. Action is urgently needed in Darfur.

The second issue I'd like to address is management reform. Unfortunately there was little progress on this critically important issue. The outcome document fell short in virtually all of the key areas identified in our task force report. These include an authoritative independent oversight board that will have all the authority of an independent audit committee, empowerment of the Secretary General replace top officials and the creation of an effective chief operating officer and modern personnel system, effective whistle blower protection and ethics disclosure standards for top officials and transparency.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Sunset provisions for all programs and activities mandated by the General Assembly, and identification of operational programs that should be funded entirely by voluntary contributions. As I've said recently, management reform is not a favor to the United States. It is essential to the vitality and integrity of the United Nations. Without it, other

reforms are much more difficult to implement and to sustain. In the area of management and reform, the next few months will be critical.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Progress on the Human Rights Council was also disappointing. Establishment of a Human Rights Council is to prove to be more than cosmetic. Its mandate and membership must be substantially different from that of the wholly discredited Human Rights Commission. That means that members of the council must meet minimum human rights standards and the work of the council should focus egregious human rights on violations. Congress' assessment of the credibility of UN reform will turn largely on getting this issue right.

Our task force devoted considerable energy and attention to the critical issue of development. Addressing the needs of the developing world is not icing on the cake, it is a key challenge for how one billion people in wealthier nations will share planet with over five billion people in poorer United countries. The States has substantially increased its government assistance in the developing world in recent years. Private American citizens demonstrated the generosity and response to the Tsnumami

and more recently the earthquake in Pakistan. The outcome document reflected a better balance than some other documents between the importance of assistance from the developing world on the one hand and good governance on the other.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That is to say, it is critically important that those in the developed world continue to make and increase their contributions but it is of equal importance importance, perhaps greater that those receiving the assistance advance toward good governance so that is it not wasted and that a private sector can be developed that will make any improvements sustainable over time. personally disagreed with the Administration's opposition to the goal of .7 percent of gdp in development assistance but wherever one comes out on this issue, there can be little disagreement that this debate has become a distraction from the goal we all seek, whatever our view on the target which is greater opportunity and self-sufficiency for the world's poor.

In this regard, a critical priority must be ending unfair barriers to trade. Despite the halting start in New York last month, I am still hopeful about

the prospects for reform. First, for much of the past decade, the United Nations has been a polarizing issue on the American political landscape. Differences remain but a consensus on the elements of reform is developing and it crosses party lines. It encompasses conservative and liberal points of view. Our task force and today's event is testimony to that fact.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Second, there is support of reform at the United Nations itself. Serious UN personnel problems overshadow that constituency inside organization of competent officials who want reform. Ιt is a fact of life that controversy and controversial statements make news. Consensus and positive support And we must recognize that as we evaluate the reactions. The people I've met at the United Nations in connection with the work of this task force, understand the need for change and strongly support it although, of course, not all of them agree on the definition of what change or reform is necessary.

And finally, just the United States and perhaps even more so, others in the world need a United Nations that works. The United States, by virtue of its principles, its power and its prosperity will inevitably

play a lead role in addressing problems in the world in the coming decades. But with rebuilding challenges abroad and at home Americans, now more than ever, recognize the need for international and value partnerships and cooperation. In that effort, the United Nations, an effective, transparent United Nations, can play a key roll. Thank you very much for your attention and I'm now pleased to turn the podium over to my friend and colleague, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich.

(Applause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GINGRICH: Thank you, Senator Mitchell and let me join Senator Mitchell who it has been a real pleasure to work with on this project and to develop an effort to represent an effective American view and I think it's important to recognize that. see our assignment starting with Congressman Wolf first creating this effort, to be one of understanding what is in America's interest as it relates to the United Nations. And so we approach the United Nations in terms of America and I agree, as we stated emphatically, and I to reinforce that an effective, transparent, accountable United Nations is in the interest of the

United States. This is not something we do just in order to be helpful to others, but it is actually an American foreign policy interest in our effort to get things done around the planet, to have a United Nations which is honest, accountable and effective.

I want to join in thanking Ambassador Solomon and the entire team that he has at the U.S. Institute of Peace which has done remarkable work in supporting this effort and I want to say that we're delighted that Senator Wallop and that Rod Hills are both able to be with us today and we hope that Dannie Pletka can join us presently, but they did tremendous work on setting some bench marks of what the reforms ought to be like. Let me start by reminding you that the conclusions we were reaching were not in isolation. I want to quote a series of quotes from Paul Volker based on his investigations and give you a sense of Chairman Volker's judgment.

Quote, "But our investigation has confirmed enough to indicate not only particular problems with the Oil for Food Program but to suggest that those problems are symptomatic of deep seated systemic problems in United Nations administration." He went on to say

further, quote, "The committee's simple conclusion is that administrative reform is indeed urgently needed if, indeed, the United Nations is to be looked to in the future to deal with large humanitarian, environmental and genocidal an other threats.". He went on to say that the, quote, "Our investigation so far as I know an investigation unparalleled in intensity of a major UN program, and clearly an international investigation, provides unambiguous evidence of a systemic problem".

Volker went onto say, quote, "I do think that some kind of benchmarks have to be set out so that you have some tangible measure of whether real action is being taken or not." We decided in that connection that there are two concrete things that ought to be done within a year, can be done within a year and that this is the chief operating officer idea and the oversight board idea.

And both of those suggestions are not unique with us, but I think all our work reinforces that. And a lot of good things, hopefully, can follow from those two recommendations being implemented. He went onto say, quote, "And it's why if we say if the Security Council isn't confident enough in the

secretariate, to carry out a program, maybe you should have the program because they'll mess it up to put it very simply".

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And finally Volker said, quote, "Look, I am being over-simplistic I understand, but cleaning it up takes biq effort, involves individuals, some individuals have got to go", close quote. Now I cite all this because here you have former Chairman of the Federal Reserve brought in by the Secretary General, given unparalleled access, issuing five reports, having a thorough understanding of the system and he basically came down at least as firmly as we did in favor of very substantial, very direct change.

In that context, I have to say that the failures of the September summit after all of this effort with all of this evidence, to achieve real change are palpable and I think it's very hard to defend what was accomplished in September as in any way being adequate. I would also note that the letter of the Group of 77 and China to the Secretary General is not encouraging in the sense that it essentially on every single front -- this is the letter of the 8th of November, on virtually every front it calls for going

slower, doing less, being more careful, as though the Volker Commission never existed, the scandals never existed, the information never existed and the various failures did not exist.

Having said all that, I want to come back and re-emphasize the point that Senator Mitchell made. These kind of processes are frustrating, time-consuming and difficult and the job of the United States is not to say, "Well, they had their chance, let's quit. The job of the United States is to pick up the ball once again, think through what we have to do to continue to press for reform, move forward in a systematic organized way, recognize that because or our unique constitutional system, with a legislative and an executive branch, we need to engage both of the branches in the process of bringing pressure to bear and that there are active things we can do.

And I think it's important to start with reinforcing what the Congress has begun. Senator Coleman in the Senate and Chairman Henry Hyde in the House have both worked very diligently to raise the issue of reform of the United Nations. I think it is helpful when they continue to hold hearings. It is

helpful when they continue to bring light on these issues, but I also think the Administration should work with members of Congress on a bipartisan basis to insure that there is a parallel effort to raise the question of the countries which theoretically signed this letter to the Secretary General, as individual countries are much less likely to defend the letter, then a block.

And so every American Ambassador should be asked to work directly with the country to which they are assigned to convince that country not to sign the letter again in the future, to convince each country to become more pro-active. If you look at the list, there are an amazing range of countries. Remember that the 40 countries in the United Nations which contribute the smallest amount collectively, contribute \$400,000.00.

So a country that gives \$10,000.00, may not have a great interest in reform since if it can simply get one job in the Secretariat, it gets back more than the total amount it's donated. But in the long run, that's a very short-sighted view at three levels. It's short-sited first of all because corruption, inefficiency, and ineffectiveness in the United Nations' implementation capabilities directly hurt that poorest

countries and the poorest people in the world.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So this is not an American interest simply to save money but if you are sincerely interested in helping the poorest people in the world, if you're sincerely interested in helping health around the world, if you're sincerely interested in maximizing the rate of development, there's a very real interest in having an effective United Nations.

so one of our arguments to these countries, an argument that I hope every member of the House and Senate would make whether they're congressional delegation trip, whether they're visited by leadership from a foreign country, member of the Congress should have a congressional form checklist that they raise every time they meet with non-And that would begin to communicate a sense Americans. of seriousness and the terms of the debate ought to be not about wasting the American taxpayer's money, ought to be about wasting the money which should be available to directly help the poorest people in the world.

The second reason there's an interest is that the greatest vulnerability to human rights

violations, to genocide, to mass killings is in the poorest countries and therefore, having an effective United Nations capable of responding on behalf of humanity is extraordinarily important to the weakest and the poorest people in the world. And an ineffective, unaccountable, non-transparent United Nations weakens the capacity of the civilized community to protect the weakest of us from the risk of mass murder.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Third, for the poorest countries in the world, the United Nations matters vastly more than it does to the United States because for the poorest countries in the world, the United Nations General Assembly is the one place where they stand and talk with a voice that's fully as loud as any other country. therefore, they should be reminded over and over, it is in their interest to have the General Assembly in the United Nations respected. It is in their interest to have the strongest possible platform from which they can speak about their concerns. And to the degree that their defensive corruption, their defensive inefficiency, their defensive bureaucracy that's not accountable, their defense of hiding behind a lack of transparency weakens the respect of the United Nations.

It weakens the one venue in which they have a genuinely effective opportunity to be represented.

So I would hope that the Congress and the Administration would jointly work and would pick up the challenge and would move to the next round of pushing for reform and would do so country by country, not merely in New York and would do so as a part of every visit and I would hope that the Secretary of State would take every occasion of having a foreign minister visit Washington or every occasion in which she's visiting another country to make sure that she has United Nations' reform on the agenda and I would hope that every meeting of the G8 would have on the agenda United Nations' reform.

And I say this because I think it's very important for the United States not to merely act in isolation. There is, for example, a proposal that if the Human Rights Commission is not reformed, that we should simply not attend the next meeting. I think that's a legitimate challenge to make to the United Nations. But I would want us to reach out to every democracy, to every country that has a sense of genuine decency and genuine concern about the rule of law and

organize a collective effort not simply an American effort.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

When we do things in isolation it's easy for our opponents to say, "That's the just Americans being petulant". But if we are in London and Paris and Berlin and Tokyo and elsewhere, and we're making the case, how can you go to a Human Rights Commission meeting in which Sudan is a member? It violates the very concept of the human rights. How can you go to a meeting in which Cuba is trying to set the agenda? think this is a dialogue we have to win. I think we have to understand it's perfectly legitimate in the modern world for countries to have to win the argument in public so that they have the moral authority to engage in the actions that they believe is and I think it should be an effort to create a multi-lateral democratic commitment to transparency, the rule of law and human rights.

I also think we have to recognize and we should all be very sobered by a comment that Kofi Annan made about the September conference and I want to quote, it's a very sobering quote he said, in speaking about the issue of terrorism, quote, "It was disgrace that

our leaders could not agree even on a single sentence about how to tackle one of the most urgent challenges of our time, the threat of weapons of mass destruction.

New efforts in this area are absolutely essential", close quote.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, I think this is particularly important because of the emerging stark threat from the Uranian government. Any of you who have read what the new Uranian president, Ahmadinejad has said in which he has described defeating the Anglo-Saxons and eliminating Israel, I think you have to take very, very seriously the failure of the United Nations General Assembly to find a clear and convincing condemnation of terrorism.

The United Nations did adopt at the General Assembly the following statement, quote, individual state has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes including their incitement through appropriate and necessary means", close quote. Well, any of who you have seen the recent Iranian cartoon on Iranian television, encouraging children to become suicide bombers; any of

you who have the series of statements by the Iranian government on literally eliminated Israel from the planet would have to ask what did this sentence mean? What does this statement mean and what actions will the UN take to enforce these violations by one of its members?

Let me say in closing that I think this is a very serious challenge because one last quote from Sherman Volker, he says, quote, "If it reforms itself," referring to the United Nations, "I think it has positive budgetary implications potential. Near as I can see, the UN get squeezed in the budget often because people don't have confidence in its administrative ability including with some reason, the United States", close quote.

I believe we should, as a country, both have a continuing campaign in every capital of every United Nations member so that our ambassadors are directly assigned a responsibility for working to get the right votes and to get the right letters rather than the wrong letters. I think that we should have -- this is not an Ambassador Bolton problem. This is an entire United States diplomatic initiative across the plain. I

believe every member of Congress who wants to see a more effective, more transparent, more honest United Nations should have in every conversation they have with non-Americans, an indication of how seriously we take this.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

I think we should make the case on behalf of those who are most directly effected by a weak, inadequate and often corrupt United Nations and that is the poorest people of the planet and the most vulnerable people of the planet. I believe this is a cause worth spending a great deal of time and effort on and while we made only limited progress since September, I think those are steps in the right direction and I think the challenge to us now is to accelerate and increase the pressure to reach out to other countries and make it a multi-lateral effort and to do everything we can to insure that the United Nations continues to move towards greater accountability, greater transparency and greater effectiveness. And I appreciate very much the chance to work with Senator Mitchell and the members of Commission. And I think I will now call on Senator Wallop if that's acceptable, to comment.

23 (Applause)

SENATOR WALLOP: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish somehow or another, that we could get the entire group of 77 in a room like this and hear the arguments as to how reform of the United Nations is in the interest of the poorest people on the planet and not a threat to them. I mean, it's just amazing what the group of 77 letter said and hear them arguing against their own specific interest. If the UN is to have any usefulness in the world at all, it's got to be useful to the poorest of the planet.

Absent that, the wealthy countries can take care of themselves and leave the poor countries behind. And so to see a letter such as that that came from the group of 77, which is just so discouraging when you think of the reforms recommended and the necessity for reform, I just -- I mean, I do agree, Newt, with your idea that it's a diplomatic problem for the United States in its entirety and all our ambassadors and all the meetings that we have with the Secretary of State and others, but somehow or another, this interest must be made clear to those in whose interest it lies.

Senator Mitchell said that he was hopeful for reform and I guess I would say that I am hopeful for

Senator Mitchell's hopefulness but I remain pessimistic in search of effective leadership and action within the UN. And so it does take the place of your recommendations and those of Speaker Gingrich to get on with reform and to press for it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The hopefulness for reform enlists pessimism in me at least in the immediate future because Secretary General's term is coming to an end and the arguments over replacement will be taking more time and more interest than will the interests of reform. However much we may be pushing it, I just think the timing at this moment in time is not really -- not really likely to elicit really great success. reason not to continue to press as both speakers just I mean absolutely it must be continued, the press for reform must be continued. But the expectations of it ought not to be so high that failing would turn us off of the effort to continue to press.

And that's what worries me the most, is the likelihood of failure in the near term is part of the political process that is likely to bring arguments and opposition to any further efforts within the UN. So my hope really is that the pressure for reform remains that

United States' principle effort with regards to the UN in all its operations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Management reform is so totally necessary right now that the meetings that we have in New York at the UN and other hearings that we had here in Washington would tend to tell you that really there is not a lot of interest from those who hold management positions in reforming their positions. It's one of those typical things that bureaucracies worldwide tend to do whether they're in a state or in the UN.

The peacekeeping operations are not working well and just are in desperate need of reform and when the UN sends a group to operate in that interest, such as we went to Haiti, you find that often as not they don't have any respect because they don't have any positive role that would protect the people supposedly being protected. It was really discouraging to see the UN vehicles cruising the streets of Port au Prince and finding that they would never get out. No matter what was happening, they would never get out of vehicles. They would only be a witness to what was going wrong and make a report which is of very little theoretically people who are

protected. And reform and peacekeeping is necessary.

Reform in the Human Rights Commission, as Newt said, is just incredibly necessary and the idea somehow or another that we would have a Human Rights Commission that was composed of the current members is absurd on its face and it really is visible whether they like it or not in the poorest countries of the world.

Lastly, I would just say that the letter from the group of 77 cannot be thought to be the last word in reforming the UN. I think both speakers indicated that they would not agree with that and would press for individual countries to be made to answer individually and not in and as a group. There's a lot of comfort in doing something in and as a group because you don't really have to answer to anybody except the letter as a whole as it exists.

So if the work that we did with the help of you, Ambassador, is to have any effect, it is going to have to have the kind of passion and pursuit that was described by the two speakers before us and it's going to take time not only with the Ambassadors of the United States, around the world and the Secretary of State but within and around the Congress because somehow or

another, the need for and the usefulness of reform is a thought but not yet a passion. And I think it needs to be defined as a passion if there is to be a United Nations and if it is to be the United Nations in which US interest as of the rest of the world are represented, and I thank you for the moment.

Rod.

MR. HILLS: Our Task Force is Chapter 3 the mundane chapter. (Inaudible) I think about poverty, weapons of mass destruction, peacekeeping, but if you don't have good management, you can reform all you want but the United Nations will not be effective, as effective (inaudible) why is the United Nations so really poorly managed? Well, two reasons; first the General Assembly does micro-managing, the inability to break free of personnel policies that are archaic but it's also a lack of culture of management in the agency itself.

We don't hire Secretary Generals because they manage well. Their deputies are not hired because the manage well. We don't send the managers to executive education courses as most companies send their top people. So it's a two-fold issue. It's a need to

establish the culture of management as well as to loose the reins of the General Assembly folks and the Secretary General.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I'd like to talk just briefly about the two things that Speaker Gingrich emphasized, the need for an oversight and the need for a Chief Operating Officer. And the latter point should be apparent. How can you run an organization unless you have somebody in charge? Who decides whether or not procurement policies are being followed? Who decides whether the budget was being spent the way it should be spent? A simple obligation to say, "You're in charge of that", is so clear. It's impossible to understand why the group of 77, why the General Assembly is not excited about having somebody in charge.

And there is a case in which I believe that the Secretary General could do more in that respect. He could make sure that all employment projects allow him to fire his deputies. He should not have people in charge of something if the Secretary General loses confidence in him.

Let me dwell for a minute on the idea of the independent oversight board. The group of 77 seems

to reject the idea of the bureaucratic layer that's not needed. The Secretariat seems to like the idea and they call it an independent advisory committee which sends shivers down your back a little bit about what they really want. We don't need advice. We need an oversight board and audit committee, if you will, with real authority, with real skill, and the ability to control the external audit and the internal audit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

You can't have the internal audit. The OIOS of the United Nations is working a lot better than it was before. It's way short of what you would want in an organization such as the United Nations. If we're to externalize, by comparison, it consists controller general or the auditor general of But the auditor general has no different countries. place to go either. They have no independent source. And so you have an internal audit and an external audit going to the general assembly of 191 nations saying, "We so much money to audit this place", something comes up in the middle of the year, there's no money to do it.

If the internal audit sees something wrong, they have to go to the Secretariat and say, "Gee, you

know, that personnel office is doing terrible. some money to investigate that trouble", there's nobody to go to. And you can't really say to them, they could all spend their own money. They would grow to a monstrosity. So you need an independent audit. The experience we have in this country is of interesting with the independent audit committee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It came into being in 1975 because a whole lot of American companies were found to be bribing foreign officials, some of them vulgar like Lockheed's bribing of the Prime Minister of Japan with 20 million bucks; some -- 15,000 bucks to get a million dollars worth of goods off a dock because the harbor master won't let it go. The common thread was that they were made in secret bank accounts. And the independent audit committee was created. The FCC convinced the New York Stock Exchange to do it and they created internal controls so you couldn't have secret bank accounts any more.

And that worked pretty well. We had better companies with independent directors on them, but then we've got Enron, we've got Rocon, we've got Waste Management. We've got these terrible scandals. Why?

Because the audit committees didn't quite work. They didn't take control of the audit. They sat there very nicely and if somebody came to them and said, "Hey, there's a problem", you go down and say, "Well, we've got to fix that". But the external auditors didn't look to the -- didn't look to the audit committee to hire them. They looked to the management to fire them.

The same thing is true of the internal audit. And so along came (inaudible). Some people think it's too excessive in some respects, I don't. But what is did was say, "Hey, you guys, you big four audit firms, you work for the audit committee. They'll set your salary. They'll tell you what you can do. Internal auditor, you're hired and fired by the audit committee". And so now they've taken control of it. That's what the United Nations needs, to take control.

They need authoritative people. We propose that instead of -- that the audit committee should consist of people, including say three controller general, three auditors general, from three different countries. So you have a board of external auditors composed of the controllers general of three countries, an audit committee consisting of that and maybe a couple

of finance ministers with respect. They have to have respect and they have to have authority. The International Auditing Standards, which are widely accepted as good but widely ignored, is that you cannot have an effective audit unless you have effective internal controls and you can't have effective internal controls unless you have an independent body overseeing the process.

So, in fact, all we're asking for is say create a body with authority with respect and let them decide whether or not something needs to be audited and let them decide how much budget the people need. Let them have enough authority so the General Assembly won't dare turn them down when they say that and let's make sure that the external auditors say, "We can't audit this place. We don't have the internal controls we need. We cant do it". There's material weaknesses. That's the discipline we're trying to put in place.

And one more point, the question of who audits all the other bodies, oil for food for example, the other issues it's common to say well those are voluntary matters, so they can be audited if they want to be audited. Well, the United Nations is an important

name. It means respect. We suggested that no United Nations official should work in any field, there should be no oil for food acceptance unless an effective audit plan is there with effective oversight and that simply is all we ask for.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

SENATOR WALLOP: Thank you, Rod.

AMBASSADOR SOLOMON: Thank you very much. We have about a half hour for some questions. If you'll raise your hands, I'll identify or recognize you and if you'd come to one of the microphones and identify yourself and your organization, we'll have an opportunity to talk, have a dialogue with our task force members. Any hands going up? Please identify yourself and your organization and make a pointed question, please.

MR. MILLIKIN: Al Millikin, Washington Independent Writers. When nations like the Sudan, Cuba or China, known violators of human rights, attempt to show leadership at the United Nations, isn't the United Nations an ideal world stage to do more rather than less than we have to challenge and confront these human rights violators? If we refuse to take part in -- say in the Human Rights Commission in 2006, how does that

set a proper example, particularly if we are secretly dealing with these nations off stage trying to get cooperation in the war on terror or dealing with natural disasters like the recent hurricanes?

CHAIRMAN GINGRICH: Let me draw а distinction. If you have a so-called Human Rights Commission being chaired by Lybia and with Sudan as a member during the period when Sudan is engaged in genocide or mass murders on a scale slightly below that of genocide but clearly stunningly unacceptable to any reasonable society, you make a mockery of the very term human rights. And so I would argue that in that arena -- there's a difference between debating in the General Assembly and agreeing to serve on a commission which is chaired by a dictatorship and whose agenda at one point was set by a coalition of Lybia, Syria, Cuba and China.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Now, that's a dictatorship defense group, it's not a human rights commission. And I think it's very important for us to indicate clearly that we're going to be very blunt and very direct about this and I believe you can get changes. As I indicated earlier, I think the United States should actively work with other

democracies and those who agree in the rule of law to say, "If the United Nations will not reform the Human Rights Commission, that we should work to establish a democratically based Human Rights Commission outside the United Nations that would only have as its members countries which, in fact, enforce the rule of law.

AMBASSADOR SOLOMON: Other questions.

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: The circumstance is not unique to the United Nations that the United States and other countries and public officials frequently have to make a judgment between participating in an event and getting your message across, which is obviously a desirable objective, and lending your name, prestige and status to an event that operates or concludes in a way that produces very undesirable results. So there's nothing new about making that kind of choice.

What we have said it that the United States should consider not participating. The Speaker, I thought quite accurately and eloquently stated that we should not do this on our own but we should involve others in the effort and I think it would be a profound error for us to, in effect, take that option off the table and to say now no matter what others say or do,

participate. going to Wе choose to we're may participate, our government, it may choose to participate but that option ought to be available to the Administration based upon the circumstances which exist at that time and the product of our efforts to implement change prior to then.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

My name is Frank Gold and I'm a MR. GOLD: U.S. Government private consultant. (Inaudible) especially pointed out that we have a major problem with middle management and top management at UN and this is a problem that's we probably can do a lot if we approach it correctly. None of these people in management position would easily agree to change. They've been working the way they have for 20 years and they've been rewarded or promoted on the basis of that and any suggestion that they will change will not be favorably acceptable by them.

What I suggest instead is that we establish a fund, a small group of experts that would select the future managers for the UN. That this group will be combined or consolidate experts from several countries and that they will initially select new deputies for programs that the UN has right now and eventually these

deputies will replace the current managers. And this group can stay permanently there and select people at the most important level. Since managers select people very much like themselves, eventually the whole workforce will change. That's the first point I want to make.

The second one -- and that's relatively easy to fund and make this change. The second relates to programs, the problem with programs. One is programs have not been evaluated or monitored for years like the Ono (phonetic) Program that has been in existence for six or seven years, just about two weeks ago, the Prime Minister of Lebanon called (inaudible) who is head of a Palestinian group in the West Bank complaining about the Palestinians that flee in the camp in Southern Lebanon and requested that he will change the behaviors of the group who carry weapons within Lebanon only within the camps, obviously a Mosque (phonetic) cannot do that.

He issued a statement saying, "You should not do that since you are guests". Part of this problem is that these people living in camps for seven years and nobody look for a way to get them out of the camps, as long as Ono exists. We saw, I think, one possibility is

to start with Lebanon, which I think has a pretty good chance to return back to be a democracy if we help them get over some of the problems, and this is a major problem that they have with the Palestinians there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

If instead of Ono this program will be dispelled to the HCR, the refugee program it will be solved just as that Means (phonetic) Program was solved by finding countries willing to accept these people and then eventually move the next camp and the next camp and basically do away with Ono.

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: Let me speak to your first point. In our Chapter 3 we propose a significant buy-out of a whole lot of people, one time only. money saves by the fact you don't have them any more, and we propose that there be an effective personnel department, human resources. Now that department could, as you say, look for other experts but there's plenty of experts in New York. So the guy who is in charge of human resources could find plenty of skills if he wants to.

And I don't quite buy your first point about nobody being any good in the United Nations. Will Rogers once said, "No one is quite as good or quite as

bad as they're supposed to be". So there are good people there and there are people that can learn if you do that sort of thing. The issue is the culture and the discipline advantage.

MR. GOLD: Well, I'm sure there are many good people there among the managers in the UN but you're right, the culture is a problem and people that behave this certain way in a culture for 20 years will not change very easily.

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: We didn't suggest it would be easy.

AMBASSADOR SOLOMON: Thanks. First here and then the other side of the room.

MR. KRAUSE: Thank you, I'm Don Krause, Citizens for Global Solutions. And I really want to thank the work of the task force for what it has done. The bipartisan effort is incredibly refreshing in this town, so thank you.

The comments that you made today one of the ones that I thought really resonated the most was the need for a full court press for all persons in the State Department to members of Congress to members of the foreign service to really push this effort forward,

there are many people who have talked about the outcome, the outcome document and some of the glass being half full or glass half empty. In reality it's a glass with the tap still running.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And if it is going to be successful, it will be that effort of taking this outside of New York into the capitals around the world. So the question is, have you seen any evidence of this type of full court press actually being developed and if not, who would you recommend to be the person within the Administration really to play point, to lead the charge on this?

CHAIRMAN GINGRICH: Well, I mean, I think pretty straightforward. Reorganizing an institution which has 191 members against the short-term instincts of a large number of its members volunteeristic way because you don't have the power to coerce it, requires that the State Department engage in a worldwide effort and I would recommend that it do so in direct and exclusive partnership with the legislative branch because I think our Constitution pretty well requires that to be effective. And that can only be led I mean, she has to decide -by the Secretary of State. Secretary Rice has to decide that achieving а

transparent, effective reform in the United Nations is one of the three or four most important goals that she has.

It's not an interesting thing that she hopes John Bolton will make progress on, but rather that it is significant for the future of the United States' role in the world that we be seen as helping reform the United Nations on behalf of the weakest and poorest people in the world. And I think that actually meets a wide range of American interests in terms of proving our commitment beyond our own national concerns in terms of proving we are capable of being multi-lateral and in terms of standing up for our values of democracy, the rule of law and human rights on terms which actually reflect the interests of most people of the planet.

So I would hope that Secretary Rice would decide that this was her personal assignment and that would guarantee you then energize the ambassadors around the world who will not be particularly energized by getting messages from New York from the United States Ambassador of the UN.

MR. KRAUSE: Have you seen any evidence that she's moving in that direction?

I mean, they certainly CHAIRMAN GINGRICH: have invested far more in the last six or seven months in the UN than you've seen out of the State Department for a very long time and you know, I think that my sense in talking with Secretary -- I mean, I don't know if the Secretary -- or Senator Mitchell wants to come in. Μy sense in talking directly with the Secretary and with others is that she takes very seriously moving the United Nations towards а more effective and transparent and more accountable model.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: I share the Speaker's views. The challenge obviously is when a Secretary of State is confronted with a myriad of problems around the world requiring extensive travel, negotiation, that issues of management reform, the type of things that Rod Hills talked about that are in fact, so critical to implementing other reforms and sustaining any reforms can tend to slip.

It's true of the President, all top officials in the Administration and Congress and what we've tried to do is to persuade them that this is a high priority and can serve many American interests. They did respond favorably, actively toward our initial

report and my hope is that the attitude that the Speaker has described will prevail.

MR. KRAUSE: I think you're doing a wonderful job and I hope (inaudible) will keep you going because the job is not done.

MR. HILLS: Could I just make one quick addition to that, and that is that I would hope our two co-chairman and you, Ambassador Solomon, would be willing to go make a little stronger effort in engaging the interest of the Congress. It has people that are interested but it is not a Congress that is interested and I think somehow or another we have to get it going in that direction, too, for it to be successful.

MR. CASTLEMAN: (Phonetic) My name is Gary Castleman and I write a column for the Washington

Times. I have a question for the panel about support for UN reform outside Washington. I know your commission is bipartisan. I know we all think that's a very good idea. I recently attended a UN day meeting in Minneapolis. It was a large meeting of folks who are strong Americans, who are strong supporters of the UN.

The guest speaker was a former colleague of Senators Wallop and Mitchell, Lee Botswitch (phonetic)

who you probably know is the UN Ambassador to the Human Rights Commission. I think he -- in the last session he made some progress and he made an impassioned appeal not only for human rights, for which he has a long record, but for reform. And he was booed and hissed by the audience primarily because he was a member of the Bush Administration.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Whether or not you -- however you feel about that, I get a sense that perhaps the feeling here is that well, most Americans support UN reform, especially people who believe in the UN and I'm asking my question of you and telling that antidote because I'm not sure that the support is as widespread as might be hoped.

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: No one, including our panel, can take the issue of UN reform out of context that exists in this country at the UN It is inevitable that people hold views on a aboard. wide range of issues and sometimes when they get the opportunity to express an opinion on Issue B, they don't concern themselves that Issue is what's That's not unusual in this country in the discussed. political process.

My hope is that for those who believe as we do and have expressed that in effect the view and is an American interest and who believe, as the Speaker has eloquently stated today, that it is in the interest of others around the world particularly some of those who are impeding reform, that they'll persevere it across, notwithstanding message and get the circumstances that you've described. I think there is broad support in this country, although there clearly is a national trend now as reflected in several recent opinion poles, of Americans wanting to pull back from international activities, which obviously, includes the UN, even though that may not be the precipitating factor.

I think we have to persist and persevere and ultimately make the argument based on self-interest that this is in the interest of the American people. That's why we should do it, Not because we want to do anyone else a favor but because it's on our interest and we believe the same argument applies to others around the world once they make the kind of analysis that we have made.

Lee Botswitch is a friend of Malcolm and I,

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we served with him and Newt knows him as well and I find what you say regrettable but you have to persevere through that. You have to understand that sometimes people seize whatever opportunity they have to express frustration even though it may not relate to the particular issue and, in fact, no one in the world is better than that than United States Senators, I might say because the rules of the Senate, as Malcolm will recall, permit Senators to speak on any subject at any time even though it bears no relationship to the legislation under consideration.

SENATOR WALLOP: And for as long as they want.

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: And for as long as they want. So after six years as Senate Majority Leader, I'm not surprised that people express opinions on issues unrelated to the subject under discussion.

CHAIRMAN GINGRICH: Let me say representing an institution with much more limited rules --

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: Much more strict rules.

CHAIRMAN GINGRICH: Much more strict rules which only allows one to speak briefly and ideally on some point, but one institution which has an equal

fervor for hostility, conflict and cheerful attacks on each other, in fact, more so than the Senate I would allege, you really raise two different things. One is, in the current polarized environment and I think one of the reasons Senator Mitchell and I have had some modest success is just the relief of seeing two people who are focused on the national interest and didn't figure out some way to turn it into a campaign fight. And I think there's a deep hunger in the United States for people who are willing to talk about what the nation needs and I would not -- whether it's on the right or left, I would basically ignore the most partisan hostilities and just move forward on the big points.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But second, something like reforming the United Nations is inherently in the long leadership issue. I mean, the average American, first of all, if they think of the UN at all, they are vaguely favorable and they don't connect any of the dots. Ιf they then learn about Volker's report, and learn about other things, they're then vaguely unfavorable and they don't connect the dots. They don't think that's their They think their job is to elect a President and a Congress which will work together to create environments

in which the US is effective in the world.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And I think that the average American will be very supportive of continuous efforts to reform the UN and I don't actually worry about interest groups in either the right or the left in that sense. On the left there's a faction that would say be for the UN no matter how flawed, and on the right there's a faction that would say leave the UN no matter how effective it is, and I think both those groups you can safely say, they're facts, they're not problems but the great vast majority of the American people would like to see an effective United Nations actually representing human rights and the interest of the poorest and weakest people of the world and would like to see the US playing a leading role within that framework, not against that framework.

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: I just want to add one comment, I apologize for taking this time, but with respect to the latter point that the Speaker mentioned, the importance of helping the poorest and weakest in the world, again, we believe that is not an act of charity. That is in the American national interest. If there's one thing we've learned in recent years, is that such

conditions and circumstance breed instability and as the dominant military and economic power in the world, where instability leads to conflict, we are inevitably at least asked to participate and frequently drawn in. So we should take these actions not only because they are morally right, but primarily because they serve our national interest if we want a world of stability, democracy, free markets and prosperity.

MR. CASTLEMAN: I just want to say I use the illustration. I know none of us are really in disagreement about any of these issues but I know a lot of your attention is turned towards the world arena and to the Congress and I was just suggesting because the audience when this incident happened, it was you know, entirely composed of very strong pro-UN people, that because you are all public figures of some note and eloquence, that you also -- it seemed to me important that you be also thinking about the American audience outside of Washington for a lot of your ideas.

I think it's important that you communicate those ideas as far as you can throughout the country.

AMBASSADOR SOLOMON: Thank you.

MS. BUSKIN: I'm Kathy Bushkin. I'm with

United Nations Foundation and thank you everything you've done in moving forward to actually reduce the polarization in this country around reform. I totally agree that management reform is essential and that progress has got to be made toward that. understand your views on the other recommendations about reform and that your report calls for a summit and the document calls for a Human Rights Council, a Peacebuilding Commissioner, terrorism, all which is on the US' agenda for that summit and that document. that the management reform issue, which is what Congress has focused on so much, may put those behind and those may get tied up as hostage to perceived departments or management reforms, which are happening, and I believe we're seeing a lot of progress but those are equally important reforms, I think, in this country. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: believe management reform is essential not just to achieve the specific objectives set forth in the report and discussed in some detail by Rod Hills today, but also as enabler of other reforms. Ιf you don't fundamental management changes, it makes more difficult the achieving of the other reforms to which you and

others have referred and it also makes the likelihood of the sustainability of reform much less.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That is not to suggest that attention should be drawn away from the others. We believe in all of the aspects of our report and we don't control the extent of attention given to various items. Ι personally -- I've not discussed this with Rod, I was dismayed early in this process when there was little attention given to management reform, in my judgment, insufficient. The fact that some attention is now being directed toward it, I think is not a bad thing and must be seen in the broader context of enabling reform in other areas but we strongly support the areas of reform that are described in our report and we hope that the pendulum doesn't shift from too far one way to too far the other and not have further attention the important issues that you've described.

AMBASSADOR SOLOMON: Please.

MS. LELAND: (Phonetic) Good morning, my name is Jennifer Leland from the State Department. First of all, I want to say thank you for your insights this morning. Since the issue of genocide was raised as an issue of particular concern and in the light of

recent instances where the US has shown hesitancy to identify the situation of genocide, I wanted to know what your thoughts are about America's responsibility to identify the situation as genocide from the outset, publicly and the sort of implications for UN intervention.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN GINGRICH: Well, I think that we owe it to ourselves to be honest about the world. I thing Rawanda was a terrible disgrace and it does little good to see movies and feel bad if you're not prepared to learn the lesson. The United States was a major problem in dealing with Rawanda because we didn't want to be honest about it. We didn't want to face it. We didn't want to act on it. I think what's happening in Darfur today is a major problem.

believe the threats of the Iranian dictatorship are an enormous problem. And I think lying about it, one of the great lessons of the 1930s is that failure to be honest about language wonderful essay by George Orwell "Politics and the English Language", which is really worth looking at because Orwell is writing in the shadow of the great totalitarian threat. And he said basically timid people

deliberatly avoid telling the truth about reality so
they are not forced to do things that frighten them.

Well, there are parts of the world that are

frightening. What happened in Cambodia under Pol Pot is terrifying. What happened in Rawanda is terrifying. What is happening today while we're meeting in Darfur is terrifying. The threat of the Iranians, if they pull it off, will be horrifying beyond anything that we have seen in our lifetime.

And I think when democratic politicians refuse to tell the truth -- that doesn't mean you have to rush out and act on it. It doesn't mean you have to tomorrow morning send troops but if you can't even be honest about the conditions you're dealing with, why should you expect that you're going to have any hope of being able to get anything done about it?

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: Not to speak to the Speaker but I think he meant democratic with a small d.

(Laughter)

AMBASSADOR SOLOMON: I think we have time for one more question, please.

23 COL. DOCTOW: (phonetic) First of all, I

apologize for being a little late. I'm Colonel Doctow from Foreign Policy Association. And my question concerns the reforms, UN reforms in general. And since Senator Mitchell has permitted that they are prepared to answer any question at any time, I would like to bring up the question of India's Security Council seat. How hard could India be kept away with one-fifth of the population of the world?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: In our report we stated that there were some issues on which the task force did not agree and Security Council expansion was one of However, we also agreed that individual members were, of course, free to express their personal views on the subject. When we released the report, we were asked that and similar questions and I expressed my personal view that Ι could support some expansion similar to that proposed by the high level panel in its second option, which would permit increased membership including longer terms with the possibility of renewal but not including additional veto power by other parties.

Since then, as you know from following the issue, there has not been the ability on the part of the

members of the UN to reach consensus on how best to proceed. I make no attempt to assess the prospects for that in the future since it's beyond my personal knowledge, but I do expect that the subject will continue to arise not just because of India's size but because of the fact that Japan and Germany, as defeated powers in the Second World War, were deliberately excluded from the Security Council on grounds which were reasonable at the time but have since become large democracies and now have the second and third largest economies in the world and, therefore, they advocate for a position that would provide them with membership as well as India and Brazil.

So, to repeat, to sum and repeat, specifically our Panel did not reach agreement on that subject, and we've expressed our individual views. I've expressed mine, and everyone else is free to express their's. Thank you.

AMBASSADOR SOLOMON: Any concluding comments? Let me just say on behalf of the Institute and the Task Force, we appreciate your coming here today. We anticipate there will be several other follow-up activities early in the New Year. I think a

number of important issues and suggestions were raised here today about things that the Task Force might follow-up on, so I know you'll join me in thanking our Co-Chairs and other Task Force members for their time. (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 1:21 p.m.)