

**U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1325:
RECOGNIZING WOMEN'S VITAL ROLES IN
ACHIEVING PEACE AND SECURITY**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND OVERSIGHT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

—————
MAY 15, 2008
—————

Serial No. 110-185
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/>

—————
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

42-424PDF

WASHINGTON : 2008

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California, *Chairman*

GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York	ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa	CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey	DAN BURTON, Indiana
BRAD SHERMAN, California	ELTON GALLEGLY, California
ROBERT WEXLER, Florida	DANA ROHRBACHER, California
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York	DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
BILL DELAHUNT, Massachusetts	EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York	STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
DIANE E. WATSON, California	THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado
ADAM SMITH, Washington	RON PAUL, Texas
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri	JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
JOHN S. TANNER, Tennessee	MIKE PENCE, Indiana
GENE GREEN, Texas	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California	JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas	J. GRESHAM BARRETT, South Carolina
RUBÉN HINOJOSA, Texas	CONNIE MACK, Florida
JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York	JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
DAVID WU, Oregon	MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas
BRAD MILLER, North Carolina	TED POE, Texas
LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, California	BOB INGLIS, South Carolina
DAVID SCOTT, Georgia	LUIS G. FORTUÑO, Puerto Rico
JIM COSTA, California	GUS BILIRAKIS, Florida
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey	VACANT
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona	
RON KLEIN, Florida	
BARBARA LEE, California	

ROBERT R. KING, *Staff Director*

YLEEM POBLETE, *Republican Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
HUMAN RIGHTS, AND OVERSIGHT

BILL DELAHUNT, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri,	DANA ROHRBACHER, California
<i>Vice Chair</i>	RON PAUL, Texas
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey	JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York	
JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York	

CLIFF STAMMERMAN, *Subcommittee Staff Director*

NATALIE COBURN, *Subcommittee Professional Staff Member*

PAUL BERKOWITZ, *Republican Professional Staff Member*

ELISA PERRY, *Staff Associate*

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESSES	
The Honorable Swanee Hunt, Chair, Hunt Alternatives Fund (Former U.S. Ambassador to Austria)	11
The Honorable Donald K. Steinberg, Deputy President for Policy, International Crisis Group (Former U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Angola) .	17
Ms. Betty Bigombe, Distinguished Scholar, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	22
Ms. Rina Amiri, Senior Regional Advisor, Central Eurasia Project, The Open Society Institute	26
Ms. Rebecca Joshua Okwaci, Secretary General, Women Action for Development	35
Janice Crouse, Ph.D., Senior Fellow, Beverly LaHaye Institute, Concerned Women for America	41
LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING	
The Honorable Dana Rohrabacher, a Representative in Congress from the State of California: Prepared statement	4
The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison, a U.S. Senator from the State of Texas: Statement	10
The Honorable Swanee Hunt: Prepared statement	13
The Honorable Donald K. Steinberg: Prepared statement	20
Ms. Betty Bigombe: Prepared statement	24
Ms. Rina Amiri: Prepared statement	31
Ms. Rebecca Joshua Okwaci: Prepared statement	38
Janice Crouse, Ph.D.: Prepared statement	43
Ms. Marianne Mollmann and Ms. Alexandra Arriaga: Written statement	51
APPENDIX	
The Honorable Donald K. Steinberg: Revised statement submitted after the hearing	70

**U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1325:
RECOGNIZING WOMEN'S VITAL ROLES IN
ACHIEVING PEACE AND SECURITY**

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2008

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
HUMAN RIGHTS, AND OVERSIGHT,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:07 p.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. William D. Delahunt (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The hearing of the subcommittee will come to order. And as I look out, I see a most impressive panel. I had an opportunity to exchange greetings with Ambassador Hunt and Ambassador Steinberg, both of whom I consider friends, people that I have profound respect for. I noted just now to Ambassador Steinberg that he was the thorn between all of these roses that are assembled before us.

Today we will address a subject that should concern all those who profess an interest in international peace: The role of women. Across the globe there are multiple examples of heroic women exercising leadership in their countries, attempting to end conflict and building a future for themselves and their children. At all levels of society from grassroots meetings to the halls of the United Nations, women are striving to achieve and maintain peace, to seek reconciliation and to promote reconstruction of failing states and societies.

The United Nations recognized the vital role women play in conflict resolution with the passage of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1325 in the year 2000. But Resolution 1325 was not simply an acknowledgment of these contributions, because it calls on all of us to do more to ensure women a greater voice in the peace building process.

Resolution 1325 asks member states to ensure increased representation of women at all decision making levels and national, regional, and international institutions, and to support gender training to service providers. It also asks the United Nations Security General to appoint more women to high level posts, as well as to field-based operational positions, especially as military observers and civilian police.

The resolution recognizes the disproportionate harm to women and children caused by conflict. They are the overwhelming major-

ity of the refugees and internally displaced persons in any conflict. They are too often the targets of combatants and armed elements. The consequences of such targeting in terms of reconciliation and durable peace are profound.

Resolution 1325 urges all sides to a conflict to protect women from gender-based violence, particularly rape and other sexual abuse. It also calls on all parties to end the impunity, which is all too common, and prosecute those responsible for war crimes relating to sexual violence. This issue cannot be over emphasized. The United Nations Fund for Women estimates that one in three worldwide will experience gender-based violence in her lifetime, and in some countries that figure exceeds 70 percent.

I want to commend the chair of the full committee, Howard Berman, for recently introducing the International Violence Against Women Act, legislation which could place the United States at the forefront of the global battle against gender-based violence.

In my own lifetime I served previously as a district attorney, the state's attorney in the Metropolitan Boston Area. In 1978, working again with heroic women, we created the first domestic violence initiative and program in the United States. That program has been replicated not only elsewhere in this country, but worldwide, and I am very proud to say that for better than a decade as a result of that unit and that effort there were no domestic violence homicides in my jurisdiction for 12 years.

[Applause.]

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you.

So as I look back on my own life, I say that has always been a priority for me and it can happen. If people of good will come together, it can happen, not only locally, not only at the State level, not only nationally, but I can assure you internationally.

So again I want to commend Howard Berman, the chairman of this committee.

But 1325 goes beyond the issue of gender-based violence. It recognizes that the best way to achieve sustainable peace is to engage that half of the population that is too often unrepresented at peace talks. By understanding the impact of armed conflict on women and by fully engaging them in the peace process, we can best maintain and promote international peace and security. This is a concept that is so obvious in its logic, but yet difficult or far from simple to implement. While the Bush administration has solidly supported 1325, there is much more to do to achieve its objectives.

To begin, I think it is long past time for the United States to more coherently pursue strategies in our foreign policy and assistance that will ensure that women's voices are heard. I welcome feedback from this panel on how best that can be accomplished. And that is why I support House Resolution 146 introduced by my friend and colleague from Texas, Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson, which calls on the United States to meet its obligations as set in 1325.

And let me take just a moment to say how honored we are that Representative Johnson has joined us today. We are also honored by the presence of Congresswoman Yvette Clarke of the State of New York, and my colleague from Massachusetts and dear friend,

Congresswoman Niki Tsongas, the only female in the Massachusetts delegation. We are so glad that she is with us, however.

I ask unanimous consent that these esteemed colleagues be allowed to participate as full members of the subcommittee for the purpose of receiving testimony and taking questions.

Now let me turn to my ranking member and colleague and friend, Dana Rohrabacher, for any comments that he wishes to make at this time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate you holding this hearing. It is again another subject that needs to be discussed and I am very happy that we are here today to begin that dialogue.

I will begin myself by saying that I have the greatest respect and admiration for the gentlelady from Texas. Representative Johnson is widely known as an effective legislator, and I have enjoyed serving with her for many years on the Science Committee.

However, due to the fact that her Resolution 146 urges the United States to take actions that will implement the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, which includes the creation of a panel, I unfortunately have to oppose that concept. I certainly do not believe that the United States should be turning over any authority and decision making on any subject to a panel of the United Nations. The United Nations is generally made up of countries that do not in any way meet the standards that we believe in in the United States, especially the democratic standards of elections, as well as honesty, et cetera.

While many of the goals, which you suggested are part of that resolution, are certainly admirable goals, the very last thing that I would want to do is then turn over some sort of authority to a panel which we don't know who they would be made up right now of in the United Nations. There are plenty of countries in the United Nations that I would want to have no say over judging United States of America, whether it is Burma, or Saudi Arabia, or any number of countries, for any number of reasons.

So I will just submit my opening statement for the record, which indicates, for example, there are different norms of different countries in the U.N., like the Saudis and different countries in Africa, which have different norms of the way they treat women, as well as other countries in the world, like in China where baby girls are murdered, with forced abortions, women having to put up with forced abortions. People have those different values.

And I am proud the United States of America has a very strong commitment to equal justice for all. And you compare what our standards are to the rest of the world, the last thing I think we would want to do is impanel a group of people from the rest of the world who may come from countries with totally different values than we have, to pass judgments on us.

So thus, while I certainly support many of the things that you brought up that are in this resolution, I would have to oppose it, because I see it, as I say, as an empowerment of the United Nations and a diminishing then of the right of the American people through their elected officials to set the standards that we want for our country.

So with that said, this does not in any way suggest that, as you say, the things that you have already outlined in your opening statement are not laudatory and very positive goals for us as a nation. Leaving the United Nations to then judge us on that is a whole different issue.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Rohrabacher follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DANA ROHRABACHER, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing today. I'll begin by saying that I have the greatest respect and admiration for the gentle lady from Texas. She is widely known as an effective legislator and I have enjoyed serving for many years with her on the Science Committee. However, due to the fact that her resolution H. Res. 146 urges the U.S. to take actions to implement United Nations Security Council 1325 which would could turn over U.S. domestic policy to an unelected group of so called international experts I do not support it.

Let's suppose that the "expert" from Saudi Arabia is under pressure from her government to take a certain policy position that all women should be covered from head to toe and strictly segregated from men. Would any of us support that?

How about if the so called expert from Nigeria supports Female Genital Mutilation because it was done to her, she believes that it has helped her lead a pure life and it takes place almost everywhere in Nigeria and therefore she wants us to share her 'virtuous' way of life by removing the clitoris of American females at puberty. Who among us would want that?

How about if the expert from Sudan strongly believes that because black slavery thrives in her country we should do it here too? I'd like to see a show of hands in the room from supporters of that concept?

Well by lending support an unelected body of foreign born "experts" who we may or may not share many of our religious, societal or cultural behaviors, and who may be under pressure from their government, all sorts of outrageous legally binding demands may be placed upon us.

Equal rights in the United States are guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We don't need to a UN Security Resolution to achieve it.

There are several sound reasons why the United States has not entered into such an agreement. First and foremost, as the resolution language suggests, the treaty obliges the United States to meet certain conditions and perform certain actions. It is, in essence, an assault on our sovereignty. Such agreements could make fundamental changes, and dictate to us the way in which our citizens are to live and act.

Secondly, the language of treaties such as The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) is broad and could, as the Supreme Law of the land, dictate actions which are in direct violation of the American values of limited government and privacy.

We should use the utmost caution in approaching measures such as this. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to the witnesses' testimony.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Dana. I am sure it is rather clear at this point in time that my good friend and I have some very serious differences.

Please let me yield to Representative Johnson for a statement.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. I am so pleased that you invited me to be here. And Ranking Member Rohrabacher, I want to say that we are going to work together and pass this resolution. I am delighted that we have been joined by two of my colleagues, because working with women's issues for international interests has been kind of hard to come by. So you are so welcome. And I especially would like to thank all of the panel members who have come. And most especially, I would like to thank Ambassador Swanee Hunt, who has been such a dedicated worker, good friend of mine, and has done so much throughout the world for our women.

Mr. Rohrabacher, when you hear her story, you will understand more clearly why we have this amendment here. This is not a resolution. This is not the first time. I introduced this now several terms, but I am hoping that this might be the last time and we can try to do something.

I introduced the resolution to express that the United States should take action to meet its obligation to women and girls as agreed in the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, and that the United States should fully assume the implementation of international law related to human rights that protect the rights of women and girls during and after conflicts.

I have visited with so many women who have come here from countries that have used aggression toward them and suppression. And I am going to invite you, my good friend Mr. Rohrabacher, to visit with some as they come in the future.

The United Nations Security Council resolution addresses the impact of war and conflict on women and encourages women's participation in peacekeeping and conflict resolution. It is not anything that I think this country does not stand for. The resolution states that women's participation at all decision making levels should increase at local, national and international institutions involved in conflict prevention, management and resolution.

I have written to the President, and I have written to the peace negotiators for the Middle East asking them to please include women, because when they do we will get it done. It calls on member states to ensure the protection and respect for human rights of girls and women, particularly as they relate to national constitutions, electoral assistance, police, and judiciaries. It also urges member states to increase their voluntary financial, technical and logistical support for gender sensitive training efforts. It must share the responsibility that encompasses all, regardless of race, class, gender or religion, and it has absolutely nothing to do with abortion and I will try to explain that to Congressman Smith.

I look forward to hearing these distinguished members who have come of the panel. And I look forward to working with my colleague. We have done it before; I know we can do it again.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank you, Congresswoman Johnson.

Would either of my other colleagues wish to make a statement? Yvette, please.

Ms. CLARKE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. To the distinguished chairman, Mr. Delahunt, ranking member, Mr. Rohrabacher, and to my colleagues on the subcommittee, I want to personally thank you for holding a hearing and allowing me to participate on an extremely important and significant issue for me.

I want to commend Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson for her tenacity, vision, insight, leadership. Your courage, despite the fear mongering opposition that exists out there, I am certain will prevail in the end.

Like mercury or quicksilver, you will find that justice always finds its way to freedom. I want to thank the chair for his interest in evaluating U.N. Security Council Resolution 1325 and address many of the concerns of how women can play a more fundamental and critical role in achieving peace and security.

As a woman and a Member of Congress, I strongly believe that I have a civic and moral duty to ensure that women throughout the world are not adversely affected by the atrocities of war and conflict and make certain that women play an integral role and actively participate in all aspects of any peacekeeping process to bring about global sustainability.

I look forward to hearing from our panelists today. You are the individuals that will lead us into a sustainable and more peaceful society globally. We look forward to hearing your suggestions, your recommendations, and be able to make sure that it is applied to all of the strategies going forward until we find that women have their rightful role and partnership in the growth and development of our mutual civil society.

Thank you once again, Mr. Chairman, for your invitation, and I look forward to hearing testimony today.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Congresswoman.

Please, Congresswoman Tsongas, my colleague from Massachusetts. We are fancy here, Niki.

Ms. TSONGAS. You are quite fancy here. I am enjoying the little monitors in here, having just spent last night about 12 hours in the Armed Services Committee where we talked so much about how to protect those in our military. So it is fortuitous that I happen to be here today to hear your testimony. And I have to give great credit to Swanee Hunt, who many of you know well, and who is a long time friend and colleague, and passionate in her work.

It is fortuitous that we are here today to talk about the impact of war and conflict on children and families and to hear from you, your thoughts about how we here in Congress can be most helpful and how the broader international community has a responsibility to bear.

So I thank you, Chairman Delahunt, my colleague, for inviting me to participate, and I look forward to hearing your testimony. Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Niki. I am going to call on, because of the personal friendship and she has already done some of your resume, but we will let her finish with the rest of it. She is not here right now.

By the way, please don't perceive us to be rude. Buzzers come off here, as Ambassador Steinberg is aware. I am sure there will be a series of votes. We have a very poor scheduling apparatus, and there are multiple commitments that each of the members have.

In any event, I am delighted to welcome Ambassador Hunt, who has been instrumental in advocating for 1325's full adoption in the United Nations and across the globe. Ambassador Hunt is the Founding Director of the Women and Public Policy Program at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. She is also President of Hunt Alternatives Fund, which supports social change at local, national and global levels. She chairs the Initiative for Inclusive Security, which advocates for the full participation of women in peace processes.

From 1993 to 1997, she served as our Ambassador to Austria, where she hosted negotiations focused on stabilizing the neighboring Balkan states. In July 1997, she launched Vital Voices: Women in Democracy, a conference convening 320 women leaders

in business, law and politics from 39 nations. The conference gave rise to the documentary entitled "Voices," as well as an ensuing State Department initiative and later an NGO with the same name.

Swanee, welcome.

Ambassador HUNT. Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We are also pleased to have Ambassador Donald Steinberg, who is the Deputy President for Policy of the International Crisis Group. Prior to joining the Crisis Group, he was a Jennings Randolph senior fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace. In 2004, he retired from the U.S. Department of State after a 29-year career. During his tenure there he served as Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, director of State Department's Joint Policy Council, special representative of Presidents Clinton and Bush for global humanitarian demining and the special Haiti coordinator, and that is when we first met. His work there was extraordinary. I can testify to that firsthand.

He is a winner of more than a dozen awards, including the State Department's Distinguished Service Award, which is the department's highest performance award. He holds master's degrees in journalism from Columbia and political economy from the University of Toronto, as well as a bachelor's degree from Reed College.

In my opening remarks I used the term "heroic women." Well, we have three such remarkable women today before us who will tell us their personal experiences about seeking peace and reconciliation in their home countries.

Betty Bigombe is currently a distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. She is best known for her role as chief mediator in the 20-year old northern Uganda conflict between the government and rebel forces known as the Lord's Resistance Army. She served as Minister of State for Pacification of north and northeastern Uganda in the early 1990s. In this capacity Ms. Bigombe initiated contacts with the rebel leader, Joseph Kony, that eventually led to the peace talks of 1993 and 1994. She returned to Uganda in a private capacity in 2004 to re-engage the government and the rebels in talks. This initiative paved the way for the ongoing peace talks between the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army in Juba, south Sudan.

She has received a master's from the Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, and has served as a senior social scientist with the World Bank's Post Conflict Unit. She was also a senior fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace.

Welcome, it is an honor to have you here.

Ms. BIGOMBE. Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Rina Amiri returned to her native Afghanistan in February 2002 to take part in peace building and reconstruction efforts following three decades of instability and war. She served as a political affairs officer in the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General at the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan, and as a member of the political unit implementing the Bonn Peace Accords. She oversaw and managed elections for women, nomads, refugees and minorities at risk in the provinces of Afghanistan and in the refugee camps in Iran and Pakistan. She also has served as a liaison for political parties in

the Presidential elections and as part of the United Nations Assistance Mission and Afghan Independent Human Rights Team. Currently she serves as a senior regional advisor with the Central Eurasia Project, Middle East-North Africa Initiative at the Open Society Institute.

Welcome, and it certainly is an honor to have you here.

Ms. AMIRI. Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Rebecca Joshua Okwaci. I have trouble with that name.

Ms. OKWACI. Okwaci, Okwaci.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Yes, Madam. She is a founding member of the Sudanese Women's Empowerment for Peace and Sudanese Women's Voice for Peace, which encourages women from war affected areas to become active participants in peace building. She also served as the Secretary General for Women Action for Development in Nairobi, Kenya. She facilitates activities with grassroots organizations, political authorities, and other stakeholders. She also organizes field visits with groups from both the north and south of Sudan, and she conducts workshops on conflict resolution, negotiation, leadership, advocacy and peace awareness for women in refugee camps in Sudan, Kenya and elsewhere. She has led delegations to meet mediation officials and representatives of the International Authority on Development Peace Initiative in Nairobi.

It is an honor to have you here and welcome.

Last and certainly not least, Janice Shaw Crouse, Ph.D., is a senior fellow at the Beverly LaHaye Institute, the think tank for Concerned Women for America. In 2002 and 2003, she has twice served the President as an official delegate to the United Nations. She serves on the following National Task Forces and Coalitions Against Sexual Trafficking, Against Abuse of Women, Against Childhood Obesity, Promoting Human Rights and Promoting Religious Freedom. The Heritage Foundation nominated her for the 2003 Bradley Prize for her influence on contemporary issues.

Before coming to the BLI, Dr. Crouse was president of Crouse Communications, a public relations and political analysis firm. She also directed the Ecumenical Coalition on Women in Society, a project of the Institute on Religion and Democracy. Previously she was associate vice president for academic affairs at Taylor University.

Ambassador Hunt, I understand you have been asked by Senator Hutchison to read a statement from her. Would you care to begin with that?

Ambassador HUNT. I would be glad to.

Chairman Delahunt and Ranking Member Rohrabacher, thank you for your invitation to testify on the importance of women's inclusion in preventing conflicts and promoting peace and security.

"It is my honor to introduce my dear"—this is a little self-serving here—"it is an honor to introduce my dear friend and fellow Texan, Ambassador Swanee Hunt. For decades she has lead tireless efforts to promote women as agents of change."

Ambassador STEINBERG. Do you want me to read that?

Ambassador HUNT. Thank you, Senator.

"I remember our trip to Bosnia shortly after the peace accord was signed. I was highly impressed with the local women who

repeatedly came together to work on specific initiatives to foster stability and reconciliation. I am keenly aware of the many contributions American women make to protect our country here and abroad. They join women from around the world who struggle daily to prevent violence in their communities and constantly promote stability and reconciliation.

“Just as American women want safe neighborhoods, access to education and thriving communities, so do the women in Sudan, Iraq and Afghanistan and other countries where violence is prevalent. And just as we rely on American women to play an active role in strengthening U.S. democracy, so too must we support women in these countries as they work to curtail hostility and secure peace.

“In today’s volatile world where most conflicts are fought in urban environments, it is imperative that we explore every option toward preventing and defeating the insurgent violence that plagues so many cities worldwide. There are many women living in areas of conflict today that can help in so many ways, especially in providing human intelligence and helping with reconciliation and reconstruction.

“Women are currently providing key intelligence in Iraq and Afghanistan and have played vital roles in other conflicts from Northern Ireland to Bosnia.

“Every attention much be given to the importance of women to security and peace in countries like Iraq, Sudan, Uganda and Afghanistan. These women are true heroines and we desperately need their experience and help to achieve a sustainable peace where there remains inherent conflict.

“Thank you, Mr. Chairman.”

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Ambassador. And now we will obviously make Senator Hutchison’s statement part of our record. And now I am going to ask you to proceed with your own remarks.

[The information referred to follows:]



Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison Statement for the Record

House Committee on Foreign Affairs:
Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight
Hearing on U.N. Security Resolution 1325: Recognizing Women's Vital
Roles in Achieving Peace and Security

May 15, 2008, 2:00pm

Chairman Delahunt and Ranking Member Rohrabacher,

Thank you for your invitation to testify on the importance of women's inclusion in preventing conflicts and promoting peace and security. It is my honor to introduce my dear friend and fellow Texan, Ambassador Swanee Hunt. For decades, she has led tireless efforts to promote women as agents of change.

I remember our trip to Bosnia shortly after the peace accord was signed; I was highly impressed with the local women who repeatedly came together to work on specific initiatives to foster stability and reconciliation.

I am keenly aware of the many contributions American women make to protect our country, here and abroad. They join women from around the world who struggle daily to prevent violence in their communities and constantly promote stability and reconstruction.

Just as American women want safe neighborhoods, access to education, and thriving communities, so do the women in Sudan, Iraq, and Afghanistan and other countries where violence is prevalent. And just as we rely on American women to play an active role in strengthening U.S. democracy, so too must we support women in these countries as they work to curtail hostility and secure peace.

In today's volatile world, where most conflicts are fought in urban environments, it is imperative that we explore every option towards preventing and defeating the insurgent violence that plagues so many cities worldwide. There are many women living in areas of conflict today that can help in so many ways especially in providing human intelligence and helping with reconciliation and reconstruction. Women are currently providing key intelligence in Iraq and Afghanistan and have played vital roles in other conflicts from Northern Ireland to Bosnia.

Every attention must be given to the importance of women to security and peace in countries like Iraq, Sudan, Uganda and Afghanistan. These women are true heroines and we desperately need their experience and help to achieve a sustainable peace where there remains inherent conflict.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE SWANEE HUNT, CHAIR,
HUNT ALTERNATIVES FUND (FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO
AUSTRIA)**

Ambassador HUNT. Thank you, Chairman Delahunt.

I particularly appreciate your concern about the U.N. Security Council Resolution 1325. I won't repeat what you have said about that. And Ranking Member Rohrabacher, thank you for inviting me. And you know what, we are going to work together on this resolution, I promise you. We are going to find a way. Because you know what, you actually would be behind 99.9 percent of the U.N. Security Council Resolution 1325, truly, really. So we will fix this.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I have no doubt.

Ambassador HUNT. All right. To Congresswoman Tsongas' point of Armed Services, the Washington Post recently had a cover story about Army Specialist Monica Brown. She is only the second woman in history to be awarded the Silver Star. Specialist Brown is one of over 26,000 American women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. This article pointed out these women are valued by the military, not only for their skills as soldiers, but also because of their cultural sensitivity to connect with local women.

And Congresswoman Gillibrand and other Members have told me repeatedly that if we value women's cultural sensitivity as warriors, then the U.S. Government should also value them as peacemakers. I began promoting a more inclusive concept of security when I was U.S. Ambassador in Austria and I was working on the conflict in the Balkans. That is when I worked with Senator Hutchison. But I became particularly aware of the inattention of the international community to use these talented, well-educated women in the conflict.

Here you have Yugoslavia, which was torn apart by this war that cost 200,000 lives. They had the highest percentage of women Ph.D.s of any country in Europe. And yet when we convened the parties in Vienna for peace talks, and later when the peace talks happened in Dayton, there was not one woman on any of the delegations. So out of 50 or 60 people in those delegations, not one woman.

I was fascinated by this and I discovered that this wasn't just about the Balkans. In fact, when I went to the U.N. and I asked an official there how come there aren't any women on any of the African delegations, I was told by this U.N. official the warlords won't have women because they are afraid the women will compromise. I thought, "Well, wouldn't that be lovely? Isn't that what a negotiating team is supposed to do?"

So I started this initiative called Inclusive Security, and that is the course now that I teach at Harvard at the Kennedy School. What it does is it recognizes that the whole nature of conflict has changed. So in World War I, 10 percent of the casualties were the civilians and 90 percent were the soldiers. And nowadays it has flipped: 90 percent of the people who are killed are civilians and 10 percent are the soldiers.

So if in fact we have a new scenario in terms of war, then we need to have a new scenario in terms of how we understand stopping war. It is not just about the absence of war, it is about sustainable peace. How do you create this mechanism for a sustain-

able peace? Well, you have to have different tools. You need to have this wider array. You have to have all the local stakeholders involved. Then they can then be available to the police, to the military, to the diplomatic structures. Women are half of these people. They are the ones who on the ground are doing these local initiatives. And so when you side-line them, it is not only fundamentally undemocratic, but it is really inefficient. In fact, it is foolish. This isn't just about fairness and women's rights, this is about efficiency and efficacy.

So we in this initiative put together research teams, and we went out and did more than 15 field studies. And this is what we found. We found that women are critical to these peace processes at every stage, whether it is prevention or during the war, the negotiations, whether it is the transitional justice afterwards or any other part of the post conflict reconstruction, the demobilization or reintegration, whether they are mediators. And especially the U.S. Congress I think would be interested in knowing that the higher the percentage of women you have in these processes, the better the governance. The closer you get to what we value, Mr. Rohrabacher, so much in terms of good governance.

You were talking about the corruption and the problems in these other countries and the U.N. Get more women, get a critical mass of women, not just one woman here and one woman there, that is not it. Get a critical mass of women into these positions of leadership and you will see a drop in the corruption. If you talk to these women about why, do you know what they say? They say, "I know that any dollar I put into my pocket is not going into a school, it is not going into a hospital."

So women lead these conflict resolution efforts, and we have this compelling evidence, and yet if you look around at the major conflicts, Darfur to Afghanistan, Iraq, you will be amazed. I think you will be shocked to see how underrepresented they are in every area, in the peace negotiations, the Constitution drafting, the peacekeeping missions again, the U.N. peacekeeping missions. The women are not there in positions of leadership.

So what do we do about it? Well, this initiative has put together a global network of these women leaders. We have over 800 of them. We are working in 50 conflicts and we are connecting these women leaders to 5 or 6,000 policy makers at this point. In fact, you make 5,006 to date. And these women are spectacular. They are civil society leaders, they are appointed and elected political officials, they are scholars, business people, they are representatives from multilateral organizations. They are investigative journalists. Think about the role that journalists play in stopping a war.

You could take all these different backgrounds and perspectives and you come up with different solutions when you have different people around the table. And over the last decades these women have led major initiatives. You have some real spectacular women at this table today, and they are only representing hundreds more.

So I am very, very honored to have you here and my friends. And by the way, that includes Janice, with whom I have worked for about 9 years.

And let me conclude here by saying I spend time sometimes in Liberia. And if I could just whet your imaginations right now and

take you to Liberia, a 14-year brutal war. And finally the women said, "Enough, enough." And thousands of them, grassroots women and educated women, they got together. And they said we are going to sit out here in the sun, in the rain until we get a peace agreement. Thousands of them. And they wore all white for sackcloth and ashes. And you know what else? They denied their men sex. But I don't know if you want that in the record, but they did.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That stays in the record, Ambassador.

Ambassador HUNT. All right. Well, then they finally got Charles Taylor and the other warlords to agree to go into the peace talks. And they surrounded the building, they literally surrounded the building where the peace talks were going on, and they locked these men in and said, "You are not coming out until you have a peace agreement because this is wrecking our lives, it is wrecking our country, and no more." And that was the movement that elected Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, the first woman elected President in Africa. And you know what she did? When she became President she brought in not just a woman as the Minister of Youth and Sports or Gender and Development, she brought in women as Minister of Finance, Minister of Commerce, Minister of Justice and Chief of Police. And you are looking at one of the few real success stories in Africa in terms of the wars.

So I think that the U.S. Congress and administration can learn from these lessons, and I would like to close my testimony with a quote from earlier this week from Secretary Rice:

"Empowering women must be a fundamental component of any relevant and effective foreign policy in today's world. So often it takes only one woman to make a difference. If you empower that woman with information and training, she can lift her entire family and contribute to the success of her community. Multiply that one woman's impact by 100 or a 1,000, and perhaps a million lives can be changed."

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Hunt follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE SWANEE HUNT, CHAIR, HUNT
ALTERNATIVES FUND (FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO AUSTRIA)

Distinguished members of Congress,

I would like to thank Chairman William Delahunt and Ranking Member Dana Rohrabacher for inviting me to testify about the critical role women play in preventing conflict, leading efforts to resolve it, and securing viable peace after the violence ends. I thank all the members of the Foreign Affairs committee as well as representatives from other committees here today. Considering the daily news from Iraq, Afghanistan, and Sudan, it is very timely for the US Congress to focus its attention on finding long term, sustainable solutions to deep-rooted conflicts. One such way is to highlight many contributions women make to peace and stability.

On May 1, 2008 *the Washington Post* had a cover page story about Army Specialist Monica Brown of my native Texas. Last year Specialist Brown was awarded a Silver Star, only the second woman in history to be awarded such a military honor. The eighteen year-old medic faced insurgents fire in eastern Afghanistan as she ran to assist her wounded comrades, "displaying bravery and grit." Specialist Brown is one of 26,304 American women currently serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. As the article pointed out, these women are valued by the military not only their skills as soldiers, but also their cultural sensitivity to connecting with local women in these worn torn countries. Congresswomen Gillibrand, and other members of House and Senate, have told me repeatedly that if we value women's cultural sensitivity as warriors, we should also value them as peacemakers.

I began promoting a more inclusive concept of security, one that acknowledges women's contributions to peace processes, as US Ambassador to Austria. While helping resolve the conflict in the Balkans from 1993 to 1997, I became keenly aware of the unwillingness of the international community to use the enormous pool of talented, well-educated women peace builders to help resolve the conflict. Yugoslavia, the country torn apart by a bloody war that lasted a decade and killed close to 200,000 people, had the highest percentage of women PhDs per capita; yet, when we convened the parties in Vienna and later at Dayton to negotiate, there were no women on any formal delegations.

The marginalization of these experts in the Balkans was simply part of a broader problem of exclusion. To address it, in the fall of 1999 I founded a program called The Initiative for Inclusive Security. Its corner stone has been the global network of women peacebuilders, which has since grown to include over 800 women from 50 conflicts. My primary goal was to connect its members to policymakers around the world. Members of the Network, all demonstrated leaders are elected and appointed government officials, directors of NGOs and movements in civil society, scholars and educators, businesspeople, representatives of multilateral organizations, and journalists. With varied backgrounds, perspectives, and skills, they bring a vast array of expertise to the peacemaking process. Over the last decade these leaders have led major efforts to create stability in the most volatile places in the world, ranging from Guatemala to Sri Lanka, Colombia to Liberia, the Middle East to Cambodia. I am honored to have three members of our Network join me here today to testify about their personal experiences of securing peace in Uganda, Afghanistan, and Sudan.

"Inclusive security," a paradigm I discussed in a Foreign Policy article published in 2001 and the title of a course I teach at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, recognizes the changed nature of modern conflicts. Just as warfare has become more inclusive—with civilian deaths more common than soldiers'—so too must our approach to ending conflict. The concept of inclusive security builds on a diverse, citizen-driven approach, motivated by efficiency. Our goal is not simply the absence of war, but a sustainable peace fostered by fundamental social changes. Women are crucial to this change since they are often at the center of civil society, electoral referenda, and other citizen-driven movements. An inclusive security approach expands the array of tools available to police, military, and diplomatic structures by adding collaboration with local efforts to achieve peace.

WHY INCLUDE WOMEN IN PEACE PROCESSES?

Women constitute over half the population; sidelining them is discriminatory and fundamentally undemocratic. But the rights argument is persuasive only to those who cherish fairness alone. For those who value efficacy and efficiency, ignoring them is foolish. Worldwide, women make profound contributions to peace building. If we hope to transform instability and violence into stability and prosperity, we must incorporate their expertise.

Women are still a shockingly underutilized resource in conflict prevention and resolution. By failing to leverage women's expertise and include them fully, we are squandering a tremendous opportunity. In Iraq, Sudan, Afghanistan, Rwanda, Bosnia, and elsewhere, I have seen firsthand how women prevent the eruption of violence, mediate among warring factions, and repair shattered societies after conflict.

Evidence of women's contributions is compelling. The Initiative for Inclusive Security has conducted field studies to document women's impact in every stage of conflict. It is evident they are highly invested in peace. And were they consistently at the table for strategic planning with policy makers they could have had an enormous positive impact on discussions, debates, and decisions relating to security. Instead, peace processes excluded women and conflict rages in some 50 countries today.

Our research proves:

1. *Women lead conflict resolution efforts throughout periods of armed conflict; and women's groups often lead the call for negotiations and an end to violent conflict.*

Nothing illustrates this point better than the work of Ana Teresa Bernal in Colombia. As coordinator of the National Network of Initiatives Against the War and for Peace, Ms. Bernal mobilized 10 million people to vote for peace in a 1996 national referendum. She helped create a vehicle for civil society and government to bring their interests into the negotiations between the government and the guerrillas. Today she is one of two women representing civil society on the recently established National Commission for Reparation and Reconciliation.

2. *Women play an important stabilizing role during the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) process.*

Though women and girls were active militarily in the conflict in Sierra Leone and twelve percent of all combatants were women, they were mostly excluded from official reintegration programs. Nonetheless, women supported the reintegration of former fighters and filled many gaps in official programs, such as community reconstruction efforts, in addition to opening their homes to former child soldiers.

No one can tell Sierra Leone's story better than its Foreign Affairs Minister Zainab Hawa Bangura, who ran for president and was arguably the driving force behind the signing of the peace accord. Ms. Bangura mobilized thousands of women to confront armed soldiers in pro-democracy street protests. With little experience confronting thousands of unarmed women, the confused soldiers found themselves receiving orders from Ms. Bangura. "We are your mothers, your sisters, your wives and your daughters," she told them. "If you are going to shoot us, then do it now. But remember, the whole world is watching."

3. *Women capitalize on their traditional roles to reach across conflict lines as mediators and promoters of dialogue.*

More than 65,000 people have lost their lives and nearly one million have been displaced during two decades of war in Sri Lanka. Fighting between the Tamil minority and the Sri Lankan government intensified in the 1990s; in 2002, the Norwegians brokered a cease-fire and parties committed to sign a peace agreement. However, large-scale violence resumed after Sri Lanka's 2005 presidential elections and subsequent talks have failed. Still, national and international women's organizations have advanced important peace initiatives. On the national front, Sri Lankan women have been active in campaigning for an end of the war, reaching across conflict divides to advance dialogue through specific peace initiatives.

After Visaka Dharamadasa's son, a soldier in the Sri Lankan army, disappeared while fighting, she traveled into Tamil territory to negotiate with the Sri Lankan army and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) to ensure the identification and return of soldiers' bodies. She advocated for combatant use of identification tags and for adherence to international laws addressing the proper treatment of prisoners of war. In the process, Ms. Dharamadasa gained the trust of LTTE leaders; and so when talks were floundering and Tamil representatives refused to speak directly with negotiators, they asked her to carry messages to the government.

4. *Women are at the forefront of good governance efforts and often serve as a bridge between government and civil society, working across political lines to achieve important policy priorities.*

No example better highlights women's contributions to governance than Rwanda, where women now hold 49 percent of the seats in Parliament—the highest percentage in the world. They are playing a significant role in politics and governance in the country, thanks to women like Aloisea Inyumba.

At the age of 26, Ms. Inyumba became Rwanda's minister of gender and social affairs after the genocide. She designed programs to bury 800,000 corpses, and designed a national adoption campaign to find homes for 500,000 orphans. As head of the Commission for Unity and Reconciliation, she went village to village helping victims dramatize their tragedies, preparing them for the reintegration of perpetrators. She created women's councils that fed into the parliament, resulting in the highest percentage of women legislators in the world.

WHAT CONGRESS CAN DO?

These women are not exceptions to the rule—they are but a few examples of the valuable contributions that millions of women make everyday to peace building in their homes, communities, and countries.

Despite all this evidence, policymakers and practitioners rarely include women in stabilization and reconstruction processes. A quick scan of today's major conflicts reveals that from Darfur to Afghanistan to Iraq, women continue to be marginalized and underrepresented in everything from peace negotiations and constitution drafting committees to service provision and peacekeeping missions.

We all recognize the pressing need to employ new tactics, policies, and strategies to resolve the scores of intransigent conflicts raging around the world. I believe that from a purely utilitarian standpoint we need to push to ensure that more than half of the population is represented at the table.

Particularly important is ensuring that sufficient number of women are integrated in peace building. In Liberia, a critical mass of women mobilized across sectors, ethnicities, and religions. When negotiations floundered, the women literally locked warring factions in the room to ensure they remained until a peace agreement was

signed. The women's efforts culminated in the election of President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, the first female president in Africa and the appointment of women to several key positions in the administration. We now see the fruits of Liberian women's labor as the country is on its way to becoming one of the few African post-conflict success stories.

The US Congress must play an important role in making inclusive security an important component of its work. In particular:

- 1) *Congress should use its oversight role to request from the Administration much more significant political and financial attention to programs that promote women's leadership, particularly in conflict resolution and peace building.* In fiscal years 2002 and 2003, US assistance to Afghanistan was close to one billion dollars; of that amount, only \$200,000 went to Afghan women NGOs, an abysmal 0.02 percent. For the past seventeen months, bill S. 147 has been in the Senate Foreign Relations committee. It calls for allocation of 30 million dollars for grants to women-led organizations in Afghanistan. That money would support human rights education for women and girls and create more opportunities for women to exercise leadership in programs that strengthen women's security and safety.
- 2) UN Security Council resolution 1325 was a first, critical acknowledgement that women must be included in all efforts to promote peace. Since its passage there has been some progress. Gender focal points are now included in many UN missions. In places like East Timor, the UN mission organized women's political coalitions to build bridges to civil society. Recognized as a stabilizing force, women were provided resources to become active participants in their country's political affairs. As a result, 26% of Constituent Assembly members are women.

Unfortunately, such examples are rare exceptions; for most part, *the UN has failed to realize meaningful inclusion of women into its core mission: peacemaking and peace building. As the subcommittee that oversees intersection of the US foreign policy with international organizations, you can advance the UN commitments by:*

- a) Holding the Secretary General and Secretariat accountable for compliance with the spirit and mandates of 1325. For example, one female Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) and two female Deputy SRSGs in 26 peacekeeping missions is indefensible; a list of dozens of qualified women has sat on the Secretary General's desk for years.
 - b) Demanding, through our influence at the Security Council, that governments, negotiators, and signators of peace agreements fulfill their commitments to include women. Request that the Secretariat publish lists of the commitments, and send monitors into conflict regions to identify and recruit talented women.
 - c) Insisting that all relevant parties include women in decisions related to constitutions, justice systems, or security sector reform. You could demand the UN withhold funding when post-conflict governing committees and commissions fail to involve strong contingents of women.
- 3) *On the political front, there are many ways in which you can press the Administration to fulfill the US commitment to implementation of Resolution 1325.* Most specifically, I recommend you:
 - a) Insist that the Department of State submit lists of qualified women for key posts in UN peace missions, especially for policy-making functions;
 - b) Call for women's involvement as mediators, members of negotiating teams, service providers for reconstruction, and members of transitional and permanent governing structures;
 - c) Push for participatory, transparent, and inclusive peace negotiations that empower forces for peace, not just armed combatants, and that make greater use of Track II processes.
 - 4) *I hope you will find the time on your CODELs to find an hour when you are in Bogotá, Baghdad, or Belgrade to sit down and listen to women's agendas for peace.* You would be surprised at the difference in substance and in tone. As ambassador, I worked closely with President Clinton, Secretary Albright, and Ambassador Holbrooke on Bosnian peace. We all had many frustrating encounters with stubborn local politicians who refused to support the possibility of co-existence. I always countered that resistance by meeting with hundreds of local women who had their fingers on the pulse of their communities. Each time I left inspired by their energy and motivation to rebuild their country.

- 5) *Members of this committee and other Congress members could also help in simple ways that can help ensure protection of these courageous women.* For example, four years ago we brought a delegation of 16 leading Colombian women from all sides of the conflict to work on a common agenda for peace. One morning, Jim McGovern hosted a congressional briefing, and some of you stopped by to meet the Colombian women. I remember Ana Teresa Bernal begging our staff to take a picture with several Congressional members that morning, and I thought it would be a pleasant piece of memorabilia. But of course, Ana is always much more strategic than that—later, she told me that having a picture with four US Congress members was a major safeguard for her back in Colombia. It was a protection “chip,” one she would cash should threats against her life continue. It was a proof that she met important people in the US who would hopefully aid her in the case of an emergency.

Congress can recognize the importance of including women like Ms. Bernal, Zainab Bangura, Visaka Dharamadasa, and Aloisea Inyumba. It should regularly invite women like Ms. Amiri, Ms. Bigombe, and Ms. Okwaci to testify. Including these, and other women, is key to sustainable peace.

Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Ambassador, thank you.
We will now go to the thorn, Ambassador Steinberg.

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DONALD K. STEINBERG,
DEPUTY PRESIDENT FOR POLICY, INTERNATIONAL CRISIS
GROUP (FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE REPUBLIC OF
ANGOLA)**

Ambassador STEINBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is indeed an honor to be here and an honor to testify before your subcommittee given the tremendous respect I have for you, as well as the ranking minority member, Congressman Rohrabacher.

I have spent three decades in my career negotiating, supporting, and implementing peace agreements around the world, including Afghanistan, Angola, Brazil, Haiti, Malaysia, and South Africa. And if there is a singular message that has come out of these three decades it is that the systematic exclusion of women as planners, implementers, and beneficiaries of these peace processes is the clearest way to doom a process.

That is the guiding principle, in fact, behind U.N. Security Council Resolution 1325, which is in essence a game plan for how to involve half of the world’s population in these processes by ensuring that there is gender equality and political leadership, by building gender sensitive security forces, by supporting women as they return to their homes, by ensuring security and safety for women in refugee camps and by insuring accountability for sexual violence, and rape, and other abuses.

This was a resolution that was long overdue and for me it is deeply personal. I was in 1994 Bill Clinton’s NSC Advisor for Africa, and I helped negotiate the Angolan peace agreement that helped end three decades of civil war that had cost .5 million lives and left 3 million people homeless. I remember at the end of the process, when we signed the agreement, thinking to myself how proud I was that this included nothing that was discriminatory against women. And in fact I gave a speech boasting that this agreement is gender neutral.

Well, then President Clinton asked me to go out and help implement the agreement as his Ambassador and a member of the Peace Commission. It took me about 2 weeks to realize that a peace

agreement that is gender neutral is by definition discriminatory against women and as some would say gender stupid.

For example, there was no mandate to include women in the Peace Commission that was actually implementing the agreement. And so you had 40 men sitting around the table talking about or more frequently not talking about issues like trafficking in women and children, restoring a health care system for women, providing girls' education, addressing sexual violence and getting women back to their homes. We based the agreement on 13 separate amnesties. We forgave each side for anything that they did in the context of war. There was even one amnesty that forgave you for anything that you might do 6 months in the future.

Well, in an environment when most of the crimes that we were looking at, as Swanee has mentioned, are crimes against women, this means that men with guns are forgiving other men with guns for crimes committed against women. We sent male combatants back to their homes, and we gave them a little bit of money and some food and some tools. But what we didn't focus on was that they had no roles in their community. They had been gone for a decade or more and their societies had learned to live without them. And so the immediate thing we saw, with frustration building up, was domestic violence. I wish I could say the same thing about Angola that you said about your district because there were massive amounts of deaths from domestic violence. There was drug abuse, there was rape, there was child abuse. It was as if we ended a civil war just to launch new violence against women.

Finally, we did well meaning exercises like clearing the roads of land mines. About 1 million were planted during the war. So we got 3 million people returning to their homes, but we didn't adequately de-mine the fields, and the wells, and the forest to which they returned. And so as women, as they always do in these societies, went out to till the fields or collect firewood or collect water, they were blowing their legs off in a rash of land mine accidents. We recognized this problem pretty quickly, and we took important steps. We brought out gender advisors and human rights advisors. We developed programs in maternal health care, girls' education. We empowered women's NGOs.

But in reality it was all ad hoc and it was playing catch up. And so I was so pleased in 2000 when the United Nations adopted and passed Resolution 1325. I was so excited about it that I actually changed the pin number on my ATM card to 1325, which probably doesn't make a whole lot of sense to say before Congress since I don't know where my wallet is.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This will be replayed again and again all over C-SPAN, by the way.

Ambassador STEINBERG. C-SPAN and all the rest, right?

The problem is 1325 has largely been a dream deferred. There were no monitoring mechanisms, no accountability mechanisms, and no enforcement mechanisms in that provision. We are still seeing women raped and trafficked with impunity by rebel movements and governments alike.

Even in a place like the eastern Congo, where we have 17,000 U.N. peacekeepers, courageous and talented women who want to step forward are facing discrimination in legal, cultural, and tradi-

tional practices. There is a stigma of victimization and real danger that makes them think twice before they want to step forward. Men who are leading peace conferences are still excluding women or shunting them off into the anteroom when the real negotiation takes place.

Mr. Chairman, in my written testimony I have gone through a whole series of recommendations for how to address those. I just want to touch on a couple of those, and I want to stress to you that legal scholars can debate whether 1325 as a U.N. resolution is binding on the United States or not. I can see it being argued both ways. I have looked at Article 25, chapter 7, et cetera. But that is not the point here. The point is this is smart policy and in American interests to implement these provisions.

First of all, we have to ensure that any Security Council peace-keeping mission has a mandate to protect women and to include women in senior positions.

Secondly, we need to insist that any negotiation led by the United Nations has at least 20 percent participation by women, even if it takes quotas to do that. And I would remind you that more than half of the countries in the world actually have these quotas. This is not an aberration, it is the norm.

Third, while we recognize the need for forgiveness and reconciliation after conflict, never should we allow amnesty for rape used as a weapon of war.

Fourth, the United Nations has to be forced to appoint more women to senior positions. There are currently 38 leaders of missions in the world. These are the equivalent of ambassadors from the United Nations to these countries. Thirty-seven are men. There is one woman, and that happens to be in Liberia, and I suspect that is because Ellen Johnson Sirleaf would not accept anything else.

Finally, the United States has to lead by example. All of our diplomatic and military personnel have to become familiar with 1325, committed to it and empowered to do something about it.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I think our real problem here has been that we have looked at women in these situations solely as victims.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Right.

Ambassador STEINBERG. And that we have seen protection of women as the soft side of peace building. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing soft about preventing the armed thugs in refugee camps from terrorizing women. There is nothing soft about going after traffickers who turn women and young girls into commodities, or holding warlords accountable for crimes against women, or forcing demobilized soldiers to stop wife and child abuse, or insisting that there is a seat at the table for women in peace negotiations and post-conflict governance. These are indeed the hardest responsibilities we face. And I commend this committee for shining the spotlight on them with this hearing here today.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Steinberg follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DONALD K. STEINBERG, DEPUTY PRESIDENT FOR POLICY, INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP (FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE REPUBLIC OF ANGOLA)

BEYOND VICTIMHOOD: ENGAGING WOMEN IN THE PURSUIT OF PEACE

Mr. Chairman. It is a great honor to testify before this Committee on the topic of UN Security Council Resolution 1325. In three decades of public service in the State Department, National Security Council, and House Majority Leader's Office, and now as Deputy President of International Crisis Group, I have focused much of my attention on the involving women in peace negotiations and post-conflict reconstruction.

Women's Participation Key to Success

Frequently, it is said that engaging women in these processes is a matter of justice and fairness. Women should be there because they make up half the population, or because women are the main victims of conflict, or because women are inherently more peaceful and collaborative and less corrupt. For me, the real question is that of effectiveness: put simply, peace processes and peace building are more likely to succeed if women are engaged as planners, implementers and beneficiaries.

This is the guiding concept behind Resolution 1325, which provides guidance for the UN staff and its member states on how to engage and protect women in the processes of ending armed conflict. Resolution 1325 is, in effect, a game plan for ensuring gender equality in political leadership, building gender-sensitive security forces, supporting women as they return to their homes, ensuring safety for women in refugee camps and settlements, and insisting on accountability for sexual violence and other abuses.

For me, this resolution was long-overdue, and it is deeply personal.

The Cautionary Tale of Angola

In 1994, while serving as President Clinton's NSC senior director for Africa, I supported negotiations to end decades of civil war in Angola that had killed a half million people and left three million people homeless. When the peace accord was signed in November 1994, I gave a speech where I boasted that not a single provision in the agreement discriminated against women. "The agreement is gender-neutral," I proclaimed proudly.

President Clinton then named me as US ambassador to Angola and a member of the Peace Commission implementing the peace accords. It took me only a few weeks after my arrival in Luanda to realize that a peace agreement that is "gender-neutral" is, by definition, discriminatory against women.

Consider the evidence. First, the agreement did not require the participation of women in the Peace Commission itself and as a result, there were 40 men on this Commission and no women. This imbalance silenced women's voices on the issues of internal displacement, trafficking in women and girls, sexual violence, abuses by security forces, and the rebuilding of maternal health care and girls' education were generally ignored.

Second, the peace accord was based on 13 separate amnesties that forgave the parties for atrocities committed during the conflict. Given the prominence of sexual abuse during the conflict, including rape as a weapon of war, amnesties meant that men with guns forgave other men with guns for crimes committed against women. These amnesties also introduced a cynicism that undercut our efforts to rebuild the justice and security sectors.

Third, male ex-combatants received a little money and demobilization kits, and were sent back to communities that had learned to live without them during decades of conflict. The frustration of these men exploded into an epidemic of alcoholism, drug abuse, divorce, rape, and domestic violence. In effect, the end of civil war unleashed a new era of violence against women.

Even such well-intentioned efforts as clearing major roads of landmines to allow three million refugees and IDPs to return to their homes backfired against women. Road clearance generally preceded the demining of fields, wells, and forests. As newly resettled women went out to plant the fields, fetch water, and collect firewood, they faced a new rash of landmine accidents.

We recognized these problems, and responded by bringing out gender advisers and human rights officers; launching programs in maternal health care, girls' education, micro-enterprise, and support for women's NGOs; and insisting that women be planners, implementers and beneficiaries for our humanitarian and reconstruction programs.

But most of this was done on an ad hoc basis, and there was a “too-little, too-late” quality about it. And thus I was so pleased when UNSC Resolution 1325 was adopted.

Resolution 1325: A Dream Deferred

But thus far, the promise of this resolution has been a dream deferred, in large part because there are no monitoring, accountability, and enforcement mechanisms. Women continue to be raped and trafficked with impunity, both by rebel movements and by the very Government security forces charged with protecting them—including in the eastern Congo despite the presence of 17,000 UN peacekeeping troops in that country.

Courageous and talented women peacebuilders face discrimination in legal, cultural and traditional practices. Sexual violence and threats against women in power impose a stigma of victimization and a real danger that makes even the most impressive and courageous women think twice before stepping forward. Men leading peace conferences still exclude women or shunt them off to ante-rooms while “real” negotiations take place.

Nine Steps to Engagement

Many steps are required to change this situation, but let me just make eight tangible proposals.

1. The United States should insist that the mandate for every UN peacekeeping mission includes as a priority the protection of women and the safeguarding of women peace builders, including through the provision of personal security and training.
2. Heads of UN missions in countries facing conflict must insist that a critical mass of qualified women—beginning at 20 percent—are included peace talks, reconstruction conferences, and governance mechanisms, even if it takes quotas to do so.
3. The U.S. should prioritize in post-conflict reconstruction and donors conferences the rebuilding of social structures of particular importance to women, such as reproductive health care and girls’ education, and all plans should be subjected to gender-impact analysis.
4. While there is a need for both reconciliation and forgiveness following conflict, amnesty should never be provided to individuals who have used rape as a weapon of war.
5. U.S. support for the rebuilding and reform of armies, police, and other security forces should insist on training in gender issues for new and existing forces and require the incorporation of women into those forces, in particular so that local women who have been abused will come forward with their accusations.
6. Personal accountability and measurement mechanisms should be developed to insist on compliance with UNSC Resolution 1325, so that individuals within the UN system know that their career advancement depends on taking these provisions seriously.
7. A formal working group of the UN Security Council should be created and mandated to implement UNSC Resolution 1325, including possible “naming and shaming” and adoption of sanctions against countries and individuals who are patent abusers.
8. The UN must upgrade the role of gender advisers in its missions and expand the number of women serving as UN special representatives to countries in conflict. This effort should be supported by programs to more effectively recruit women into the UN system at all levels, and to promote their success through training and mentorship.
9. Finally, the United States should lead by example, ensuring that all its diplomatic and military personnel are familiar with and committed to the provisions of UNSC Resolution 1325, and have the resources needed to ensure its implementation.

The “Hard” Road Ahead

Mr. Chairman. Fundamental to these solutions is a change in mindset, one that goes beyond viewing women solely as victims, and viewing the protection of women as the “soft side” of peace-building.

Let me assure you there is nothing “soft” about going after traffickers who turn women and girls into commodities. There is nothing “soft” about preventing armed thugs from abusing women in IDP camps, holding warlords accountable for crimes

committed against women, forcing demobilized soldiers to refrain from domestic violence, or insisting on a seat at the table for women in peace negotiations and post-conflict governments.

These are among the hardest responsibilities in our peace building agenda, and I commend this Committee for shining a spotlight on them in this hearing today. Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, thank you, Ambassador. And I can assure you that I as one member and the chair of this committee will review closely your recommendations. Let me just say that I concur fully with your observations. I think you have just provided us with a history of why we have failed and how we can improve.

We are going to have a series of votes that will probably last somewhere between 40 and 45 minutes. I know my ranking member has to depart early, but I shall return. But before I would like to be able to hear from Ms. Bigombe in her opening remarks. And when I return we will hear from the remaining members of the panel. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF MS. BETTY BIGOMBE, DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR, WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

Ms. BIGOMBE. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. I feel extremely honored and privileged to testify before you today.

As a woman with almost 20 years of hands-on experience in conflict resolution and mediation in northern Uganda, a part of the country that has been ravaged by war since 1986, I can tell you with certainty that the inclusion of women in mediation and negotiation processes is an essential element to achieving a sustainable and lasting peace.

In my capacity as a government official and then later as chief mediator, I have remained intimately involved in the efforts to bring peace to my country. In 2004, I organized the first ever face-to-face meeting between Ugandan Government representatives and the brutal Lord's Resistance Army, along with women, traditional leaders and youth. This eventually paved the way for the peace talks that you mentioned in your opening remarks.

There are many compelling reasons why women serve as effective peacemakers. First, women are often very pragmatic when it comes to getting their sons, brothers and husbands to lay down arms.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, in the massive internally displaced peoples camps in northern Uganda, it was a group of women who carried out the footwork for an initiative I had developed to provide rebel combatants with incentives to defect from the LRA. The plan was clear. I drafted letters assuring physical security and resettlement kits, which were then delivered by the women to their loved ones involved in the fighting. Within the span of 2 short months, approximately 5,000 ex-combatants defected and returned to the camps. It was an incredibly simple, yet effective plan, and one which reduced the size and capacity of the LRA without any military showdowns or bloodshed.

Second, within the context of the negotiations, being a woman can bring about a different type of communication dynamic. When deep in the jungle talking to the brutal LRA leader Joseph Kony, I was granted the special status of "mother," which in the African

cultural context meant that I had earned certain respect. This enabled me to assume an almost parental tone of authority with him, one which was reprimanding, hard-lined, and yet not perceived as threatening. I could be bold in what I said, which proved very strategically useful.

Third, women tend to bring issues to the table that will have tangible impact, both immediate and long-term, on the family and community at large. Again, in Uganda it was the women who successfully lobbied to create a victims' compensation fund. It was women who spearheaded the movement to ensure that the definition of ceasefire includes halting rape by combatants. Overall, it is a people-centered approach that women tend to advocate with a focus on rebuilding the fundamentals of society that are key to achieving sustainable peace.

Fourth, women have a unique ability, often based on experience, in crafting gender appropriate responses to gender specific issues. This includes considering the needs of female ex-combatants who are often the most invisible victims in these types of conflicts.

In Uganda, and I can say DRC, and other countries that have gone through conflict, countless young women, many of them merely girls, have been abducted by the rebels. They are forced to serve as both sex slaves and domestic slaves. They are also expected to engage in acts of violence, sometimes killing their own family members and members of their own communities, which prevents them from returning home. In the wake of the conflict, these women are often forced to turn to prostitution, where they risk increased exposure to HIV/AIDS.

Currently, despite their demonstrated capacity, women are not serving in leadership positions in any of the high profile conflict resolution cases.

I believe the United States has in some ways acted as a leader in helping move Resolution 1325 beyond rhetoric. Your government's invaluable assistance through multilateral partners and nongovernmental organizations and your promotion of public-private initiatives demonstrates a commitment to increasing women's political participation and economic opportunities in many regions of the world.

These measures represent a good beginning. However, the United States can and should do more. Developing a comprehensive action plan for Resolution 1325 would send a strong message to the rest of the world that the United States is serious about giving this resolution teeth. Having an action plan would also lend weight and credibility to American diplomatic efforts by allowing the U.S. to put more pressure on other member states to be more rigorous in their domestic implementation of the resolution.

Pressure for more effective implementation of the resolution must be kept up. Time is of the essence. A clear, firm and consistent effort from the United States would make a considerable impact.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Bigombe follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MS. BETTY BIGOMBE, DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR, WOODROW
WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

In 2004, the U.S. Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, Ellen Sauerbrey, acknowledged that “No approach to peace can succeed if it does not view men and women as equally important components of the solution.”

As a woman with almost twenty years of hands-on experience in mediating one of the world’s most brutal and longstanding conflicts, I couldn’t agree more with this statement. Based on my experiences and my observations, I can tell you with certainty that the inclusion of women in mediation and negotiation processes is an essential element to achieving a sustainable and lasting peace.

Women often demonstrate significant amounts of patience and tenacity, which are incredibly useful tools considering that peacemaking is almost always a long and strenuous process. To give you a sense of perspective, the conflict in northern Uganda has been raging since 1986. In my capacity as a government official and then later as chief mediator, I have remained intimately involved in the efforts to bring peace to my country. It has not been an easy task, but I have resolved to keep at it and to secure a solution. In 2004, for example, despite the fact that prospects were bleak, I went back to Uganda, where I organized the first ever face-to-face meeting between Ugandan government representatives and the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA), along with traditional leaders, women, and youth. This initiative, which later became known as the “Bigombe 2 Initiative,” eventually paved the way for the ongoing peace talks taking place in Juba, south Sudan, which will hopefully soon lead to the signing of a final peace agreement.

There are many other compelling reasons why women serve as effective peacemakers. In my own experiences I have found that women are often very pragmatic when it comes to getting their sons, brothers, and husbands to lay down arms. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, I had the honor of meeting and working with a number of courageous and resourceful women in the internally displaced people’s camps in northern Uganda. These women carried out the footwork for an initiative I had developed, aimed at strategically targeting rebel combatants and providing them with incentives to defect from the LRA. The plan was clear: I drafted letters assuring physical security and resettlement kits, which were then delivered by the women to their loved ones involved in the fighting. Within the span of two short months, through persuasion and sheer perseverance, our letter-writing initiative resulted in approximately 5,000 rebels defecting and returning to the camps. It was an incredibly simple yet effective plan, and one which reduced the size and capacity of the LRA without any military showdowns or bloodshed.

Women have also been active through civil society channels. In the late 1980s, for example, when few others dared to speak out, countless women joined together in peaceful demonstrations against the war. More recently, a coalition of Ugandan women participated in a five-day trek to Juba, south Sudan, carrying the Women’s Peace Torch and calling for women’s perspectives and experiences to be included in the official negotiations.

What these dedicated women know—indeed what they have always known—is that their involvement in the peace process is pivotal. In fact, within the context of negotiation, being a woman can actually bring about an entirely different type of communication dynamic. When talking to Joseph Kony and other LRA commanders, for example, I was granted the special status of ‘Mother,’ which, in the African cultural context meant that I had earned a certain respect. This enabled me to assume an almost parental tone of authority with them—one which was both reprimanding and hard-lined, and yet not perceived as threatening. As a result, I could be bold in what I said, which proved very strategically useful. This approach, if taken by a man, may well have been interpreted as aggressive or combative, and might not have been as effective.

Another reason that women’s inclusion in mediation and negotiation efforts is so imperative is that their perspectives will often broaden the scope of the peace process by taking a more forward-looking, development-oriented approach. Underpinning this argument is my observation that women have a fundamentally different conception of ‘peace’ than many men. In my experience, a woman’s vision of peace is far more comprehensive and expansive than simply the cessation of violence. Ending hostilities is obviously crucial, but to succeed in the post-conflict transition to a peaceful, stable, and prosperous society, basic issues such as education, health, social service provision, justice, and community reconciliation must be taken into account.

I have also observed that uniformed men appear typically to use negotiations as a way to discuss and exact demands, often seeking to guarantee their own interests

as an integral condition of whatever agreement is reached. What this means is that the needs of the community are frequently sidelined or treated as secondary. Women, on the other hand, tend to bring issues to the table that will have a profound and tangible impact—both immediate and long-term—on the family and the community at large. In Uganda, for example, it is the women who tirelessly and successfully lobbied to create a victims' compensation fund. It is women who spearheaded the movement to ensure that the definition of 'ceasefire' includes halting gender-based violence by combatants. In terms of promoting reconciliation, much can be said for the growing networks of female "peace animators" who help recruit and train other women to manage inter-community conflicts. Overall, it is a people-centered approach that women tend to advocate, with a focus on rebuilding the fundamentals of society that are key to achieving a sustainable peace.

I believe that the issue of addressing victims' needs, particularly victims of sexually-based violence, is one of the most compelling reasons why women's voices in peace talks are so critical and why they must be heard. Women have a unique expertise and experience in dealing with gender-related violence, which in my view serves as the basis for why they need to be involved in devising gender-appropriate responses to these issues.

This includes considering the needs of female ex-combatants, who are often the most invisible victims in these types of conflicts. To give some background from the Ugandan case, countless young women—many of them merely girls—have been abducted by the LRA. Once conscripted, they are forced to serve as both sex slaves (the common term here is "bush wives") and domestic slaves, cooking and cleaning for rebel commanders. They are also expected to engage actively in the perpetration of violence. One commonly used practice is to send these young girls to their own communities to kill or loot—even victimizing their own family members in some cases—thereby foreclosing the possibility of return.

As a result, when the conflict begins to wind down women end up facing dual rejection—first by their so-called "bush husbands" and then by their own families and communities. The public health and security consequences of this are far greater than may be readily apparent. These women are often forced to turn to prostitution, for example, where they risk increased exposure to HIV/AIDS.

Female ex-combatants are likewise neglected within the context of post-conflict disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) programs. Many of these girls have become child mothers as the result of rape and sexual slavery. The psycho-social rehabilitation required—not only to restore the girls' dignity or to reintegrate them into a society where they face stigma and ostracism, but to transform them into productive members of society—is enormous and complex. While SCR1325 has affirmed that "the different needs of female and male ex-combatants . . . and the needs of their dependants" should be taken into account during post-conflict planning, in my view, much remains to be done in order to make this a concrete reality, calculated to provide tangible solutions to the *de facto* situation on the ground.

We are reminded that in October 2000, in commemoration of the successful adoption of SCR1325, the United Nations emphasized the interrelatedness of women and peacemaking. I quote the then-Secretary-General: "When society collapses, women play a critical role in ensuring that life goes on. When ethnic tensions cause or exacerbate conflict, women tend to build bridges rather than walls. When considering the impact and implications of war and peace, women think first of their children and their future, before themselves."

The reality, however, is that SCR1325 is still not being fully implemented. Women continue to play a marginalized, and all too often token, role in peacemaking processes. In 2006, for example, a full five years after the resolution was passed, only four out of sixty-one United Nations senior peacemaking officials were women. Today, only one United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary-General is a woman. Moreover, women are not currently serving in leadership positions in any of the high profile conflict resolution cases such as Darfur, Uganda, Congo, or the Middle East, despite their demonstrated capacity and widespread involvement in track two and grass roots peacebuilding and reconciliation efforts.

Ambassador Ellen Sauerbrey has said that the United States "places great emphasis on the role of women in resolving conflicts and building peace," and I agree that in certain ways the United States has acted as a leader in helping move SCR1325 beyond rhetoric. Your government's invaluable assistance through multi-lateral partners and non-governmental organizations, as well as through the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the National Endowment for Democracy, has demonstrated a commitment to increasing women's political participation, economic opportunities, education, and their role in civil society, in many regions of the world.

It should be mentioned that the United States has also been helpful in promoting public-private initiatives such as the “Women Leading Women in Peace: Fostering Courage for Change,” which was launched to facilitate exchange and interaction between Fortune magazine’s Most Powerful Women in Business and women trying to make a difference in post-conflict societies.

These measures represent a good beginning. I believe, however, that the United States can and should do more. Developing a comprehensive action plan for implementing SCR1325, along the lines of those adopted by Sweden, Canada, and Liberia, just to name a few, would send a strong message to the rest of the world that the United States is serious about giving this resolution teeth and addressing its existing implementation gap. Having an action plan would also lend weight and credibility to American diplomatic efforts, by allowing the U.S. to put more pressure on other member states—particularly those emerging from armed conflict and political instability—to be more robust and rigorous in their domestic implementation of the resolution.

I would also urge the United States House of Representatives and the Senate to pass the International Violence Against Women Act (HR.5927 and S.2279 respectively), as a way to ensure that issues relating to women in peace and security are put squarely on the United States foreign policy agenda and become a greater priority in diplomatic efforts and in United States foreign assistance programs.

I conclude by emphasizing that pressure for more effective implementation of SCR1325 must be kept up. Time is of the essence. The public health and security implications of the failure to deal with these issues in a meaningful fashion are real, present, and urgent. There are many obstacles yet to overcome, but I believe a clear, firm, consistent, and timely effort from the United States will make a considerable impact on increasing the substantive participation of women in peacemaking processes, thereby contributing to the achievement of sustainable solutions to serious and complex conflicts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you so much.

We will recess for approximately 45 minutes. There will be no further votes. I shall return, and I am hoping that I will be joined by several of my colleagues.

We are in recess.

[Recess.]

Mr. DELAHUNT. Again, I thank the panel for indulging the committee. As you are aware, we just finished our final votes for today, and I expect at least one of my colleagues to rejoin us. But if we could proceed with opening statements.

I think next up is Ms. Amiri. If you are ready, please proceed. And make sure to have that in so that the people that are viewing this, and I am sure this will run at different times, so that we can hear your testimony. It is important. Thank you.

Please proceed.

**STATEMENT OF MS. RINA AMIRI, SENIOR REGIONAL ADVISOR,
CENTRAL EURASIA PROJECT, THE OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE**

Ms. AMIRI. Thank you. I want to begin by thanking you, Chairman Delahunt, for having this event and for inviting me to testify on the importance of women in building sustainable peace and security in Afghanistan. It really is an honor to be here.

The dramatic fall of the Taliban witnessed widespread appeals from the international community, including from this administration, that the plight of Afghan women be addressed and that women be included in the peace process. This, coupled with the U.N. Security Council’s unanimous adoption of Resolution 1325, provided a powerful framework for ensuring women’s inclusion in the peace process. Women participated in the official Bonn talks and the Bonn agreement provided unequivocal commitment to their inclusion in the peace building processes.

International prioritization of women's involvement created the conditions for women's involvement in the peace process in Afghanistan, but it was Afghan women themselves who transformed these conditions into reality. In 2002, when I returned to Afghanistan, I was sent by the U.N. to go to Kandahar. It was quite early in 2002, and while the Taliban didn't have their guns, they were certainly present in the area.

I had somebody come to my office. It was an Afghan woman, an Afghan woman teacher, who had spent the years under the Taliban regime in her house deprived of any opportunity to work or engage in public activities. She walked into my office, pulled her burqa back, looked at me straight in the eye, and with a firm handshake demanded that I work with her to create conditions for the inclusion of women from Kandahar to participate in the Emergency Loya Jirga, which was the process by which the transitional administration would be selected.

She did end up becoming one of the 100 women who participated in this assembly. She went on to become one of the 20 percent of the women who participated in the constitutional assembly that ratified the new Afghan Constitution. She contested the parliamentary elections, and now she is one of the 27 percent of the women who serve as parliamentarians. This is a testament—

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I can interrupt you just for a moment, maybe it was 6 months to a year ago there was a documentary on PBS. By any chance was this woman the subject of that documentary, if you know?

Ms. AMIRI. I am not sure which documentary this was. This woman's case, it is one story that I tell, but there are many women like her in Afghanistan, women who at the moment that they recognized there was an opportunity opening up for them, that in spite of the limitations that they had faced in the past, and in spite of being traumatized beyond any degree that I think any of us can understand, they seized the opportunity. Not only did they seize the opportunity, they maximized it.

Prior to the constitutional process, Afghan women activists and leaders developed a coalition in which they drafted language to be included in the draft Constitution providing for the equal rights of women and men, in addition to providing language that protected the rights of minorities and that protected the rights of the handicapped. They succeeded through meetings with various members of the international community, as well as the President of Afghanistan and the head of the Constitutional Commission, in getting this language included in the draft Constitution and eventually having this language ratified.

In the constitutional process there was an interesting moment in which the delegates to the process broke across factional and ethnic lines, paralyzing the process. The women interestingly picked this moment, despite the fact that the men were literally sitting in different parts of the room and one part had actually left the room and had frozen the process, the women decided at that point to work across coalition lines and use this moment as a strategic point to lobby for a quota providing for 25 percent of the parliamentarians to be women.

They approached me at the assembly floor and said, "We want to talk to your boss," who was Lakhdar Brahimi, the head of the U.N. "We want to meet with Ambassador Khalilzad," who was then the U.S. Ambassador. Despite the fact that these women did not like each other, they had similar sentiments as the men about some of the tensions that occurred, they walked in and they worked across their differences and effectively lobbied for the support of the United States and the U.N. for the position that they were advocating and ended up getting what they had sought, getting 25 percent of the parliamentary seats.

Many Afghan men at that point said, "It is fine." They got it. But there is never going to be enough Afghan women to actually engage in this process.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me interrupt you again. Since I have the gavel and there is no one else here, this is going to become a conversation.

In the aftermath, you indicated there were differences, and I am sure they were in some cases significant differences, among the women. After they went through this process where they came together and lobbied and advocated and succeeded, did the relationships among them change? Did they have a better understanding of each other and did their differences, while still existing, become less of an impediment to their relationships?

Ms. AMIRI. Most of these women had known each other prior to all of these tensions. They came to agreement on this particular issue, recognizing that they had and would continue to have significant differences along different lines, but that they had to work together. And this type of pragmatism that they exhibited was not something that was witnessed among the male delegates. It was strategic, and they ended up winning one of the most significant measures in the Constitution.

Getting back to what I was noting, that most people dismissed this, that there wouldn't be enough women candidates to contest these elections simply because they didn't have the experience, they didn't have the confidence, they didn't have the education, well, it turned out that close to 330 women contested these elections, despite the fact that these women throughout the country were facing regular threats, credible threats. They were facing limitations in terms of resources. These women were poor and no one was helping them. Even international organizations, because of the limitations that they had placed upon them, could not provide support to any candidate. They had mobility restrictions and they also faced cultural restrictions. In spite of all of this, women across the country, even in very insecure areas, contested the elections.

I remember once where there was a woman who had faced a significant number of threats. She came to my office, and I had to ask her, I said, "Why? Why are you putting yourself through this?" She said, "This is the moment. This window has opened and it will close. And regardless of what happens, I have to take advantage of it."

That is the sentiment that Afghan women carry with them. The perception I think through much of what is conveyed in the media is that Afghan women are victims. Afghan women are much more than victims. They are agents of social change. They are resilient.

They are determined. And despite the fact that they face significant limitations in terms of getting entry into many sectors, including for example the security sector, less than 1 percent of women are represented in the Afghan National Army and the Afghan National Police. But yet even when there is just a minority of them in these institutions, it makes a difference.

For example, with the Afghan National Police, since the entry of women, there has been the establishment of family response units which are addressing a lot of the problems that are brought in that the police simply didn't have the resources to deal with in the past. Oftentimes if a woman came in or if a family came in with a situation of domestic abuse, the woman would be put in prison and the man would be put in another prison, or oftentimes the man would be let go and the woman would be kept in prison.

Women in the legal sector, again, significant limitations. There isn't, despite much effort, we don't have a woman represented in the Supreme Court. There are a handful of women who serve as judges, as prosecutors. But even then, Afghan women activists quickly have been learning that the best route of advancing women's rights is equipping themselves with religious knowledge and arguments and are using this to advocate for a much more moderate interpretation of religious and Sharia law. This not only has an impact on the situation of women, but it also broadens the space for dialogue and allows for the discussion of taboo subjects. Women are creating that space.

Now, despite this progress, it has to be still acknowledged that women face considerable challenges. Life for women in rural Afghanistan remains unchanged. Women continue to fall at the bottom of global poverty, health and education indicators. Moreover, there is a culture of impedency that persists, and weak security and the absence of rule of law mechanisms place Afghan women in a dangerous and vulnerable position.

There is pervasive violence against women. Women are the victims of rape, often silent victims, because if they report this, oftentimes they are imprisoned as well. They are victims of trafficking and brutality. Moreover, women are dying from domestic violence and frequently resorting to suicide through immolation, through burning themselves, to escape desperate situations.

I actually visited a center in Herat, West Herat, which is a western province, and there were 50 women from all age ranges who had simply taken a match and kerosene, and burnt themselves and had two-thirds of their body burned, and the majority of them were not going to survive. But this is how desperate that situation was.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Ms. Amiri, let me interrupt you once more, Ms. Amiri. The House just failed to pass funding for the war in Afghanistan and Iraq. I suspect, however, that there will be another proposal that will come forward in terms of assistance to both Iraq and—actually the assistance aspect of the so-called supplemental budget did pass. But I am sure there will be other opportunities.

I would appreciate if you, working with your colleagues and working with other women in Afghanistan, would make recommendations to the committee in terms of conditioning that assistance in a way that would enhance protection for women in Afghanistan against that sexual violence, against the—I don't want

to use the term, but I guess I will have to—cultural norms that put women in such incredible desperate straits.

I don't mean that as a condemnation of Afghan culture. We have had our own culture here in the United States. We had a so-called rule of thumb, which meant that a man was entitled to a defense if he beat his wife with a stick that was less in circumference than the size of his thumb. As I am sure you are aware, women have only recently achieved full equal rights in this country, and even then those rights are not necessarily fully implemented.

But the kind of assistance I am talking about that I support vigorously for Afghanistan, and I think that view is shared by most of my colleagues, not just on this committee but in this Congress, it would be very, very helpful to know how we can insist that these conditions that ensure and enhance the protection of women and their participation in terms of the governance of Afghanistan as it proceeds hopefully to a better future. But proceed.

Ms. AMIRI. We would welcome being able to have an intervention in that regard. It is certainly true of what you speak about the challenges that we face in terms of culture, but I would say it is not just an Afghan culture, it is a culture that has been affected by war, by poverty and by radicalization. And all of those elements, women are bearing the brunt of—I'm not sure. Is my voice high enough? Is it loud enough?

Mr. DELAHUNT. We want to get you on so that others can listen.

Ms. AMIRI. Now it is working.

Women are bearing the brunt of the radicalization of Afghan society, and, moreover, there is increasing targeting of women in this revitalized insurgency. There have been several incidents of school bombings and assassination of women leaders and teachers throughout the country.

Colleagues and friends of mine, including Safia Amajan, who was the Director of the Ministry of Women's Affairs in Kandahar, and Zakia Zaki, a prominent journalist, were violently gunned down for their activism and leadership. There are many women like Zakia and Safia who are bearing the brunt of the violence from the insurgency simply because they want to make an example of women to try to curb back some of the achievements that women have made in public space. And even in Kabul, women parliamentarians report getting daily threats and intimidation. Particularly women parliamentarians face regular threats.

In short, while there has been significant gains certainly in the political sector, certainly in urban centers, but Afghan women are far from realizing the principles of 1325.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This is what happens when you go high-tech. We have been having continuing problems, and I intend to have a conversation with the staff.

Ms. AMIRI. Just to repeat, that while significant gains have been made, Afghan women are far from realizing the principles of 1325 and much more needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, supporting Afghan women is not simply necessary from a moral point of view, but from a strategic point of view. Even the modest gains of the last few years illustrate that women are playing a pivotal role in advancing the reform agenda.

They are courageous, resilient, and natural partners in this peace process.

The United States Congress can help advance their engagement and leadership by, one, increasing funding for Afghan women organizations, particularly in the provinces, to provide critical health, literacy, education and legal services; urging the Ministries of Defense, of Interior, of Justice, to provide women professionals opportunities for engaging in these sectors; encouraging President Karzai and his administration to take concrete measures to counter violence against women; ensuring a quota for women employees and PRTs to allow for consultation with women activists and leaders on the ground; equipping women parliamentarians with the necessary legislative skills; promoting women's recruitment across sectors in the leadership of Afghanistan; supporting voter education and women's involvement in the upcoming electoral process; and advancing networking and coalition building among women parliamentarians and leaders so that they might be able to have a united voice and to advocate on their own behalf.

Through further and direct support, Afghan women can obtain a moderate and inclusive and stable Afghanistan, goals that are at the heart of United States and international objectives.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Amiri follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MS. RINA AMIRI, SENIOR REGIONAL ADVISOR, CENTRAL EURASIA PROJECT, THE OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE

I want to express my gratitude to Chairman Howard Berman, Chairman William Delahunt of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, and Ranking Member Dana Rohrabacher for inviting me to testify on the importance of women in building sustainable peace and security in Afghanistan.

INTRODUCTION

The fall of the Taliban was met with broad appeals by human rights and women's organizations towards addressing the plight of women. This, coupled with the fact that the United Nations Security Council had unanimously adopted Resolution 1325 the preceding year, provided a powerful framework for ensuring the inclusion of women's rights in the Afghanistan peace process. Not only were women included in the official peace, talks, but the Bonn Agreement provided unequivocal support for women's rights in the peace process.

International support and prioritization for women's involvement creates the conditions for women's reemergence as actors in the public space. It was the Afghan women themselves, however, who transformed these conditions into realities. In 2002, when I went to Kandahar as part of the UN's Emergency Loya Jirga team, an Afghan woman teacher who had been largely confined to her house during the Taliban regime marched into my office and with a firm handshake demanded that I support the involvement of Kandhari women to participate in the Emergency Loya Jirga. This woman not only succeeded in being one of the 12% of women delegates to the Emergency Loya Jirga, but she went on to be one of the 20% of women who served on the Constitutional Loya Jirga that ratified Afghanistan's constitution. She then became one of the 328 women who contested the parliamentary elections. Today she is one of the 68 women parliamentarians in the lower house.

Women activists recognized that the Bonn process created a window of opportunity where they could benefit from the political and financial support of the international community to regain a space in Afghani society. They also understood that they had to not only seize this opportunity, but to expand upon it, and were therefore determined to play more than a symbolic role. Women delegates to the Constitutional Loya Jirga succeeded in advocating for a quota providing for 25% of the lower house in parliament and securing language providing for the equal rights of men and women. In the 2005 parliamentary elections, women candidates campaigned vigorously, despite security threats, a dearth of resources, limited mobility, and having to contend with conservative critiques of their activities.

These are significant achievements that cannot be disputed. But have they led to genuine and sustainable change in the lives of Afghan women? Have women been able to effectively engage in the peace and reconstruction process on a broader scale? Have the principles of resolution 1325 been realized for women? What does the experience of Afghanistan demonstrate in regard to women's roles in peace and security matters?

LIMITATIONS TO WOMEN'S PROGRESS

The statistics on the situation of Afghan women provide a stark picture, leading perhaps to the conclusion that, despite significant political advances, the lives of most Afghan women have not changed significantly. While maternal mortality rates have gone down by 25%, Afghanistan falls at the bottom of poverty, health, and education indicators. It is reported that almost half of all deaths among women of reproductive age are the result of pregnancy and childbirth; more than three-fourths of those deaths are preventable. Moreover, a culture of impunity, weak to non-existent security and rule of law mechanisms, and violence against women, leave Afghan women in a dangerous and vulnerable position. Women are dying from domestic violence and in increasing numbers committing suicide to escape desperate situations. In 2007, the UN Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) received almost 2,000 complaints of gender-based violence. Such acts include verbal violence, beatings, rape, forced marriage, murder, and crimes of honor. I would note that this number only represents those with the resources available to report their complaints; the vast majority of Afghan women are simply unable to obtain judicial recourse and often encounter social isolation or violence as a result.

Increasing insecurity further threatens to undermine the successes of the last few years. After witnessing a record number of girls returning to school, families in parts of the southeast and south are preventing the women and girls from their families from going to school and work out of fear for their security. The deteriorating security situation has also led to the reduction of essential services that many rural women rely on. In the past year, many international development and relief organizations including Medecins Sans Frontiers, the Red Cross, and various UN agencies have reduced their operations and pulled out of rural provinces where aid is already extremely limited. The environment has also made it extremely difficult for rural women to access the legal, educational, and social resources established in the last six years. For many outside Kabul, little has changed since the Taliban's departure.

In addition, women also are direct targets of a revitalized insurgency, which can primarily be attributed to their efforts to provide educational opportunities and other critical services to their communities. There have been many cases of school bombings and assassinations of women teachers and principals throughout the country. For instance, in December 2006, five members of the same family were murdered by Taliban militants in Helmand; two of the women victims were teachers at the local girls' school. Women leaders like Safia Amajan, Kandahar Director of Women's Affairs, and Zakia Zaki, prominent journalist, were gunned down in 2006 and 2007 for their activism and leadership roles. Even in Kabul, women government officials and parliamentarians report threats of verbal harassment and physical violence.

WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO BUILDING PEACE

Security Sector

Despite restrictions and limitations to their participation, women are represented in the security sector. In 2007, 233 women served in the Afghan Police Force and 259 women in the Afghan National Army. While this represents less than 1% of employees in the security forces, the presence of women in security forces has been effective. Women police officers have moved beyond the counterinsurgency operations frequently performed by the ANA to employ more community-based approaches to policing. They have been instrumental in the design and implementation of Family Response Units, police units specifically mandated to address all forms of familial violence. Their presence has enabled countless women to voice their concerns and seek justice. Additionally, women police officers provide the ANA with the necessary capacity to perform gender appropriate operations, such as guarding women prisoners and searching women at border checkpoints.

Government

Afghan women scored a tremendous victory during the 2005 parliamentary elections. With the aid of international organizations such as the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and the International Republican Institute (IRI), Afghan women-led

civil society organizations conducted capacity training for hundreds of women candidates across the country. Over 600 women candidates ran for office despite grave threats to their personal and familial safety. Women did remarkably well in the elections; over 30% of women candidates garnered enough votes to win their seats without using the electoral quota.

Women currently represent 27% of the Wolesi Jirga, the highest percentage of women parliamentarians in any Muslim country and higher than many Western nations. Contrary to expectations that they would play little more than a symbolic role, a significant number of women parliamentarians have proven to be vocal and active members.

To translate these voices into a formidable block, these women need to develop a united voice around common interests. Efforts are underway in this regard. Through the support of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and other international and local organizations, women parliamentarians have undertaken efforts towards building bridges across political and ethnic divides and formed a nonpartisan women's network. They have also made key linkages between government and civil society; the Afghan Ministry of Women's Affairs is currently working with civil society to draft new legislation to prevent and punish violence against women. In 2007, women parliamentarians led efforts to push legislation changing the legal age of adulthood from 11 for boys and 9 for girls to 18 and 16 respectively.

The number of women in the government's cabinet has steadily decreased over the years; The Interim Administration included three women ministries, in the current cabinet all cabinet members are men, with the exception of the Minister of Women's Affairs. Broadly, women represent 25% of civil servants and are employed in significant numbers in some ministries, including the Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development and the Ministry of Higher Education and Vocational Training.

In 2005, President Karzai appointed Habiba Sarabi, then Minister of Women's Affairs as the first woman governor in the country. In an environment characterized by constant rotation of governors in the provinces, Governor Sarabi has demonstrated her effectiveness by serving in the same position for the last three years.

Justice System

The Afghanistan Compact places particular emphasis on the need for a professional and engendered judicial system. Women are important contributors to this process. They represented 20% of delegates to the Constitutional Loya Jirga. During sessions, women were at the forefront of efforts promoting ethnic pluralism and the rights of minorities. They helped support the establishment of Uzbeki as an official language under the constitution in exchange for Uzbek support for women's participation in the government as well as advocating for the rights of the handicapped and for the protection and promotion of human rights. Women activists also advocated successfully for the inclusion of language promising equal rights to women. These efforts contributed to the drafting and ratification of one of the most progressive constitutions in the Islamic world.

In small numbers, women have also secured positions as judges (4.2%), prosecutors (6.4%), attorneys (6.1%), and heads of Family and Juvenile Courts. The Supreme Court has resisted appeals to include women in its membership. In spite of limitations to women's official involvement in the judicial sector, Afghan women civil society and NGO leaders are also playing a key role in promoting and protecting the rights accorded in the Afghan constitution. Organizations like Da Qanoon Ghustunkeh, Medica Mondiale, Equal Access, and Shuhada play an essential role in providing legal services for detained women and girls. Close to 80% of these incarcerated women are in prison for moral crimes, in particular allegations of zina or sexual misconduct outside of marriage. Women are often prosecuted even when they are victims of rape. Afghan women's organizations, in collaboration with the Ministry of Women's Affairs, are also lobbying for legal reforms and advocating for changes in the family and penal codes to protect the rights of women and girls.

Afghan women's organizations also act as a moderating force, by working with local shuras and other traditional justice systems and promoting a moderate interpretation of Shariah law. A significant number of Afghan women are combining studies in Shariah and Law to equip themselves with the necessary skills to protect and advance their rights.

CONCLUSION

While significant gains have been made in the political and public sector, Afghan women are far from realizing the principles of 1325. Yet the small gains that have been made illustrate the potential of women and the pivotal role that they are playing in advancing the reform agenda and moving Afghanistan towards a more mod-

erate and inclusive society. They are promoting a more moderate interpretation of Shariah law and undertaking efforts to broaden the space for discourse and debate.

Supporting Afghan women is not simply necessary on moral, but strategic grounds. Afghan women are natural partners in the peace process. These efforts are ultimately critical for the long-term stability of Afghanistan's peacebuilding and reform efforts. Afghan women time and again demonstrated courage and resilience in advancing their rights. The U.S. Administration and the international community need to continue creating the conditions for Afghan women to realize their rights. It is therefore vital that the U.S. Congress continue to prioritize and leverage women's positions and to support the further implementation of Resolution 1325 in Afghanistan by:

- Appropriating increased funding for Afghan women-led NGOS, particularly in the provinces, to provide critical health, literacy, education, and legal services and to ensure that they are provided in remote areas.
- Establishing a quota for women employees in US-led Provincial Reconstruction Teams to ensure regular consultations with local women leaders in the design, implementation, and oversight of all projects;
- Requiring the US State Department for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) to establish affirmative action mechanisms to increase women's participation in security institutions, specifically by providing the following incentives:
 - Equal pay based on rank;
 - Childcare;
 - Special housing and health facilities for women;
 - Professional development services to encourage women's promotion to high-level positions; and
 - Equal education requirements for men and women to serve in entry-level positions.
- Appropriating funding and providing targeted capacity-building opportunities for Afghan women parliamentarians to effectively legislate in the National Assembly and to strengthen their contribution in parliamentary committees;
- Supporting efforts towards networking among women parliamentarians and leaders and strengthening the capacity of women leaders towards coalition building around issues of common interest.
- Ensuring that judicial reform programs sponsored by the US Agency for International Development (USAID) provide comprehensive training on the constitution, civil code, and human rights law, including Afghanistan's international commitments, to all judges, lawyers, law enforcement officials, and prosecutors. Women's rights should be emphasized as a top priority;
- Urging the Afghan Government to provide all women government officials and parliamentarians with adequate security to travel to and from work;
- Calling upon the Ministry of Interior to launch a campaign to recruit women police officers.
- Supporting the training of Afghan National Police on alternatives for supporting women victims.
- Encouraging President Karzai and his administration to take concrete measures to counter all acts of violence against women, including familial violence; and
- Ensuring congressional delegations to Afghanistan meet with women government officials, parliamentarians, and civil society leaders.

Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you so much, Ms. Amiri.

Now we will go to, and I am going to make this pronouncement correctly, Ms. Okwaci.

Ms. OKWACI. Okwaci. Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you. Thank you all.

**STATEMENT OF MS. REBECCA JOSHUA OKWACI, SECRETARY
GENERAL, WOMEN ACTION FOR DEVELOPMENT**

Ms. OKWACI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman Delahunt. Thank you for inviting me today. I would like to thank the United States for contributing to ending the Sudan's conflict.

Talking about women, women have been most severely affected by Sudan's conflict and underdevelopment. But I would like to stress that we are not passive victims. I have traveled from Africa to come here and tell you about the vital contributions Sudanese women have made to peace building and negotiations which culminated in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, the CPA, which was signed in Kenya in the year 2005.

I was with other women colleagues, many of them, extensively involved in the process leading to the CPA. I can tell you firsthand information how critical women were to ending the war and how we have not stopped there. We continued. We continue to call for the speedy implementation of the CPA as the people remain desperate to see peace dividends. And today people want to see. They don't want only to read and shout that the agreement has been signed, but they want to see the dividends, what are the results.

Let me start by saying that during the war and the conflict in our country, thousands of women joined the political struggle for peace and justice, and I am one of them. We formed networks and NGOs and repeatedly called for peace. Details are in my document. From Maastricht to the Netherlands to China to wherever, there were forums for peace, we were there to have our voices heard.

As negotiations dragged on, we became determined and we said we wanted to participate directly in the peace talks, not outside in the corridors, and not under the name of "experts." When we sit outside there and people are talking things inside on our behalf, we wanted to be directly in the talks.

We developed the Sudanese women's minimum agenda in which we called for one-third women's representation. In fact, we said 33. Not even 30. We didn't want to leave out even one person. Thirty-three percent of women representation. And that should be in decision-making positions, because you know that is where planning is done.

But despite our having shared the negotiations, and I keep on repeating that to our men, that even if we were not inside the talks, we were behind the talks throughout. So we shared the negotiations. Only a handful of women were formally included in the talks. In fact, by the end of the talks, we had only three women from that big group. But we appreciated that. And we all continued, however, to raise our voices louder, and louder, and louder every time. And when the talks grew tense, and sometimes they would adjourn and they would postpone 3 days and run away, we said no.

We continued to press men to keep negotiating, because we understood very well how we suffered with our children. And even though the men who die on the battlefield are our men, and the boys who are in the army are our sons and our children, so we wouldn't allow lives to be lost.

We organized visits to the talks and we were actually going there every other time to go and tell them you have to push on. You have to continue. We sent strong messages to the mediators, even the

IGAD, which was the big organization mediating the talks. We met them. It was difficult. But over time our impact grew.

I recall a reception one evening when I approached chief negotiator Sumbeijwo, General Lazaro Sumbeijwo. He was an important, very big, important Kenyan general. I said to him, I stood before him and I just told him, "I am Rebecca." And he said, "Which Rebecca? There are many of us. But which Rebecca?" And I said that, because knowing for months we had been sending messages, calling for the men to stay at the peace table and we wanted to bring the women in.

So—

Mr. DELAHUNT. I have no doubt he met his match.

Ms. OKWACI. So I replied, "I am one of those small Sudanese women." Then immediately he said, "Oh. So you are one of those women who have been making so much noise about peace? I have to say you made me live in the peace talks place for 3 months. I have forgotten my family." But from that point I knew very well that we were being heard, that our messages had been received.

The CPA has created new democratic political space for women. Across the country, we have pressed for fair representation, and I am proud to tell you that the current draft electoral law includes a 25-percent quota for women in the national assembly. We made sure that it goes inside there, the same way we have the 25 percent in our Constitution. It was our making.

Despite our efforts, again I want to remind you that there are pockets of tension and instability in our country. We are proud of the CPA, but still there are some pockets of tension, not forgetting in particular the situation and the conflict in Darfur.

There has been slow progress in the reconstruction of our economy and development of basic infrastructure. Health is a problem. Education, illiteracy is very high and many other of those things. I want to say it is the women, it is the girls, it is our daughters who are missing out on school and education.

What we want is to dramatically increase women and girls' literacy and we want to reduce the number of women who die during childbirth, and we want to ensure women's economic and political empowerment, and also eliminate gender-based violence.

My colleagues have mentioned rape and assaults. These are all in abundance in our country, and I know that also is the situation in Darfur.

And I don't want us to forget the situation in eastern Sudan, which had signed an agreement but sometimes it is put aside. We don't want it to be a binding situation where we forget and then tomorrow it stops. So eastern Sudan is very important.

But let me again turn for a moment to Darfur. Women there are often portrayed merely as victims, exactly what used to happen to us, but we said no, we are not. And there was no ability to influence peace. And these portrayals could not be further from the truth.

Late last year I witnessed Darfurian women coming together to identify common priorities and speak with one voice. I admired them very much and hope our experiences in south Sudan can inspire and inform them.

Again, I repeat, women should be included in negotiating teams as mediators and as participants in the negotiations. And with the Darfurian women, they are determined that they want to be represented the same way we did.

Mr. Chairman, two dates loom large in Sudan's future, and I want to speak loud here. These are our national elections in the year 2009 and our referendum in 2011 on unity or secession of Sudan. Women are looking ahead to elections, preparing to participate as voters, as organizers and as candidates.

Mr. DELAHUNT. May I interrupt? I don't mean to embarrass you, but per chance would you consider yourself as a candidate in these elections?

Ms. OKWACI. I think I can. I think I can. Not only me, but many of us. I think the opportunity is there, and we need to really just work very hard, the same way we have exerted our positions, we want to continue to be there. And 25 percent for us, okay, we are happy with it, but still we would go higher. We are still going to be in the 75 percent anyway.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am sure you are aware that in the U.S. House of Representatives, for the first time in this institution's history, the presiding officer, the Speaker of the House, is a female, Congresswoman Pelosi. I can't wait to take a DVD, a disc, and present this to her, to hear the stories, the very inspiring stories of the three of you. I know that she shares my sentiments, and I feel rather confident that Congresswoman Johnson's resolution will find its way to the floor of the House.

Please proceed.

Ms. OKWACI. You have encouraged me to be not only an MP, but a speaker of our Parliament.

So, Mr. Chairman, we will need assistance to achieve these goals. Specifically, the United States Congress can do the following: Appropriate funding for Sudanese women-led NGOs to provide health, education and legal services.

I also don't want to forget the repatriation of the refugees and people going back home, especially the IDPs. They are going back into very rough conditions in our country.

I would also like to say that we require USAID contractors to ensure a minimum of 50 percent women as beneficiaries and implementers of the projects. We want to oversee things happening ourselves.

Also I want to say appropriate funding for programs that strengthen women as candidates and reporters and as journalists. I use the radio to bring news to people in even the remotest villages in our country. And as a peace builder, because I combine the two, I train women on peacemaking through my organization, Women Action for Development, and often I combine the two roles together, hosting radio programs about women and peace-building. And I cannot overemphasize the important role the media plays in sensitizing women and helping them participate fully in nation-building.

I would like to applaud the United States Government and USAID for recognizing the key role women play in Sudan's recovery and reconstruction and for calling for gender to be a primary crosscutting theme in all programs.

Peace throughout Sudan is possible. I would like to repeat, it is possible. We have already started it, and we have to continue sustaining it. But not without the full participation of women. We must keep our momentum. The moment we invest in women as drivers of reconstruction and stability is now.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Okwaci follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MS. REBECCA JOSHUA OKWACI, SECRETARY GENERAL,
WOMEN ACTION FOR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me to address you today on the critical topic of women, peace, and security in Sudan. It is a great honor. The US has contributed enormously to ending Sudan's conflicts and improving the lives of our people. Without US assistance, many more would have lost their lives.

My remarks will focus on the specific ways Sudanese women were instrumental in ending the north/south war, as well the vital contributions women are making to implement the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and to resolving the conflict in Darfur.

Sudan has been governed by a series of Islamic-leaning military regimes since gaining independence from the British in 1956. Northern economic, political, and social domination of has fueled several civil wars. The signing of the CPA in 2005 ended over two decades of war between the North and South. The agreement, which provided a framework for peace for the entire country, carried the promise of a new era of stability.

Unfortunately, peace and stability remain elusive. The CPA, which the US did so much to help us achieve, is in peril. Implementation of the agreement is severely behind schedule. Key decisions about boundaries, power, and wealth sharing have yet to be made. Tensions are rising in the south and insecurity is growing because people are desperate to see peace dividends. Compounding the challenges is the conflict in Darfur, which has killed more than 300,000 people, displaced more than two million, and ensnared neighboring countries since erupting in 2003.

Women have been most severely affected by Sudan's conflicts and underdevelopment. They have suffered systematic rape and gender based-violence; lost their own lives and those of family members; and assumed new roles as heads of household, all while being denied access to land (which is provided for in the constitution but not really implemented), health care, and education. Women's quality of life indicators in Sudan rank among the worst in the world. In southern Sudan, only one in five children is in school, with three boys for every girl. Only 12 percent of women are estimated literate. Southern Sudanese women have a one in nine chance of dying during pregnancy or childbirth.

Despite the challenges they face and the hardships they endure, women are not passive victims. They provide humanitarian services, sustain and reconcile communities following generations of conflict, assume new roles in government, and press tirelessly for peace in Darfur and in Eastern Sudan.

NEGOTIATING THE COMPREHENSIVE PEACE AGREEMENT

I was extensively involved in efforts to negotiate the CPA. I can tell you firsthand how critical women were to ending the war.

Thousands of women joined the political struggle for peace with justice. They left their homes, not just to accompany their husbands but also to fight for freedom, democracy, and justice—the very same values that form the foundation of the United States. Women organized themselves into networks, and non-governmental organizations on both sides of the political divide. Though the war was at its height by then, they made an effort to contribute to the Beijing Conference in 1995 calling for an end to conflict in their country. They also organized and participated in many national and international conferences, such as the Hague Appeal for Peace and the International Conference on Sudanese Women and Peacemaking in Maastricht, The Netherlands, to highlight the urgency for peace. They engaged in dialogue, worked on reconciliation among the leaders, and helped develop issue papers that formed the basis for the Machakos Protocols. They kept constant check to ensure that talks did not stall. Three women participated in the negotiations in Naivasha that ultimately culminated in the CPA. Women were the inspiration behind the series of agreements that led to the CPA.

As negotiations dragged on, we became determined to participate in the talks ourselves. We convinced the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement/Army to

nominate a handful of women leaders as formal delegates. Making a difference was difficult. We were few in number. We were expected to contribute to a gender-blind party-position; and were ill prepared for debates with seasoned politicians who intimidated anyone who dared to focus on gender issues. Nonetheless, women made important contributions. We developed the Sudanese women's minimum agenda in which we called for one-third women's representation in decision making bodies. When the talks grew tense, women pressed men to keep negotiating. We worked across party lines to find points of compromise. We organized visits to the talks and sent strong messages to the mediator, who was always understanding. We grew savvier as time went on and our impact grew. Thanks to our efforts, the CPA recognizes the need for positive discrimination for women and the importance of recognizing women's equal rights.

IMPLEMENTING THE AGREEMENT

Political Representation

The CPA created new democratic, political space, which provided a window of opportunity for women's participation. Women today hold key executive positions in the Government of National Unity (GONU) and the Government of Southern Sudan (GOSS), including federal minister of health and governor of Western Equatoria State, ministers, members of Parliament, and heads of commissions. Women successfully advocated for a precedent-setting 25 percent quota in the constitution of the GOSS, which guarantees women's participation in government. Women across the country have used this quota to press the GONU for a similar guarantee, and I am proud to tell you that the current draft electoral law maintains the quota for women's elected representation in the national assembly.

In 2007, women formed a caucus in the GONU, the Assembly's only cross-party grouping of parliamentarians. Its executive committee includes members of four political parties including the majority National Congress Party and Sudanese Peoples Liberation Movement (SPLM). All 86 women parliamentarians in the Assembly comprise its membership. When the SPLM suspended its participation in the GONU in fall 2007, the women's caucus kept meeting. Women kept pushing for peace.

Economic reconstruction

With the support of the Government of Norway, the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), and The Initiative for Inclusive Security, I was member of a diverse delegation of Sudanese women that attended the Oslo donor's conference in April 2005. We established a common agenda and asserted our role in Sudan's post-conflict reconstruction and peace efforts. Women made recommendations that offered concrete proposals for promoting gender equality in all aspects of peace building. We urged donors to reflect strong gender-responsive principles in the allocation of resources for Sudan's recovery and reconstruction. Specific areas requiring immediate attention were access to basic health and social services; support for economic policies to improve women's livelihoods and to ensure food security; removal of gender discrimination in education and training; and confrontation of rampant gender-based violence.

I applaud the US Government and the US Agency for International Development (USAID), which heard the call. That strategy recognizes the key role women will play in the recovery and reconstruction of Sudan and called for gender to be a primary crosscutting theme in all programs. USAID required 50 percent women be beneficiaries of its Localizing Institutional Capacity in Sudan (LINCS) program (being implemented by Mercy Corps and International Rescue Committee). I further commend the US Government for supporting the women's caucus in the GOSS through the International Republican Institute (IRI). IRI has helped this nascent caucus organize and begin achieving results. This visionary decision to prioritize women's leadership has enhanced women's capacity to stabilize the country. I would urge its replication in USAID programs to rebuild following conflict around the world.

Unfortunately, there has been little overall progress toward achieving the Oslo priorities. Again with support from Norway, UNIFEM, and Inclusive Security, a delegation of women recently participated in the Sudan Donor's Consortium meeting in Oslo. In reiterating women's priorities it was noted that there has been very little progress in advancing women and girls' literacy, increasing access to capital, reducing maternal mortality, ensuring economic and political empowerment, and protecting women from gender-based violence. Similarly, there is significant scope for improving efforts to better facilitate the repatriation and reintegration of returning women refugees, internally displaced people, and former combatants.

The positive discrimination promised in the CPA is not reflected in resource flows or in the results of peace building and development to date. Many of the critical needs identified in the framework for reconstruction in southern Sudan have not been met. The relevant national ministries lack sufficient resources and influence in decision-making. Women's real access to justice is limited by significant constraints in the judicial sector including the absence of family law reform and adequate criminal law provisions for addressing violence against women; legal reform must be accelerated to bring judicial processes in line with constitutional equality provisions. Women are not given the opportunity to lead and to own peace building and development; they are insufficiently represented on the oversight committees of trust funds and the peace negotiations in Darfur.

PRESSING FOR PEACE IN DARFUR

Let me turn now for a moment to Darfur where women are severely marginalized in efforts to resolve the conflict. Despite efforts to organize, articulate priorities, and press for participation, women were only sporadically involved as consulting experts in the seventh round of negotiations around the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) and were a very small minority of the members of formal negotiating delegations. That said, the women who did participate in the peace talks did so because they received political and financial support from the international community, specifically the African Union (AU), who mediated the talks, UNIFEM, and the governments of Canada, Norway, and Sweden.

The AU–UN Road Map for Peace, initiated in the summer of 2007, included a means for civil society and women's involvement in talks. However, negotiations stalled in the fall of 2007 and efforts to revive them have focused only on armed rebel groups and the Government. Lessons from South Sudan can help achieve peace in Darfur and women can be the inspiration.

Despite their repeated exclusion, Darfuri women continue to press for peace. For example, in January 2008, Darfuri women joined more than 60 women from across Sudan and Africa to create an action plan for peace in Darfur at a meeting convened by *Femme Africa Solidarité*. Women at the meeting echoed previous findings from consultations organized by The Initiative for Inclusive Security, that achieving security in the region is women's highest priority.

As in the wars between North and South, rape and other forms of sexual violence in Darfur have been used as a weapon of war to humiliate, control, create fear, and displace women and their communities. Women are not, however, passive victims; they are vital actors in the provision of security. In Resolution 1769, the UN Security Council charged UNAMID with the protection of civilians and the provision for safe humanitarian access. To successfully fulfill this mandate, UNAMID must involve women in all efforts to provide protection, humanitarian access, camp security, and undertake community policing. Specifically, UNAMID should expand patrols to protect women when they leave camps to collect firewood, increase the number of women peacekeepers and civilian police, involve women in all security related committees, and consult with them separately.

LOOKING AHEAD

Two dates loom large in Sudan's future. National elections are scheduled for 2009 and a referendum over the South's secession is scheduled for 2011. Throughout the country, women within political parties and in civil society are looking ahead to elections, preparing to participate as voters, organizers, and as candidates. They recognize the need to increase their representation in legislative assemblies at state and national levels to address poverty and to change the way laws and budgets are drafted and implemented. In addition to consolidating democracy and increasing their role in post-conflict reconstruction, women hope to enshrine their rights in law and ensure access to justice.

Women will need assistance to achieve these goals. We hope you ensure a significant percentage of US support for Sudan's transition to democracy goes directly to programs to support women's political leadership.

Sudan will not achieve security and prosperity without the full participation of women. Overcoming the many obstacles they face will require internal and external support—in the form of resources, education, and access to decision-making. As Sudan is the US Government's highest priority country in Africa, we hope the US will do everything possible to facilitate its transition to democracy. Strengthening women's leadership will be an essential step.

SPECIFICALLY, THE US CONGRESS CAN:

- Appropriate funding for programs that strengthen women as candidates and voters so they engage in the electoral process and hold representatives accountable;
- Appropriate funding for Sudanese women-led NGOS to provide critical health, education, and legal services;
- Encourage the Government of National Unity and Government of Southern Sudan to fulfill quotas guaranteeing 25 percent women's participation in public office, on commissions overseeing peace building, and negotiating peace in Darfur and elsewhere including in the Elections Law, Political Party laws and by-laws, and in the post-election constitution of Sudan
- Require US Agency for International Development contractors and grantees to ensure a minimum of 50 percent women as beneficiaries and staff of projects (international and local), to guarantee a minimum 50 women-led organizations as implementers, and to assess the impact of funds spent on women's empowerment and gender equality; and
- Press the US Administration to engage the National Ministry of Finance with the ministries responsible for women to institutionalize gender-responsive budgeting across government budget processes.

Peace is possible. We have made important progress that must not be lost. The moment to invest in women as drivers of reconstruction and stability in Sudan is now.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I hear you loud and clear. Thank you. Thank you.

Again, certainly last but not least, our final witness on this panel, Dr. Crouse.

STATEMENT OF JANICE CROUSE, PH.D., SENIOR FELLOW, BEVERLY LAHAYE INSTITUTE, CONCERNED WOMEN FOR AMERICA

Ms. CROUSE. Thank you, Chairman Delahunt, and members of the committee as well. I am proud to be a part of this distinguished panel. I was very moved by the stories of the three women. And Ambassador Hunt commented, I have worked with her and with—she didn't know this—Ambassador Steinberg for nearly a decade now. So, as usual, we agree very much on the problems. We disagree very much on the solutions.

So I am very happy for this opportunity to address the subcommittee on such an important issue, and the bottom line is the United States' responsibility regarding United Nations Security Resolution 1325. The problem is that the United States has not agreed to the obligations of 1325. That resolution refers to numerous U.N. treaties. The United States has made no commitment to any of those treaties.

For instance, we have not ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) or the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and we have withdrawn from the International Criminal Court. The United States is not obligated to meet any of the commitments under these agreements, nor do we have any of the obligations that are mentioned in House Resolution 146. UNIFEM has said that 1325 represents the big picture in terms of human rights and CEDAW is the implementation of those. So I think it is really important for us at this committee, and I guess as the final presentation, why the United States has chosen not to make those commitments.

At the outset, let me state unequivocally that in the United States equal rights are protected under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The human rights provisions of the U.N. treaties are already available to citizens in the United States. We emphatically support the human rights of women and girls. The so-called women's rights movement and the gender mainstreaming effort have policy implications that go far beyond human rights concerns, and that is my major concern about 1325.

The issue in regard to United Nations treaties is a matter for the United States of national sovereignty. It is a matter of quotas, and it is a matter of the specific provisions of the various treaties that would challenge the laws and customs of the United States.

For America, there are numerous problems associated with CEDAW, which is the major foundational treaty at the foundation of 1325. CEDAW supersedes national sovereignty. The single condition that the Founding Fathers laid out for treaties of the United States were that they had to be constitutional. CEDAW violates that basic requirement. CEDAW would supersede all Federal and State laws.

In addition, CEDAW would be enforced by a 23-person oversight committee at the U.N. that would be responsible for implementing CEDAW in every signatory nation. Thus, the welfare and well-being of American women and families would be at the mercy of 23 individuals, among whom the United States might not even have a voice. Recent appointees to that 23-member oversight committee for CEDAW included China, Cuba and Iraq.

Specific provisions of the CEDAW treaty are very troublesome. A lot of baggage comes along with this resolution that we are discussing today, and the devil, as they say, is in the details.

Let me just mention some of the troubling aspects. The treaty could be used to justify the legalization of prostitution, and nations across the world have discovered that legalization inevitably increases illegal prostitution; instituting same-sex marriages; and undercutting parental roles in child rearing and teaching values to their children.

Let me be even more significant about five specific problems concerning CEDAW. CEDAW'S definition of discrimination and equal rights is all encompassing and dangerous. It goes beyond just establishing equality, which U.S. laws already afford women. The treaty language is far too vague and it would invite an avalanche of frivolous lawsuits in the United States. CEDAW could be used to restore the drive for a Federal ERA that was summarily dismissed years ago.

Number two, CEDAW undermines the traditional family structure in the United States and other nations that respect the family. The preamble states: "The change in the traditional role of men as well as the role of women in society and in the family is needed to achieve full equality between men and women."

CEDAW mandates gender reeducation. Taxpayers in the United States would be forced to pay the high cost of gender neutralizing all textbooks and school programs.

CEDAW is a thinly veiled comparable worth mandate, even though American women are prevalent in male-dominated professions and earn a majority of associate's and bachelor's degrees, as

well as 40 percent of the doctoral degrees and more than 40 percent of the law and medical degrees, as well.

In addition, number five, abortion is the driving force behind the CEDAW treaty. Universal access to abortion on demand continues to be viewed as essential for women's equality. Pregnancy is viewed by many as hampering women's careers and lessening their ability to compete equally with men. Ratification of CEDAW then could be used to broaden the scope of abortion in the United States, just as it has and continues to be used for that purpose around the world.

So, in conclusion, today's hearing on House Resolution 146 dips a toe into the waters to test whether CEDAW can now be ratified. All of these treaties are linked so closely together it is impossible to separate them. Those who advocate most vehemently for CEDAW don't need this treaty. They have already enjoyed abundant materialism, opportunities and negligible inequality.

Poor women in developing nations are fighting for the basic needs of everyday life, education, literacy, access to basic medical needs, nutrition. The accounts of the war atrocities that we have heard today break our hearts, but we cannot use these acts to push a treaty that carries so much unexpected baggage for us.

Hiding under the guise of human rights and veiling intentions with appeals to needy women in developing nations, activists insist that CEDAW is necessary. But, Mr. Chairman, please let me repeat, the United States has not agreed to the obligations of U.N. Security Resolution 1325.

In the United States, equal rights are protected under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The human rights provisions of U.N. treaties are available to every citizen in the United States. We emphatically support the human rights of women and girls. The so-called women's rights movement and gender mainstreaming efforts have policy implications, however, that go far beyond the human rights concerns that we have talked about today.

The issue in regard to the U.N. treaties is a matter of national sovereignty, a matter of quotas, and a matter of the specific provisions of the various treaties that would challenge the laws and the culture of the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Crouse follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JANICE CROUSE, PH.D., SENIOR FELLOW, BEVERLY LAHAYE INSTITUTE, CONCERNED WOMEN FOR AMERICA

Thank you, Chairman Delahunt and Members of the committee, for this opportunity to address the Subcommittee on such an important issue as determining what, exactly, is the United States' responsibility regarding the United Nations Security Resolution 1325?

House Resolution 146 states that the U.S. has "obligations" not just for its own actions, but also to "ensure" appropriate action from other U.N. member nations. Further, according to the resolution, the U.S. should assume implementation of international law regarding the "rights of women" and "for other purposes." Why? Because, according to the resolution, we have agreed to.

The problem is that the United States has *not* agreed to the obligations of the UN Security Resolution 1325.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 refers to numerous United Nations treaties. The United States has made no commitments to those treaties. For instance, we have not ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) or the Convention on the Rights of the Child. We have withdrawn from the International Criminal Court. The United

States is not obligated to meet any commitments under these agreements nor do we have any of the obligations that are mentioned in H.Res.146.

It is important to note exactly WHY the United States has chosen NOT to make these commitments.

At the outset, let me state unequivocally that in the United States equal rights are protected under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The human rights provisions of the U.N. treaties are already available to citizens in the United States. We emphatically support the human rights of women and girls. The so-called “Women’s Rights” movement and “gender-mainstreaming” effort have policy implications far beyond human rights concerns. The issue in regard to the U.N. treaties is a matter of national sovereignty, a matter of quotas and a matter of the specific provisions of the various treaties that would challenge the laws and culture of the United States.

Let’s look specifically at the problems associated with CEDAW¹—a U.N. treaty that was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on December 18, 1979 and signed by President Jimmy Carter in 1980. The *Senate Foreign Relations Committee* passed it on September 29, 1994, but the full *Senate* has not ratified CEDAW.

Thus, while most countries have signed the treaty—legally binding them to implement its provisions—the United States has not signed on and deliberately is not bound to implement the treaty’s provisions.

For the United States, there are major problems associated with the treaty.

I. CEDAW SUPERSEDES NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

A founding principle of the United States is respect for signed treaties. Treaties, along with the Constitution and United States laws—according to Article VI, Section 2, of the U.S. Constitution—are “the supreme Law of the Land.” The single condition that the founding fathers laid out was that any ratified treaty had to be constitutional. That is, it should line up with the principles of the Constitution and our republic.

CEDAW would violate that basic requirement:

By Overriding the Constitution:

Regrettably, in a national culture where strict constitutional interpretation is not guaranteed, CEDAW could supersede all federal and state laws, as evidenced by past federal court rulings.² CEDAW’s language would give that international treaty precedence over the laws in individual American states. For instance, its “use of overly broad language . . . allows the U.N. to invade the most personal of relationships between men and women.”³ For example, it would require individual American states to give up authority in family law, allowing the federal government to take over family law.

Therefore, the founding fathers certainly would have rejected CEDAW. As President Thomas Jefferson wrote, “If the treaty making power is boundless, then we have no Constitution.”⁴

By CEDAW Committee Oversight Rulings:

Part V (Articles 17–22) of CEDAW outlines the creation of a Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women to oversee the implementation of CEDAW in every signatory nation. This Committee consists of “23 experts of high and moral standing and competence in the field covered by the Convention” whom representatives of the Convention signatories elect. This, in essence, places the welfare and well being of American women and families at the mercy of 23 individuals, among whom the United States might not even have a voice.

CEDAW legally binds every signatory country to implement its provisions. After signing, each country *must submit* an initial report with a detailed and comprehensive description of the state of its women, “a benchmark against which subsequent

¹The author is indebted to former CWA staffers, Laurel MacLeod and Catherina Hurlburt, whose article, *Exposing CEDAW*, about the problems associated with the CEDAW treaty, provided a draft for this testimony. Numerous articles on CEDAW by Janice Shaw Crouse are at www.cwfa.org and in various publications.

²James L. Hirszen, Ph.D., *The Coming Collision: Global Law vs. U.S. Liberties* (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House, 1999), 45. In the following cases, the judges (U.S. Supreme court justices in the last case listed) decided that any congressional act that fulfills the provision of a treaty overrides state sovereignty: *United States v. Thompson*, 258 F. 257 (E.D. Ark. 1919); *United States v. Samples*, 258 F. 479 (W.D. Mo. 1919); *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, 40 S.Ct. 382 (1920).

³Hirszen, *The Coming Collision*, 32.

⁴Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Wilson C. Nicholas, September 1803, *The Jeffersonian Encyclopedia* (New York: Funk & Wagnals, 1900), 90, as cited in Hirszen, 23.

progress can be measured.”⁵ This initial report should include legislative, judicial, administrative and other measures the signatory nation has adopted to comply with CEDAW. The country must submit follow-up reports at least every four years. Since 1990, a pre-session working group of five Committee members has reviewed these subsequent reports and composed questions to guide the full Committee. After a country’s representative meets with the full Committee, it draws up concluding comments, observations and recommendations. Numerous of the CEDAW Committee’s rulings for various signatory countries have been arbitrary and offensive; for instance, scolding one nation’s husbands for not doing their share of housework or admonishing another nation for celebrating Mother’s Day.

II. THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF THE CEDAW TREATY ARE TROUBLESOME

Definition of “Discrimination”—

CEDAW’s definition of “discrimination” is all-encompassing and dangerous. It goes beyond trying to establish equality, which U.S. laws already afford women. CEDAW is essentially a global Equal Rights Amendment, a tool to deny any distinctions between men and women. Article 1 of CEDAW defines “discrimination against women” as: “Any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by women, irrespective of their marital status, on a basis of equality of men and women, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field.”⁶ According to this document, *any* “distinction, exclusion or restriction” could be changed if a woman claims that such distinctions “nullify her recognition, enjoyment or exercise . . . of human rights and fundamental freedoms.” This language is far too vague and would invite an avalanche of frivolous lawsuits in the United States.

Undermines the Traditional “Family”—

CEDAW undermines the traditional family structure in the United States and other nations that respect the family. The preamble states, “A change in the traditional role of men as well as the role of women in society and in the family is needed to achieve full equality between men and women.” Article 5a would require the United States government to “take all appropriate action” to: “Modify the social and cultural patterns of conduct of men and women, with a view to achieving the elimination of prejudices . . . based on . . . stereotyped roles for men and women.”⁷

The CEDAW committee determines which roles are “stereotypes” and the “appropriate action” for “eliminating the prejudice.” For example, in its analysis of *Denmark*, it “noted with concern that stereotypical perceptions of gender role continued to exist in society . . . [that] kept men from assuming an equal share of family responsibilities.”⁸ In its 2000 review of *Belarus*, the committee complained that “Mothers’ Day” and the “Mothers’ Award” encourage women’s traditional roles.⁹ Also, the CEDAW committee urged *Armenia* to “combat the traditional stereotype of women in the noble role of mother.”¹⁰ Further, it complained to *Luxembourg* about its “stereotypical attitudes that tend to portray men as heads of households and breadwinners, and women primarily as mothers and homemakers.”¹¹

Denigrates the Role of Parents in Child Rearing—

CEDAW also undercuts the proper role of parents in child rearing. Articles 5 and 16 affirm that in family matters “the interests of the children shall be paramount.” Will the CEDAW committee decide what is in a child’s “best interest”? What penalty would result from violating the “best interest” of the child? This statement subordinates every family member to the CEDAW committee, regardless of the issue or circumstance.

⁵ CEDAW Reporting guidelines.

⁶ CEDAW.

⁷ CEDAW.

⁸ *Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Denmark*, A/52/38/Rev.1, paras. 248–274 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 27 January 1997), para. 264.

⁹ *Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Belarus*, CEDAW/C/2000/1/CRP.3/Add.5/Rev.1 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 31 January 2000), para. 27.

¹⁰ Susan Jones, “In Defense of Mother’s Day, Senator Blasts ‘Anti-Family’ Treaty,” *CNS News*, 12 May 2000.

¹¹ *Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Luxembourg*, CEDAW/C/2000/1/CRP.3/Rev.1 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 21 January 2000), para. 29.

Regarding children's interests, CEDAW conveys that government knows best, not parents. The Committee derided *Slovenia* because *only* 30 percent of children under age three were in day-care centers. The remaining 70 percent, the committee claimed, would miss out on education and social opportunities offered in day-care institutions.¹² The CEDAW committee's review of *Germany* urged "the Government to improve the availability of care places for school-age children to facilitate women's re-entry into the labor market."¹³

Usurps Parental Role in Teaching Values to Their Children—

The Committee even seeks to empower governments to usurp parents' role in teaching values to their children. In its report on *Romania* and other countries, it encouraged "the Government to include sex education systematically in schools."¹⁴

In her book, *Ready or Not*, Kay Hymowitz criticized the forced maturation of adolescents today: "[The] generation that came of age in the sixties and seventies . . . hoped that they would demystify sex, free it from the control of church ladies and what sexual reform advocates had long called the "conspiracy of silence." In this new world, sex would be better and so would kids. So why hasn't this dream come true? The answer becomes clear enough when you take a careful look at the statements of sex educators, curriculum planners, public health officials. . . . Information is all these kids need, they say. . . . So now we have a nation of teenagers who are information rich but knowledge poor."¹⁵

Hymowitz cites a 1996 poll by the *Ms. Foundation for Women* that found 73 percent of girls think most girls have sex not because they want to, but because that is what their boyfriends want.¹⁶ With CEDAW in place, teens around the world will feel increased social pressure from sex educators as well as boyfriends.

CEDAW Mandates Gender Re-Education—

Article 10c requires: "The elimination of any stereotyped concept of the roles of men and women at all levels and in all forms of education by encouraging coeducation and other types of education which will help to achieve this aim and, in particular, by the revision of textbooks and school programs and the adaptation of teaching methods."¹⁷

Single-sex schools could be discouraged and eliminated because their "perspective" on gender is not acceptable to the international government. Taxpayers could be forced to pay the high cost of "gender neutralizing" all textbooks and school programs. America could become a nation of androgynous children who are not *allowed* to believe that any gender differences exist beyond the external.

For example, the Committee recommended that the Romanian government "place priority on the review and revision of teaching materials, textbooks and school curricula, especially for primary- and secondary-level education."¹⁸ The committee called upon Austria's government to "integrate gender studies and feminist research in university curricula and research programs."¹⁹

In her book, *The War Against Boys*, author Christina Hoff Sommers argued males and females are significantly different and unequally treated.²⁰ That is, in the United States, girls receive *better* treatment. In his review of the book, *National Review* editor Richard Lowry wrote: "Girls get better grades, do more homework, engage in more extracurricular activities, enroll in more advanced-placement classes (and fewer special-education classes), go to college in greater numbers, and so on. This doesn't mean that girls are academically superior to boys; just that the special needs of boys are being neglected. As competitiveness and individual initiative are

¹²*Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Slovenia*, A/52/38/Rev.1, paras.81–122 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 23 January 1997), para. 104.

¹³*Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Germany*, CEDAW/C/2000/I/CRP.3/Add.7/Rev.1 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2 February 2000), para. 28.

¹⁴*Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Romania*, CEDAW/C/2000/II/CRP.3/Add.7 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 23 June 2000), para. 39.

¹⁵Kay Hymowitz, *Ready or Not: Why Treating Children as Small Adults Endangers Their Future—and Ours* (New York: The Free Press, 1999), 164–5.

¹⁶Hymowitz, 174.

¹⁷CEDAW.

¹⁸*Concluding Observations: Romania*, para. 25.

¹⁹*Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Austria*, CEDAW/C/2000/II/ Add.1 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 15 June 2000), para. 25.

²⁰Christina Hoff Sommers, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is Harming Our Young Men* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

discouraged, classroom discipline loosened, and outlets for natural rambunctiousness—e.g., recess—eliminated, schoolboys tend to tune out or turn on (to Ritalin).”²¹

CEDAW Jeopardizes Federal and State wage level laws—

Article 11d requires that women receive the “right . . . to equal treatment in respect to work of equal value.” This phrase is a thinly veiled “comparable worth” mandate. *Comparable worth* actually calls for equal pay for *unequal* work. This concept wars against our free-market system, where the supply and demand of workers determines the value of a job in a given profession. This respects an individual worker’s experience, expertise and ability.

Proponents of comparable worth say legislation is necessary to ensure equalization of wages. Feminists *claim* that a woman earns only 76 cents for every dollar a man earns.²² Yet that figure is skewed because it does not take into account job choice, position, age, experience, education and consecutive years in the work force. Using all women in their calculations distorts the statistics.²³ Also, having children changes the earning equation—many mothers prefer part time work or choose flexible hours, while others jump off the fast track in order to invest time in their families while their children are young.

Further, research from the *National Longitudinal Survey of Youth* found that there is no wage gap among those ages 27–33 who have never had a child; women in that demographic earn about 98 percent of their male counterparts’ income.²⁴

The number of American women in “male-dominated” professions has steadily increased since they entered the work force in large numbers during the 1940s.²⁵ Currently, women earn the majority of associate’s and bachelor’s degrees, as well as 40 percent of doctoral degrees and more than 40 percent of law and medical degrees.²⁶ The *Korn/Ferry* executive search firm found that in 1998, 72 percent of corporate boards included women.²⁷

Nonetheless, the CEDAW Committee expressed concern that in Germany “in 1997, although women accounted for 42.1 percent of the gainfully employed population, they comprised 88 percent of the persons working in part-time employment and 55.9 percent of the unemployed. The committee declared those differences resulted from the persistence of indirect discrimination against women in the labor market.”²⁸ As a result, the Committee (as noted earlier) called for more child care availability in Germany so women could work. No mention was made of the fact that some women choose not to work or to work part-time in order to spend more time with their children.

Abortion is the Driving Force Behind the CEDAW treaty—

Articles 12 and 14 (section 2b) seek “to ensure, on a basis of equality of men and women, access to health care services, including those related to family planning.” This document, written in the late 1970s, illustrates the language—specifically family planning or health care “services”—that activists use when they mean “access to abortion.” Since that time, pro-life NGOs have successfully lobbied to have on record that U.N. documents cannot advocate abortion, though, many U.N. personnel continue to interpret the treaties to include abortion services and promote such interpretations among member nations.

Universal access to abortion-on-demand continues to be viewed as essential for women’s equality. Feminists view pregnancy as hampering women’s careers and lessening their ability to compete equally with men. Access to abortion for all women, then, is viewed by feminists as necessary as an *equality* measure. Ratification of CEDAW could easily be used to broaden the scope of abortion in the United States, just as it has and continues to be used for that purpose around the world. The advocates that pushed hardest for the “normalization” of abortion now push it on a global level; CEDAW is a key tool in doing just that.

For example, the Committee recommended that the Romanian government increase efforts to improve women’s reproductive health, including “availability, ac-

²¹ Richard Lowry, “The Male Eunuch,” *National Review*, 3 July 2000.

²² Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1998, as cited in “*Catalyst Fact Sheet: Labor Day 1998.*”

²³ Diana Furchtgott-Roth and Christine Stolba, *Women’s Figures: An Illustrated Guide to the Economic Progress of Women in America* (Washington, D.C.: AEI Press and Arlington, VA: *Independent Women’s Forum*, 1999), Preface, xii.

²⁴ Furchtgott-Roth and Stolba, Summary and Highlights, xvii.

²⁵ Furchtgott-Roth and Stolba, p. 19.

²⁶ Furchtgott-Roth and Stolba, p. 22.

²⁷ Furchtgott-Roth and Stolba, p. 19.

²⁸ *Concluding Observations: Germany*, para. 25.

ceptability and use of modern means of birth control.”²⁹ It also complained that “although Ireland is a secular State, the influence of the Church is strongly felt. . . . In particular, women’s right to health, including reproductive health, is compromised by this influence.”³⁰ It decried that, “with very limited exceptions, abortion remains illegal in Ireland” and urged the government “to facilitate a national dialogue on women’s reproductive rights, including on the restrictive abortion laws.”³¹

The U.N. Treaty on CEDAW Could Usher in a Back-Door ERA—

The definition of “equal rights” is a problem area in U.N. Treaties, especially CEDAW. Who decides what is “equal” and what is a “right”? Article 2 requires each nation that ratifies this Convention: “(a) To embody the principle of the equality of men and women in their national constitution or other appropriate legislation [emphasis added] . . . and (c) Establish legal protection of the rights of women on an equal basis with men and to ensure through competent national tribunals and other public institutions the effective protection of women against any act of discrimination.”³²

In the United States, radical feminists have been trying to pass a federal Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) since 1970. Their efforts have failed, so they have moved to the state legislatures. But the dream of amending the U.S. Constitution with the ERA has not died. Efforts are revived periodically and CEDAW could be used to renew the drive for a federal ERA.³³

CEDAW Could be Used to Sanction Same-Sex Marriage—

The federal ERA was defeated for many reasons. For example, it sought to gender-neutralize society, eliminating distinctions between the sexes. Pro-family advocates feared the ramifications of this far-reaching Constitutional amendment. Such expectations have now become reality. State ERAs have played a central role in leading courts to allow same-sex “marriage.” Ratification of CEDAW—which could force a federal ERA—might be the fast track to federally sanctioned same-sex “marriage.”

While Article 1 of CEDAW defines “discrimination against women” as “any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex,” the treaty makes no explicit mention of homosexual or lesbian rights. Nevertheless, the Committee has mandated such special rights. In its review of *Kyrgyzstan*, it expressed concern “that lesbianism is classified as a sexual offense in the Penal Code” and ordered that “lesbianism be re-conceptualized as a sexual orientation and that penalties for its practice be abolished,”³⁴ in defiance of the country’s religious position and cultural heritage.³⁵

The CEDAW Committee Favors Legalizing Prostitution—

Article 6 states that countries that have ratified CEDAW “shall take all appropriate measures, including legislation, to suppress all forms of traffic in women and exploitation of prostitution in women.” This statement echoes an earlier treaty, the *Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others*, which called prostitution “incompatible with the dignity and worth of the human person” which “endanger[s] the welfare of the individual, the family and the community.”³⁶ Article 1 of this treaty orders countries to: “punish any person who, to gratify the passions of another: (1) procures, entices or leads away, for purposes of prostitution, another person, even with the consent of that person; (2) exploits the prostitution of another person, even with the consent of that person [emphasis added].”

Tragically, the CEDAW Committee has deviated completely from the original intention of the document regarding prostitution. Article 11, section 1(c) of the treaty upholds “the right to free choice of profession and employment.” The Committee has

²⁹ *Concluding Observations: Romania*, para. 39.

³⁰ *Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Ireland*, CEDAW/C/1999/L.2/ Add.4 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 1 July 1999), para. 20.

³¹ *Concluding Observations, Ireland*, paras. 25, 26.

³² CEDAW.

³³ Hirsén, 31

³⁴ *Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Kyrgyzstan*, A/54/38, paras. 95–142 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 27 January 1999), paras. 127–128.

³⁵ The majority (70 percent) of Kyrgyzstan is Sunni Muslim. *Library of Congress, “Kyrgyzstan—A Country Study,”* March 1996.

³⁶ Preamble, *Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others*, entry into force 25 July 1951.

included “voluntary” prostitution in that “free choice”—to the detriment of needy women around the world. It has called upon China to “decriminalize prostitution,”³⁷ expressing concern that it is often the “result of poverty.”³⁸ Also, while it urged Germany “to recognize that trafficked women and girls are victims of human rights violations in need of protection,”³⁹ it also expressed concern “that although they are legally obliged to pay taxes, prostitutes still do not enjoy the protection of labor and social law.”⁴⁰ Even more blatant, its report on Greece stated, “While noting positively the fact that prostitution is decriminalized and instead is dealt with in a regulatory manner, the Committee is concerned that inadequate structures exist to ensure compliance with regulatory framework.”⁴¹

THE FIGHT AGAINST CEDAW

Although President Carter signed CEDAW in 1980, and it passed out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1994, the Senate has not yet ratified this treaty. Former Sen. Jesse Helms (R-North Carolina), who served as chairman of the foreign relations committee for years, led the effort to block the U.S. ratification of CEDAW. On May 11, 2000, just before Mother’s Day, Sen. Helms introduced a “sense of the Senate” to reject CEDAW because it “demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family.”

Advocates have not ceased in their quest to ratify the treaty, however. On April 12, 2000, Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-California) introduced a “sense of the Senate” to hold hearings and act on CEDAW. *S.Res.286* had 34 cosponsors.

Today’s hearing “dips a toe” into the waters to test whether CEDAW can now be ratified.

The U.S. Constitution allows the president to enter into treaties with two-thirds Senate approval. It also requires the Senate to have a quorum, a majority (51), present to conduct business. Thus, with 51 senators present, CEDAW would need a minimum of 34 approving senators to ratify it.⁴² You can guess who—depending on whether they survive the next election—would attend the vote were CEDAW to come to the Senate floor.

Attorney James Hirsén, *J.D., Ph.D.* described how some Members get around the rules to impose their minority views on the majority. The Senate ratified the U.N. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a treaty that delves into our most personal affairs, on April 3, 1992. According to the *Congressional Record*, only five senators were present. Majority leader George Mitchell conducted proceedings and made the motion to approve the treaty. Another senator seconded the motion, and the chair, Jay Rockefeller, called for a vote. He asked a gallery of empty chairs for any opposition. The treaty passed, according to the official records, with “no opposition.”⁴³

In addition, President Clinton issued *Executive Order 13107*, “Implementation of Human Rights Treaties,” on December 10, 1998. He then established an Interagency Working Group, with representatives from major federal departments, to implement America’s alleged “obligations” under U.N. treaties on human rights “to which the United States is now *or may become* a party in the future [emphasis added].”⁴⁴ This shows how far a president can go in abusing his power by imposing his will on the public.

PUSHING SO-CALLED “WOMEN’S RIGHTS” AND QUOTAS

The feminist movement, in its plan to restructure society and enact its legislation—gender mainstreaming, gender re-education, comparable worth, quotas, redefining marriage and family, and a federal ERA—is using a U.N. treaty to mandate its agenda and to establish international quotas for compliance and implementation.

Those who advocate most vehemently for CEDAW don’t need the treaty. They already enjoy abundant materialism, opportunities and negligible inequality. Women

³⁷ *Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: China*, A/54/38, paras. 251–336 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 3 February 1999), para. 289.

³⁸ *Concluding Observations, China*, para. 288.

³⁹ *Concluding Observations: Germany*, para. 36.

⁴⁰ *Concluding Observations: Germany*, para. 39.

⁴¹ *Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Greece*, A/54/38, paras. 172–212 (Geneva, Switzerland: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 1 February 1999), para. 197.

⁴² Hirsén, 25.

⁴³ Hirsén, 25–26.

⁴⁴ Cliff Kincaid and Phyllis Schlafly, “Clinton’s Power Grab Through Executive Orders,” 20 January 1999.

in the United States have the right to vote. They are fully participating members of society, protected by the federal Civil Rights Code and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (*EEOC*), as well as state civil rights codes and state employment commissions.

Poor women in developing nations are fighting for the basic needs of everyday life—education and literacy, access to basic medical needs, nutrition, etc. Radical feminists in Western nations are using these women’s disadvantages to push an agenda of sexual and reproductive rights for females as young as age 10. Hiding under the guise of “human rights,” and veiling their intentions with appeals for needy women in developing nations, they insist CEDAW is necessary.

The *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women* is flawed. The U.S. Senate must not ratify it. At its best, CEDAW is unnecessary. At its worst, CEDAW unravels America’s families and forces women to model themselves in the image of global feminism.

CONCLUSION:

Mr. Chairman, allow me please to repeat: The United States has *not* agreed to the obligations of the UN Security Resolution 1325.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 refers to numerous United Nations treaties. The United States has made no commitments to any of those treaties. For instance, we have not ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) or the Convention on the Rights of the Child. We have withdrawn from the International Criminal Court. The United States is not obligated to meet any commitments under these agreements nor do we have any of the obligations that are mentioned in H.Res.146.

I have explained WHY the United States has chosen NOT to make these commitments.

Again, let me reiterate unequivocally that in the United States equal rights are protected under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The human rights provisions of the U.N. treaties are already available to citizens in the United States.

We emphatically support the human rights of women and girls. The so-called “Women’s Rights” movement and “gender-mainstreaming” efforts have policy implications far beyond human rights concerns.

The issue in regard to the U.N. treaties is a matter of national sovereignty, a matter of quotas and a matter of the specific provisions of the various treaties that would challenge the laws and culture of the United States.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Mollmann and Ms. Arriaga follows:]



**UN Security Council Resolution 1325:
Recognizing Women's Vital Roles in Achieving Peace and Security**
House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on International
Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight
May 15, 2008

Written Submission by
Marianne Møllmann,
Women's Rights Division Advocacy Director, Human Rights Watch
and
Alexandra Arriaga,
Managing Director of Government Relations, Activism and Development,
Amnesty International USA

In its Resolution 1325 from October 2000, the United Nations Security Council outlined what the United Nations and its member states need to do to incorporate a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations and to promote women's full involvement in all efforts to maintain and promote peace and security. The resolution is historic not only in that it constituted the first time the Council systematically addressed the manner in which conflict affects women and girls differently from men and boys, but also because it acknowledges the crucial link between peace, women's participation in decision-making, and the recognition of women's life experiences throughout the conflict cycle. As such, the resolution calls for enhanced participation of women in all mechanisms to prevent, manage, and resolve conflicts, and for attention to the special needs of women and girls during resettlement, disarmament, reintegration, and other post-conflict processes. As the Subcommittee considers this part of Security Council Resolution 1325, we urge attention both to women's participation and to substantive representation of women's needs and experiences on peace and security agendas.

There is no denying that women and girls suffer particular harms in conflict. Violence targeting women and girls—that is, gender-based violence—has been a horrifying characteristic of all recent armed conflicts and post-conflict situations, whether as a form of torture, as a method to humiliate the enemy, or with a view to spreading

terror and despair. Human rights and humanitarian organizations have reported such violence in Afghanistan, Burundi, Chad, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Peru, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Chechnya/Russian Federation, Uganda and the former Yugoslavia, just to mention a handful. It is precisely because conflict carries such devastating consequences for women and girls that efforts to build peace and prevent the recurrence of conflict must consider the role of women. Peace processes cannot undo the loss and suffering experienced by women and girls during war, but these processes can provide the starting point for accountability and redress. Indeed, effective peace processes can help prevent future violence through such redress. Moreover, at the crudest level, peace processes will have failed if they do not address the specific harm suffered by women and girls, just as they will have failed if they did not take into account the harm suffered by men and boys.

Research and experience from many countries give insights into the core elements of effective peace processes from the perspective of including women's experiences and needs. These elements include:

- Women must be represented in the drafting, implementation, and application of the rule of law that is created during transitions from war to peace;
- Sex-based discrimination in access to justice must be addressed—this means, inter alia, that underlying gender assumptions regarding the design of post-conflict dispute resolution mechanisms must be overcome;
- The role of sex-based discrimination in the causes of the armed conflict must be analyzed;
- The particular way in which the conflict affects women and girls—as civilians and as combatants—must be analyzed;
- The peace agreement must include meaningful political participation for women;
- Post-conflict rule of law must create legal accountability for crimes committed against women and mechanisms to protect the safety and dignity of women victims and witnesses in judicial proceedings;
- Reparations arrangements must be non-discriminatory; specially adapted to women's needs, interests, and priorities; and address the political and structural inequalities that negatively shape women's and girls' lives; and
- Any reconciliation processes must provide a process for including women's experiences in the history of the conflict.

Most of these elements form part of the international human rights obligations undertaken by states to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women and

girls, and, as such, should not depend on Security Council emphasis—or indeed, on the existence of armed conflict and post-conflict reconstruction—for their full implementation. However, the international attention directed at post-conflict reconstruction may facilitate much needed action in an area that too often gets ignored.

The United States House of Representatives has a crucial role to play in furthering the implementation of this Security Council Resolution. First, the House should ask the administration to make action on implementation of Resolution 1325 a priority for its membership of the Security Council, specifically during its June 2008 presidency of the Security Council. The United States government is in a unique position to provide leadership on this issue at the Security Council, because of its permanent seat at the Council. In particular, the House should urge the administration to advance systematic data collection and analysis of the effect of armed conflict on women and girls at the Security Council. Finally, the House of Representatives should ensure attention to the mentioned key elements of effective peace processes whenever it addresses post-conflict situations, and should urge the administration to do the same.

The House of Representatives should also build bipartisan support for passage of the International Violence Against Women Act (S. 2279/H.R. 5927), which would enhance US implementation of key recommendations in Resolution 1325. The International Violence Against Women Act would integrate work to stop violence against women and girls into US foreign assistance and diplomatic efforts. It would provide support for programs for legal reform, for females affiliated with the fighting forces, and for women's non-governmental organizations on the ground.

For more detail, please contact Marianne Møllmann, Women's Rights Division advocacy director at Human Rights Watch, marianne.mollmann@hrw.org, tel. +1-212-216-1285.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Dr. Crouse.

If I may, you express concern about CEDAW. Am I correct when I state that the United States has not signed CEDAW and is not a party thereto?

Ms. CROUSE. Correct. My point is that 1325 is closely linked to CEDAW, because CEDAW is the foundational implementation aspect of 1325.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I read 1325, and yet I failed to note that it calls for adoption of CEDAW.

Ms. CROUSE. It utilizes CEDAW for implementing all of the provisions of the document.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, I think there is some disagreement. I can see Ambassador Steinberg disagrees with that particular—

Ms. CROUSE. Well, the official UNIFEM document states that very specifically and links it altogether.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I just want to be clear. We are not a party to CEDAW, and in terms of the U.N. Security 1325, it does not call or require accession to CEDAW. I really want to—I understand you are the minority witness here, and I respect that, and I respect your position. At the same time, it is my understanding, and correct me, anyone can correct me, that the Bush administration actually has strongly supported the adoption of 1325.

Is that a fair statement on my part?

Ms. CROUSE. I am not representing the Bush administration. I am representing Concerned Women for America.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I understand that. But I just want to be clear. President Bush, his administration, strongly, in fact the United States voted for U.N. Security Resolution 1325.

Ms. CROUSE. We will be talking with him about that.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Before or after he leaves office? Who cast that vote? Who is the Permanent Representative of the United States to the U.N. that cast United States' vote in support of U.N. Security Resolution 1325?

Ambassador STEINBERG. I think it was Bill Richardson.

Ambassador HUNT. It was probably Bill Richardson, because it was in 2000. But the Bush administration took to the G-8 a resolution which was passed that called for a G-8 resolution to insist on women's full involvement in the peace process and named Security Council Resolution 1325 as the basis for that. But I would like to see—

Mr. DELAHUNT. Ambassador Steinberg?

Excuse me, Ambassador Hunt.

Ambassador STEINBERG. Just a few comments. First of all, the only linkage between 1325 and CEDAW is one clause in the resolution, clause 9, that says all parties to war should in general support United Nations' ideas, including, and then it lists CEDAW as one of them. It certainly does not by any means require American involvement in CEDAW.

I would also point out though, and I am going to have to check the facts, but when I was in the Bush administration we actually had accepted the fact that we have signed CEDAW. We put it as a low priority in terms of adoption by the Senate, but we certainly—and the Congress—but we in the Bush administration certainly did not oppose it. We said that there were some concerns we

were looking at as to whether it was consistent with Federal laws, State laws, and those sorts of issues.

Secondly, I have to comment that I was a little bit confused by Congressman Rohrabacher's reference and the other speaker's reference to some panel. There is no panel in 1325. I don't know where that comes from. I think maybe that is under CEDAW itself, but it has no relationship whatsoever with 1325.

I would also say that there is no provision in 1325 that even comes close to touching abortion. So that strikes me as just a canard that is raised.

As an American diplomat for 29 years, yes, there is a cost to the United States not signing on to these sorts of provisions, even if within U.S. law there is a protection. I don't know how many times I apologized for the fact that the United States and Somalia were the only two countries that still have not ratified the Treaty on the Rights of the Child, and I can't tell you the number of times I had to explain how good our human rights record is on gender issues when I was undercut in my diplomacy by someone who said, "Well, you haven't even signed CEDAW," and then listed all the countries around the world that had committed to that. So there is a cost here.

Ms. CROUSE. Yet all three of the ladies who talked today, Ambassador, have talked about the fact that the United States has provided leadership in their countries on human rights issues. So the problem is not that we have opposed CEDAW, but that we recognize the problems that are associated with that treaty that affect the United States so dramatically in terms of our national sovereignty and in terms of our quotas. And those aspects of that treaty are very much—you know, this is an official U.N. document right here that talks about how the two documents, the 1325 and CEDAW, are inextricably linked together and work together and should. Right in the introduction it says the synergies across all the work in these documents explore the ways in which Resolution 1325 can expand the reach of CEDAW, and, conversely, the way CEDAW deepens the impact and effectiveness of 1325.

So they are meant to go together, and that is very clear, not just in 1325, but in other documents.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, the hearing today is obviously an effort to explore the need, and I think we can agree on that, in terms of the protection of women, and as all three of our guests from overseas have indicated, how to maximize the potential that is so enormous to make them an integral part of creating peace and sustaining peace, in being an incredible powerful force in that regard.

With all due respect, Dr. Crouse, I pointed out that you were the minority witness, and, again, I hold you in high esteem, but I wanted to be very clear that the Bush administration, a Republican administration, and many of my Republican colleagues, obviously with the exception of my friend from California, are enthusiastically supportive of U.N. 1325.

As you indicated, you are going to talk to President Bush, and I hope you do, and I hope you have a good conversation and wish him well in his retirement. But, at the same time, I want to be clear to the panel and to those who will be watching this that this

is not a partisan issue. We have, I think, tremendous support for this initiative across party lines.

I understand your group opposes it for reasons that you have articulated, and I respect that. But we have not signed CEDAW. Resolution 1325, in my opinion, certainly does not explicitly call for its adoption or its ratification, and, as I indicated, we will see if Ambassador Hunt can influence the ranking member. But I think that this resolution put forth by the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Johnson, should be heard before the full committee, and I think it is very important to send a message to the world that we will work in a collaborative fashion through multilateral organizations to protect women and to utilize the special talents they have in terms of creating conditions for peace. And hopefully we will all benefit from that.

I have recognized for years the talents of women. I always said that if we had more women in leadership positions, and if you combine that with a military draft of men over 60 years old, that we would soon I think solve most of the conflicts that are destroying our world today. Somehow we would find that we would work it out before things got out of hand.

Ambassador Steinberg?

Ambassador STEINBERG. I am very appreciative of you giving that age limit. I was a conscientious objector once. I am 55 and I don't really want to be one again.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, I am going to be 67 in July, and I am ready to go.

Ms. CROUSE. I hope you heard me loud and clear say we agree on the problem and I have been moved by the stories we heard. However, I think we have to follow the admonition that we first do no harm, and the solution to the problem is the crux, not the problem itself. We do have to address the problem, no question about that. But sometimes solutions can create greater problems, and I think we need to be very cautious about the implications and the ramifications of 1325.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Dr. Crouse.

Let me just direct a question to Ambassador Hunt.

Ambassador, what can Congress do in terms of women's efforts in building peace and promoting security? What can this institution do, in your opinion? We have got excellent recommendations and suggestions from our three guests. And I know people have other schedules and I don't want to continue this dialogue to the point where people are getting hungry or missing planes, or trains, or buses, or whatever.

Ambassador HUNT. I will be finished by 5 o'clock. All right?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Please.

Ambassador HUNT. Here it is. Congress should request the administration support programs that promote women's leadership in peace and security. In Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003, United States assistance to Afghanistan was close to \$1 billion. Of that amount, \$200,000 went to Afghan women NGOs. That is .02 percent. By the way, the NGOs were there. So don't listen to anyone who says, "We couldn't find them."

Two, hold more hearings just like this one and ensure that the witnesses include representatives from local women's organizations. And I am very, very happy to help you find them.

Three, in every conflict, call for women's involvement, as mediators, members of the negotiating teams, service providers for the reconstruction. In other words, get the aid money to the women. Right now, they are bypassed. And call for women in the governing structures.

And Don Steinberg will tell you that you can't just leave it to the negotiating teams in the conflict and expect them to include women. As the host, you can require it.

Four, in your encounters with the U.S. and international and local actors working to resolve a conflict, push for transparent and inclusive peace negotiations that empower forces for peace and not just the armed combatants. What we do is we invite all the warlords around the table and tell them to design a peace process, and that is bad casting.

Okay, fifth, members and staff meet with local women when you are on codels. We have all had these frustrating encounters with these stubborn local politicians, the men who refuse to collaborate, but I meet with local women who are working across the lines. So you have got to mix up what you do on codels.

By the way, it takes the principle—

Mr. DELAHUNT. Ambassador, that is a very good suggestion. I think I could bring that to the attention of the Speaker in codels and as we travel the world, and I think it is important that we do. That there ought to be a best practice, if you will, to request meetings that bring women to the table to discuss issues specifically to the conflict, if we happen to be in a society that is experiencing conflict.

Ambassador HUNT. Okay. I get 1 more minute now, okay?

Mr. DELAHUNT. In fact, we can go for another 10.

Ambassador HUNT. Thanks, thanks.

In December of '97, I was with President Clinton and the First Lady, Hillary Clinton, in Bosnia. He was meeting with the local politicians, and they were these die-hard nationalists. The First Lady and I were meeting with these fabulous women NGOs who were completely mixed in terms of ethnicity. He and Secretary Albright and Sandy Burger looked exhausted and were so discouraged at the press conference at the end. They said this country is not going anywhere any time soon. We were so energized. It couldn't have been more striking in that moment.

And, you know, you are right to talk about the Speaker. Because it has to come from the top. I mean, the staffs, bless their hearts, they are not going to push the principals to do this with the same kind of drive as the principals pushing the staffs.

Okay. Six, insist that the State Department submit lists of qualified women for key posts in the U.N. peace missions, especially the policy making. The U.N. is the worst—Janice, you would love this. The U.N. is the worst, it is just the worst in terms of the role of women.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Ambassador Hunt, let me interrupt. Because this committee—as I am sure you are aware and probably other members of the panel before us, this committee has primary jurisdiction

over the United Nations and our relationship, the U.S. relationship with the U.N. I have to tell you there is a woman who comes frequently before this committee to brief us on peacekeeping operations, and that is Jane Hall Lute. Wow. I am proud that she's an American, and she is just—absolutely, I think, infuses, if you will, a certain perspective and professionalism and spirit in the United Nations that, as you suggest, is desperately needed.

Ambassador HUNT. Yes, thank you.

Ambassador STEINBERG. May I, for a second?

Ambassador HUNT. But you don't get 1 of my minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You may go for another 10. I am just starting to get warmed up, and I want to go back to Ms. Bigombe.

Ambassador STEINBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would really like to talk with you or your staff following the hearing about the United Nations and gender issues.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Sure.

Ambassador STEINBERG. I worked at the State Department, as you know, for three decades. We were sued time and time again on gender issues. We lost almost every lawsuit. And I can tell you for a fact that the situation within the U.N. is far worse than it ever was at the State Department. And the single statistic that I cited earlier is the best one. To say they have 38 ambassadors, one is a woman and she was just appointed, that is outrageous. And it is not as if they are training individuals to come up behind. It is not as if there is a mentoring process or a process of recruitment of good women. There is no single authority that has responsibility on these issues, and they are failing.

Mr. DELAHUNT. No, I am glad you noted that. I will take advantage of your presence, not here today, but knowing that you are available.

I really would like to continue this conversation with all of you, by the way. Having you here, I wonder where we would have been in the '90s and even into the early part of the new millennium in Haiti if there were more Haitian women that were involved in the political life of that nation as I think back on how often we were frustrated, exasperated.

As Ambassador Hunt indicates, President Clinton and—who was with him at that time—Sandy Burger. They were exhausted and shaking their heads. How many times have we had that experience?

But I mean I have to tell you I have had strong feelings about this issue. And we need to utilize all of our resources. And we are only truly utilizing half of what we have if we don't implicate women into these initiatives, into these peace processes. This conversation today has really provoked some new ideas and maybe some new strategies.

Ambassador HUNT. Could I—

Mr. DELAHUNT. You can take all the time you want.

Ambassador HUNT. No, I want to close with one last, and this is one that you wouldn't expect, and that is why I want to mention it in particular.

When we bring these women from conflict areas to the U.S. Congress and people are walking around snapping pictures, you may think that is for them to go home and show their grandchildren or

show their children. In fact, sometimes that is their main way of insuring their physical security. Because they go home and they put that picture on their wall. And it is a sign to a lot of bad guys back home, "Don't touch this woman, she's got friends in high places." And take that please very, very seriously and make the time to meet with these women and let them go home with that picture.

And that is all I am going to say except to thank you so much for holding this hearing.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, thank you, Ambassador. I am not going to let you go quite yet.

I listened to Dr. Crouse and the concerns that she expressed. Let me make this inquiry of Dr. Crouse.

You heard me talk about conditions in terms of assistance that would focus on exactly this issue. This wouldn't require dealing with the U.N. or any multilateral organization. What is your opinion in terms of that kind of a strategy, that kind of approach?

Ms. CROUSE. I love the work that the Independent Women's Forum is doing in Afghanistan. I think having grants available to groups like that is a very positive aspect of—

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am not just talking just about those groups. I am talking about the Government of Afghanistan. I am talking about—

Ms. CROUSE. They have a State Department grant, was the reason I mentioned this.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I guess what I am saying is, as our assistance goes to the nations that these three heroic women represent here today, that there be a component that there are certain criteria when it comes to the participation of women in the political life of those nation states. Not just simply grants to support their individual programs or those NGOs. I clearly support that. But I am trying to take it a step further.

What I am saying is, if Sudan or Afghanistan, Uganda, Kenya, wherever in the world, if they want American assistance, there has to be a recognition that the women in those nation states in those societies are recorded a dignified, appropriate role in the political life. A human rights condition, if you will, to all of our assistance. Do you want time to think about that?

Ms. CROUSE. I am certainly not an expert on the way Congress works.

Mr. DELAHUNT. None of us are, believe me.

Ms. CROUSE. Aside from quotas, which I very definitely do not support, I think we as a government really miss out on the benefits of the bully pulpit and on the benefits of the little things like Swanee mentioned, the pictures that are taken. The impact of having Congressmen visit countries and interact with people and governments, stating very clearly the expectations that you have just articulated so beautifully, I think, is tremendously effective. It is saying, "We are your partner, and these are things that we expect from you." I would much prefer to see that kind of subtle and nuanced kind of pressure put on countries, rather than saying, you will, through the U.N., institute quotas—

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am not talking about the U.N. here.

Ms. CROUSE. Well, even from our Government, to say to get money from us you have to do—

Mr. DELAHUNT. We do that all the time.

Ambassador HUNT. Do you feel that way about trafficking, about John Miller's initiative at the State Department that there shouldn't be requirements?

Ms. CROUSE. The quotas is what I object to. I have absolutely no objection to saying that if you expect help from the United States here are things, principles of human rights that we feel are absolutely essential.

Ambassador HUNT. Great.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Or you don't get the money.

Ambassador HUNT. Great.

Ms. CROUSE. Or you don't get the money. We do that with trafficking, and it has been tremendously effective. Because just before that report comes out, the report that comes right here to you, countries are calling the head of the TIP office to say, What can I do to get off tier 2 or tier 3 watch? It is a tremendously important and effective way to have—

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Dr. Crouse.

Let me ask our three guests if they have an opinion about the efficacy of quotas. Ms. Amiri.

Ms. AMIRI. I think in the ideal scenario we would all agree that we don't need quotas, but we are far from ideal. And in countries that we represent I would say that we are the opposite side of the spectrum of the ideal.

And I can tell you that, in Afghanistan, if it was not an international community making women's issues a red line and emphasizing that the Afghan Government had to have women included in the leadership of the country—it was both the U.S. Ambassador at that time as well as the head of the U.N. who played a critical role in this regard—we would not have a Ministry of Women's Affairs. We wouldn't have had women in the peace process and the peace talks. We would not have had women recruited in the emergency constitutional parliamentary elections. And you wouldn't see a situation that would be very different from what we had under the Taliban simply because the men at that stage were not willing to create the space for women.

The only thing that created the space for women was the international community leveraging women's position through quotas. For us, nothing else would have worked.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Ms. Bigombe?

Before you begin, I understand another colleague from Texas, Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee, is coming, which means that I want to wait for her. And when she arrives I am going to hand over the gavel to her. I am expected to be in Boston this evening, my hometown. The Boston Celtics won last night. We are ahead of Cleveland 3 to 2. And I just want to again inform of you of that so you don't think I am totally rude.

But I do want to, as she arrives, hand her the gavel and come down and acknowledge and shake the hands of each of you as I exit the door to catch a flight.

Ms. Bigombe.

Ms. BIGOMBE. Thank you.

First, I will touch a little bit on the question of quotas. I think for countries——

Mr. DELAHUNT. A little closer.

Ms. BIGOMBE. Can you hear me now?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Yes.

Ms. BIGOMBE. For countries that have status that are resistant to the idea of bringing women on board, the idea of quotas can work. But it should also not be done at the expense of competence. Because I have noticed some countries do it for the sake of, for example, qualifying for aid, if it is given as a conditionality that it has to be done. So let's figure so many women in that position, not necessarily that they will be given the responsibility to do what they can do effectively, given the qualifications they have.

Having said that, I will go back to Resolution 1325. I mentioned a little bit in what I said in here that I think it is very important to have action plans. I know that the Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway, and Liberia, and Canada do have action plans; and with action plans you have policies that can be followed. Then you develop benchmarks of what can be done.

Now you have a situation, the U.N. flagged this off. And there is great talk about bringing women on board, appointing them into positions, but with all kinds of excuses. They have not even gone back since the Resolution was passed to assess how far we have gone with this, with Resolution 1325. What have we achieved? There is no assessment of that nature anywhere. So you don't even know how far we have gone and what the problems are. Why are we not moving forward in implementing Resolution 1325?

I think these are some of the actions that the U.S. can be an example to other countries by having, first of all, an action plan that would be taken seriously; and it can help other countries by example by saying show us what action plans you have in bringing women on board. It would have some good impact.

Ambassador HUNT. Could I add one last thing?

Oh, yes, please.

Ms. OKWACI. With regard to quotas, sometimes when things are very thick and difficult you have to find a strategy in the way of coming out of that. I am not saying that it is a must to have a quota system. In our situation, for instance, our country doesn't call for quotas when it is the role of women in the homes and in the family. Automatically, the women are there 100 percent, and we don't discuss that. But when it comes to positions and political representation, women are left outside. That is where people resort to going for some specific strategy to work out.

And I think from our experience when we started with the 33 percent there was something to negotiate over, and it went until it was accepted in the constitution. Today, we are represented in a small way, but still there is something work on. And having it in our constitution in strength I think this is what we want and use. Everybody who would say, okay, we know you are there to represent it. But there is nothing to really wave in their faces. You have no way but to get something to use. And that is why we use the quota system, and we hope that will help us in the elections to come.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, thank you.

And, as I indicated to you, we will be shortly joined by a leader in this institution, the House of Representatives, who happens to be a woman and who also happens to be from Texas, and that is my friend and colleague, Sheila Jackson Lee. Now she just walked in.

I am going to hit the gavel and recess for 2 or 3 minutes so I can extend personally to each of you a thank you. And I am going to give her an opportunity just to look over some of the material. And I am going to ask if you would consider staying for another 10 or 15 minutes, because I want her to hear what you have to say. I know she will benefit from it, as I have today.

So a short recess, and I will get up, and you can just take a little bit of a break. And when Ms. Jackson Lee sits down, she'll hit the gavel and ask whatever she wants and you can continue this conversation.

Ambassador HUNT. Do we get a picture?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course. In fact, I am going to ask my colleague to join me for whatever picture. Sheila.

[Recess.]

Ms. JACKSON LEE [presiding]. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight. We will resume the hearing on the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325: Recognizing Women's Vital Roles in Achieving Peace and Security.

Let me, first of all, take the opportunity as an advisory member of this subcommittee to thank the chairman and the ranking member, particularly the chairman. I think that you can be assured that we have no better helm at this subcommittee than Congressman Bill Delahunt. He certainly works closely with the ranking member and the full committee chairman, Mr. Berman and Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, all of whom have a very strong commitment to human rights. But this particular hearing that focuses on the legislation of Congresswoman Johnson out of Dallas really comports with the new attitude and spirit.

If we are going to be a nation that holds itself out to the world as a defender of principles, of dignity, human rights, women's rights of which we vigorously debate here in the United States and pride ourselves with making progress on these issues and frankly pride ourselves in the ability to raise these issues with our friends and even foes around the world, then I think we must go the extra mile. When we view it as being painful to some of the issues that some of our diverse population may be engaged in, we have to ask the question of what is the right thing.

I serve on the subcommittee on Africa and Global Health and the Subcommittee on the Middle East. I am a member of the Human Rights Caucus that was founded by Tom Lantos, and we continually serve on this committee by remembering his spirit and commitment to human rights and women's rights. I co-chair the Congressional Children's Caucus. I have followed the ups and downs of women's rights as relates to the United Nations, and some years ago I joined the effort in Norway to work with Palestinian women and Israeli women on the questions of human rights and peace.

So I am very much in support of the concept of the importance of women's vital role in peace and security, and we can mention

any number of conflicts of which they have been ignored and thereby the insight that they would give is lost.

Let me just quickly start with Ambassador Hunt, and let me be forthright and indicate that we are at the end of the day. Many of us are looking at airlines, and airplanes that have no interest in the vital policy of this particular august hearing, and they would suggest to us that their priority is to close the doors as we try to enter the airport. So I want to get just a smidgen from each of you to put the icing on the cake and to associate myself with the Congressman and this legislation and to offer our office as a resource.

I co-chair the Pakistan Caucus and the Afghan Caucus. I will be headed to Afghanistan, and Israel, and Egypt. I was in the Sudan, in Darfur last August. I expect that we will return. We were in a meeting just recently on Sudan with the special envoy that has been appointed by China. I have called upon the Secretary of State to head for Sudan and, frankly, in that particular area not leave until we have a resolution of the opportunity, albeit seemingly a difficult challenge, for Darfurians to be able to return to their home and for southern Sudan to be part of a peace agreement that lasts.

I have spoken to women who have experienced and expressed the viciousness of rape, the violence against their children, the fear; and I have also spoken to women in Sudan who are strong, who I know very well could make important differences in the discussions of peace.

Ambassador Hunt, do you want to briefly express the difficulties with the resolution in the U.N. Security Council?

Ambassador HUNT. Congresswoman, I would be very, very brief.

Policymakers, like media, are very empathetic with the plight of victims. In our opinion, the best way to help victims is to get women into leadership positions, not to focus only on the victims. You get women into leadership. They will have the empathy to tend to the victims.

Right now, we have tremendous examples of bottom-up efforts in every conflict in the world, but what we are lacking is the top down. And the U.N. Security Council resolution calls for a concerted effort top down at the U.N. And the U.S., as a member state of the U.N. and a member of the Security Council as it passed that resolution, is obliged to change our actions, to find innovative ways to ensure that women are fully supported in every stage of the peace process.

I will say no more because the real experts are here.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me ask a quick question. I will ask that you suffer my plight and to answer the question so that I can get on the record your instruction, because I think that is very important. And so my sentence to you, Ambassador Hunt, we know we have the legislation, but we know that the problem, of course, is the U.N. Security Council resolution. What implementation do we need from the U.N. on that?

Ambassador HUNT. Are you asking if the U.N. is implementing the security—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Are they, yes?

Ambassador HUNT. The answer is no. I would guess they are implementing it at 15 to 20 percent.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So if we have an ambassador who sits on the U.N.'s Security Council representing the United States, we need a champion of that issue?

Ambassador HUNT. That is exactly right.

And Don Steinberg was representing the crisis group to the U.N., so if I could hand this—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to get the action item for the United States. I am going to ask him. But we have an ambassador to the United Nations?

Ambassador HUNT. And he or she should be instructed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. They sit on the U.N. Security Council.

Ambassador HUNT. That is right.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And, therefore, they have the ability to interact with the major players of the U.N. Security Council and, of course, the U.N. Assembly—General Assembly.

Ambassador HUNT. Yes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So what we need is a champion through the United States by way of our own foreign policy to get this done, to get it moving beyond 15, 50 percent, to make this an important foreign policy of the United States.

Ambassador HUNT. You said it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me go to Ms. Okwaci.

Ms. OKWACI. Okwaci.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you, madam.

Would you just tell me the vitality of having a woman involved in these peace discussions or discussions of conflict?

Ms. OKWACI. Yeah, I believe the participation of women is very important. And, very briefly, the experiences we had in Sudan, we had the war from 1983, the second war. And it went for a very long time, almost more than two decades. And always it was our men who would sit at the negotiating table. There was not much progress.

I think what we saw is that men stick to their positions. Many of them come from the military, from the revolutionary movements; and I witness when they come and sit for negotiations. They come together, they greet one another, sit tomorrow for one session, and on the third day they are going back. And what we hear is that the talks have stalled.

We have thought it is very important to have women there. We have had to listen first to what are the stories, what happens, what needs to be resolved. Even if we don't have much of the interest of how to resolve the conflict but still based on an understanding that the bulk of people who die in the bush or in the fighting are the women, are the children. Not only that, but men die in the battlefield; and we feel as mothers, as women that they don't deserve to die just because of a small conflict that can be discussed, that can be approached and that can be resolved.

So the women could be there to listen to the stories. They can give the witnesses. They can compromise, and they are very vital in easing those tensions that will make the talks stall. So I think our contribution has really made a very big difference, and that is why we are pushing hard for sustainable peace in our country.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would imagine the other aspect of it is, as you indicated, that they bring their own conflicts and baggage or problems to the table.

Ms. OKWACI. Yes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank you.

Mr. Steinberg, and I will go quickly to my other witnesses, and I thank you again for your indulgence.

Ambassador STEINBERG. Madam Chairwoman, I want to pick up on the question that you were raising regarding the United Nations specifically; and I want to use the fact—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Is your microphone on?

Ambassador STEINBERG. I want to use the fact of your remarkable engagement in the Children's Caucus to provide a contrast. In addition to Resolution 1325, there is also Resolution 1612 on children and conflict.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And I am delighted that you have offered that, and I would hope as I run out that you will give all of your information—because I know that you have been at the United Nations—to my office.

And I just want to interrupt you for a moment.

Ambassador STEINBERG. Right.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Please pardon me.

I understand our failures with the international convention regarding children. I know you may not be speaking specifically to that, but our foreign policy has failed as it relates to that as well.

Let me yield back to you. I apologize. I do want to make sure that we focus on that issue.

Ambassador STEINBERG. What I wanted to focus on was that 1612 has been remarkably successful. It has been successful because it identified a focal point, Radhika Coomaraswamy, as the Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict. There is no focal point for 1325.

It established mechanisms for regular reporting from the Secretary General directly to the Security Council, naming countries that are abusing children in armed conflict. There is nothing of that equivalent in 1325.

There is a requirement for a watch list and regular reports with measurements in 1612; nothing similar in 1325. There is absolutely no accountability mechanism. And it is as if this were an act of Congress that is simply hortatory.

Resolution 1612—and we have done studies of the two—has been remarkably successful for children because there is a budget that has been provided for the Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict. There is an office. It is way up high in the secretariat building. You go and try to identify who is responsible for 1325, and there is no one. There is even a working group of the Security Council for children and armed conflict. Nothing for women. And for me this is a very significant point.

The United States will have the presidency of the Security Council in June. We have already heard that the United States plans to talk a lot about women and armed conflict. My suggestion would be that Congress may wish to talk with the administration about using its presidency of the council in June to put some teeth into 1325 to provide some accountability mechanisms, to provide some

degree of measurements and to, if nothing else, establish a working group of the council which the United States could chair—France currently chairs the one on children in armed conflict—and to require regular reports, naming and shaming those countries that are failing to meet their obligation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. That is an excellent, instructive road map for us. Let me announce on the record that I will join with my chairman. I move to work on that legislatively, and I also think that that is very instructive for us on Foreign Affairs as we look to a more effective foreign policy through the U.N. now that we have the chairmanship. I know that we haven't had it for a while. We expect to see some leaps and bounds.

Obviously, we have some constraints, if I might say, because the administration remains the same for a period of time. I think we will take advantage that we are transitioning and they need to adhere to Congress's instructions as to what actions should be taken at the U.N. Security Council.

Let me ask the last three witnesses to answer the question as well. Would you accept my apologies for asking you to be brief?

Ms. AMIRI. Thank you.

After three decades in which women in Afghanistan were entirely removed from public space, most pronounced under the Taliban, in 2000, the Bonn agreement in the beginning of 2002 provided an unprecedented opportunity for women's leadership to emerge.

We have had the benefit of seeing in the last 6½ years what women's leadership might be able to provide in terms of a larger sense for peace and security in Afghanistan. I think, overall, there are a number of things we can say.

One, as I noted earlier, Afghan women represent a moderating force. In a country that has been radicalized by war and with a country in which religion is increasingly being politicized and extremism is gaining force, women are at the forefront of presenting a moderate or advocating for a moderate interpretation of Islam and opening the space for debate and discussion on taboo issues. They are also representing a much more inclusive model of leadership and advocating beyond their own interests. They have advocated for minority groups for vulnerable groups, and they have also demonstrated a pragmatism and been able to work across conflict lines. Even when there are fundamental differences, women have shown in Afghanistan that they can put those differences aside and work together where they have a common interest.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am going to ask you for my staff to engage with you as I go off to Afghanistan. I would like specifically to have on the agenda to meet in a roundtable discussion with women.

Ms. AMIRI. I would be very pleased to assist in that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. If you would assist us in that, I would greatly appreciate it. I co-chair the Afghan Caucus, and maybe hopefully when I return we can focus a whole session on women in conflict in that country in particular.

Let me move to Ms. Bigombe—or would you tell me the correct pronunciation?

Ms. BIGOMBE. You got it right, almost right.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you for your testimony.

Ms. BIGOMBE. Thank you.

A lot has been written, talked about on what women actually do in conflict resolution and mediation. A lot has been talked about and written about how women bear the brunt of war and how they rebuild their own societies.

What we are talking about, what is concerning us most is the fact that, despite the contributions women make, which is recognized, women still get marginalized. The worst, all that has been written and talked about gave birth to Resolution 1325. With that very well-articulated resolution, very little or almost nothing at all is being done to enhance women's position to do more.

We are talking about position at high level, both within international organizations and in countries. We are talking about supporting women, the grassroots women, both during conflict and post-conflict situations. Women during war actually keep the society going on.

But I have looked at interventions in post-conflict situations. The World Bank will go in, the U.N. will go in, the USAID will go in and will totally ignore these groups that have kept the community going during war. Will not support them, will not pick on, build on what they have been doing to keep the society together.

So your help comes in, one, putting pressure on the U.N. And I said here before and I will repeat this, that if the United States Government does not have an action plan for Resolution 1325, the only four countries that do have action plans for Resolution 1325 are Sweden, Norway, Canada and Liberia. I think what is happening in Liberia today is a very good example of the success that women have been given an opportunity because of a woman President who believes in women and what is going on.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Is not afraid of it.

Ms. BIGOMBE. Right. And I think your opening remarks were very important, that if the U.S. is what it is, prides itself in having done this as an example to the world, it has to take the lead and ensure that women are appointed at high-level positions in different international organizations and also supported in countries. Thank you.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you very much. We look forward to working with the Woodrow Wilson community. We thank you for your research and your comment on this, and I know that I will be engaging.

Let me—Dr. Crouse, I don't want to strike out completely.

Ms. CROUSE. That is correct.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I leave it to you to summarize in a brief moment, and I appreciate your indulgence of my schedule.

Ms. CROUSE. Thank you so much, Chairman Jackson Lee.

I really appreciate the fact that you ended with these informal summaries, because I have felt they were just tremendously valuable, just very succinctly saying our main message.

As a representative of the minority, my main message was, while we agree with the problem, we don't always agree with the solution; and I urged caution in terms of U.N. treaties because of national sovereignty issues, with quota issues and the specific provisions, specifically of CEDAW, which I see as very closely tied to

1325 as causing many problems that affect us not just in the legislation but in terms of our culture and laws as well.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank you very much.

Diversity of opinion is welcome, and I think you will find the resolution of this particular subcommittee and the full committee will take into consideration the sovereignty of this nation and others. I think the ultimate goal is to make good on what may be a vital component to peace around the world, and that is to have a perspective of thought and intellect and analysis that comes from those who have either been victims of or who can see the picture in a larger focus than only through the narrow lens of a gun. So I think this is a wonderful affirmation of the work that we need to do and the persons that we can collaborate with to do the work.

Thank you, Ambassador Steinberg, specifically for giving us the framework of the ascent of our Ambassador to chairmanship—she or he, but it is he at this time—and, therefore, we will be energized to make this a priority, you can be assured.

I am delighted to have a subcommittee chair that focuses on this issue. I think the legislation that has already made this an issue or to get the Congress on record of support other resolution now can be further supported by enhanced legislation that will push action.

And I do think we should include in our call for action Secretary of State Rice, who I know, herself, could give this consideration. We want to bring it to her attention and give her the sense that there is great support in the Congress for her focus and her instruction along with the President's instruction to the Ambassador to make this work.

So thank you all very much; and, with that, the committee is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 5:50 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X



MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

Beyond Victimhood: Engaging Women in the Pursuit of Peace
Testimony to the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs
Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight
Donald Steinberg, Deputy President
International Crisis Group
15 May 2008

Mr. Chairman. It is a great honor to testify before this Committee on the topic of UN Security Council Resolution 1325. In three decades of public service in the State Department, National Security Council, and House Majority Leader's Office, and now as Deputy President of International Crisis Group, I have focused much of my attention on involving women in peace negotiations and post-conflict reconstruction. In my testimony, I will outline a number of tangible steps the United States can take to effectuate important change, including through the use of the presidency of the United Nations Security Council, which the United States will assume in July 2008, to give teeth to Resolution 1325.

Women's Participation Key to Success

Frequently, it is said that engaging women in these processes is simply a matter of justice and fairness. Women should be there because they make up half the population, or because women are the main victims of conflict, or because women are inherently more peaceful and collaborative and less corrupt. For me, the real question is that of effectiveness: put simply, peace processes and peace building are more likely to succeed if women are engaged as planners, implementers and beneficiaries.

This is the guiding concept behind Resolution 1325, which provides guidance for the UN staff and its member states on how to engage and protect women in the processes of ending armed conflict. Resolution 1325 is, in effect, a game plan for ensuring gender equality in political leadership, building gender-sensitive security forces, supporting women as they return to their homes, ensuring safety for women in refugee camps and settlements, and insisting on accountability for sexual violence and other abuses.

For me, this resolution was long-overdue, and it is deeply personal.

The Cautionary Tale of Angola

In 1994, while serving as President Clinton's NSC senior director for Africa, I supported negotiations to end decades of civil war in Angola that had killed a half million people and left three million people homeless. When the peace accord was signed in November 1994, I gave a speech where I boasted that not a single provision in the agreement discriminated against women. "The agreement is gender-neutral," I proclaimed proudly.

President Clinton then named me as US ambassador to Angola and a member of the Peace Commission implementing the peace accords. It took me only a few weeks after

my arrival in Luanda to realize that a peace agreement that is “gender-neutral” is, by definition, discriminatory against women.

Consider the evidence. First, the agreement did not require the participation of women in the Peace Commission itself and as a result, there were 40 men on this Commission and no women. This imbalance silenced women’s voices on the issues of internal displacement, trafficking in women and girls, sexual violence, abuses by security forces, and the rebuilding of maternal health care and girls’ education, issues that were generally ignored by the men around the table.

Second, the peace accord was based on 13 separate amnesties that forgave the parties for atrocities committed during the conflict. Given the prominence of sexual abuse during the conflict, including rape as a weapon of war, amnesties meant that men with guns forgave other men with guns for crimes committed against women. These amnesties also introduced a cynicism that undercut our efforts to rebuild the justice and security sectors.

Third, male ex-combatants received a little money and demobilization kits, and were sent back to communities that had learned to live without them during decades of conflict. The frustration of these men exploded into an epidemic of alcoholism, drug abuse, divorce, rape, and domestic violence. In effect, the end of civil war unleashed a new era of violence against women.

Even such well-intentioned efforts as clearing major roads of landmines to allow three million refugees and IDPs to return to their homes backfired against women. Road clearance generally preceded the demining of fields, wells, and forests. As newly resettled women went out to plant the fields, fetch water, and collect firewood, they faced a new rash of landmine accidents.

We recognized these problems, and responded by bringing out gender advisers and human rights officers; launching programs in maternal health care, girls’ education, micro-enterprise, and support for women’s NGOs; and insisting that women be fully engaged in all our humanitarian and reconstruction programs. But most of this was done on an ad hoc basis, and there was a “too-little, too-late” quality about it. And thus I was so pleased when UNSC Resolution 1325 was adopted.

Resolution 1325: A Dream Deferred

Thus far, however, the promise of this resolution has been a dream deferred, in large part because there are no monitoring, accountability, and enforcement mechanisms. Women continue to be raped and trafficked with impunity, both by rebel movements and by the very Government security forces charged with protecting them – including in the eastern Congo despite the presence of 17,000 UN peacekeeping troops in that country.

Courageous and talented women peacebuilders face discrimination in legal, cultural and traditional practices. Sexual violence and threats against women in power impose a stigma of victimization and a real danger that makes even the most impressive and

courageous women think twice before stepping forward. Men leading peace conferences still exclude women or shunt them off to ante-rooms while “real” negotiations take place.

Nine Vital Steps

Some have questioned whether the United States is legally bound by UN Security Council Resolution 1325. I will leave it to legal scholars to debate this question, but I would stress that it is largely irrelevant in the current context. The United States should implement and promote the provisions of Resolution 1325 because it is in our national interest to do so – by involving women in these processes, we raise dramatically the likelihood of success of peace consolidation, and thus prevent massive suffering abroad. Further, by so doing, we reduce the likelihood of dangerous instability that can lead to threats to American national security in the form of proliferation of conventional arms and weapons of mass destruction; trafficking in persons and drugs; terrorist training and planning sites; and spread of infectious diseases.

Many steps are required to change this situation, but let me just make nine tangible proposals.

1. The United States should insist that the mandate for every UN peacekeeping mission includes as a priority the protection of women and the safeguarding of women peace builders, including through the provision of personal security and training.
2. Heads of UN missions in countries facing conflict must insist that a critical mass of qualified women – beginning at 20 percent – are included peace talks, reconstruction conferences, and governance mechanisms, even if it takes quotas to do so.
3. The U.S. should prioritize in post-conflict reconstruction and donors conferences the rebuilding of social structures of particular importance to women, such as reproductive health care and girls’ education, and all plans should be subjected to gender-impact analysis.
4. While there is a need for both reconciliation and forgiveness following conflict, amnesty should never be provided to individuals who have used rape as a weapon of war.
5. U.S. support for the rebuilding and reform of armies, police, and other security forces should insist on training in gender issues for new and existing forces and require the incorporation of women into those forces, in particular so that local women who have been abused will come forward with their accusations.
6. Personal accountability and measurement mechanisms should be developed to insist on compliance with Resolution 1325, so that individuals within the UN system know that their career advancement depends on taking these provisions seriously.

7. A formal working group of the UN Security Council should be created and mandated to implement Resolution 1325, including possible “naming and shaming” and adoption of sanctions against countries and individuals who are patent abusers.

8. The UN must upgrade the role of gender advisers in its missions and expand the number of women serving as UN special representatives to countries in conflict. This effort should be supported by programs to more effectively recruit women into the UN system at all levels, and to promote their success through training and mentorship.

9. Finally, the United States should lead by example, ensuring that all its diplomatic and military personnel are familiar with and committed to the provisions of UNSC Resolution 1325, and have the resources needed to ensure its implementation.

American Leadership in July

Mr. Chairman. One change that the United States is in a position to make in the near future is to use our upcoming presidency of the UN Security Council in June 2008 to promote and pass a new resolution to give “teeth” to Resolution 1325. Actors responsible for implementing Resolution 1325 still lack the reporting systems, incentives, performance measures, means and monitoring systems needed to ensure accountability to women in conflict-afflicted societies.

A model for a new resolution is UNSC Resolution 1612, which addresses the issue of children affected by armed conflict. Resolution 1612:

- O Provides for a UN system-wide action plan with a monitoring, reporting and compliance mechanism.
- O Requires that the Secretary-General report to the Security Council on the resolution’s implementation, including lists of parties in violation of the resolution.
- O Mandates a working group of the Security Council that meets every two months to review progress under the resolution.
- O Insists that parties to armed conflict prepare concrete time-bound action plans to halt the recruitment and use of children in close collaboration with UN peacekeeping missions and UN country teams.
- O Mandates the creation of a Special Representative of the Secretary General for Children and Armed Conflict, currently the remarkably effective Sri Lankan human rights advocate Radhika Coomaraswamy, backed by an ample and talented staff and sufficient budget.

My staff and I would be pleased to work with members of the committee to consider the practical steps needed to make this resolution a reality.

The “Hard” Road Ahead

In conclusion, fundamental to these solutions is a change in mindset, one that goes beyond viewing women solely as victims, and viewing the protection of women as the “soft side” of peace-building.

Let me assure you there is nothing “soft” about going after traffickers who turn women and girls into commodities. There is nothing “soft” about preventing armed thugs from abusing women in IDP camps, holding warlords accountable for crimes committed against women, forcing demobilized soldiers to refrain from domestic violence, or insisting on a seat at the table for women in peace negotiations and post-conflict governments.

These are among the hardest responsibilities in our peace building agenda, and I commend this Committee for shining a spotlight on them in this hearing today. Thank you.