THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FOREIGN POLICIES OF EMERGING-MARKET DEMOCRACIES: WHAT ROLE FOR DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS?

Washington, D.C.

Friday, April 15, 2011

LUNCH KEYNOTE

Introduction:

CARL GERSHMAN
President, National Endowment for Democracy

SAMANTHA POWER
Special Assistant to the President and Senior
Director, Office of Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights
National Security Council

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. GERSHMAN: Why don't we get going? I'm Carl Gershman, I'm the President of the National Endowment for Democracy, and it's my great both pleasure and honor to introduce to you today Samantha Power, who is the Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director of Multilateral Affairs at the White House, and who runs the Office for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights.

Samantha is well known to a lot of people in this room and for a very, very long time, because she has had a very powerful voice on issues relating to human rights, human dignity and, you know, fundamental issues of human rights in the world.

A lot of what Samantha has focused on in her work in the government is what she wrote about before going into the government. Certainly her book, Chasing the Flame, about Sergio Vieira de Mello, is a book about a human rights –- a great human rights defender, and this has certainly been the kind of work that she's done, and when she was at Harvard, she held the Anna Lindh Professorship of the Practice of Global Leadership and Public Policy; that was at the Kennedy School. And both of these people, Sergio de Mello and Anna Lindh, were people who gave their lives for human rights, Anna Lindh having been assassinated in 2003, and Sergio de Mello died in Iraq in the UN explosion that same year, which suggests that people obviously in this work pay a price for what they do.

The NED has had a very productive relationship with Samantha. I remember a conversation I had with her where I outlined to her one of our great concerns, which was that a number of governments, especially in the aftermath of the Orange Revolution in Ukraine, were cracking down on civil society and preventing NGO's from operating, and she took a great interest in that issue, and eventually, you know, it's now become a very important issue for the administration.

President Obama spoke about this in his last UN Address. Secretary Clinton gave her major speech at the Krakow meeting last July of the Community of Democracies on the whole issue of defending civil society. And then the U.S. was part of the campaign within the Human Rights Council of the UN to create a new Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Assembly and Association. And I know that Samantha was probably involved in all of these things, in certainly making it an important issue in the administration. She's obviously also with her important book on A Problem From Hell, been deeply, deeply concerned about the problem of genocide and the mass atrocity crimes. And last November, she took part in a very important meeting that was organized in Paris by the Holocaust Museum, which was attended by other officials in our government, David Pressman, who is the National Security Director at the War Crimes – at the National Security Council for problems dealing with War Crimes and Atrocity, Stephen Rapp, the Ambassador-at-large for War Crimes at the State Department, and his assistant, Diane Orentlicher.

Our government has positions in the White House and in the State Department which seek to anticipate potential mass atrocity crimes, and the speech that Samantha gave in Paris at this conference really focused on how can governments better organize themselves to be able to anticipate and to prevent crimes – mass atrocity crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide.

The issue for which we're talking about at this conference, the foreign policies, the international policies of what we call emerging market democracies, is one that she's taken a very large interest in. In the administration, we've talked about it a great deal, she's spoken about Indonesia, India, Brazil and other countries that we're dealing with today and the importance of their international policies. This is not an issue, though, interestingly, that she wrote a great deal about before coming in, unlike the other issues that I've mentioned, but it's one I know that she has a very large and deep interest in, and we are, you know, really anxious to hear her thinking today.

Let me just say also by way of introduction before I introduce Samantha that she really has come here today also because she wants to hear from you. We have a number of very interesting people who've spoken on these issues, and she hopes to be able to take feedback from the audience so that this can enter into the thinking of the administration on these issues.

So the way we're going to organize this is that we're going to hear from Samantha, and then she really wants to hear from the audience in terms of comments and thoughts. And I hope that the major presenters at this conference will give their thoughts and reaction to what she has to say, and then I think that

will be very beneficial for the administration as it tries to develop its thinking about the whole issue of the importance of the –- and how to work with the –- what we call the emerging market democracies and why they're so important in terms of America's thinking about foreign policy today.

So it really is a great honor and a great pleasure for me to welcome Samantha to this conference. And I just really want everybody to know that the NED considers her to be a real friend within the administration. Samantha.

MS. POWER: Thanks so much. I'm very sorry not to have been able to attend the proceedings before me, because I'm sure I would have learned a tremendous amount, and I really do look forward just sitting back and taking notes after you hear from me here.

So I will talk today about emerging market democracies and their role in democracy and human rights promotion, focusing specifically on those countries around which you have built this conference, and with the obligatory caveat here recognizing that many of the so called emerging democracies have democratic traditions and human rights traditions of different kinds that date back generations, if not centuries.

That said, when President Obama took office, the number of democracies in the world had grown in the previous two decades from 69 in 1989 to 119 in 2009. However, the number of countries actively supporting democracy and human rights bilaterally and in international fora had remained quite static in that same period.

Over the last two years, this administration has made a conscience effort to work with emerging democracies to enlist their support in standing up for human rights around the world.

In his UN General Assembly Address, which Carl alluded to, in 2010, President Obama addressed this issue, the theme of your conference head on, saying “I appeal to those nations who emerge from tyranny and inspired the world in the second half of the last century, from South Africa to South Asia, from Eastern Europe to South America, don’t stand idly by, don’t be silent. When dissidents elsewhere are imprisoned and protesters are beaten, recall your own history, because part of the price of our own freedom is standing up for the freedom of others.”

In pursuing a partnership with emerging democracies on democracy and human rights, this administration I think has brought several premises to bear. First, an obvious one, in a world this interconnected, none of us can afford to allow gross violations of human rights to go unaddressed. Given the spillover and the destabilizing effects of allowing repression to fester, it long ago ceased to be viable to treat human rights conditions as merely the internal affairs of a sovereign state.

Over 60 years ago, the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration recognized that protecting human dignity at home is critical to preserving peace and security abroad. President Obama has pressed this pragmatic case to other peoples and governments, stressing, “Governments that protect these rights are ultimately more stable, more successful and more secure.”

In short, the more true democracies there are in the world, the better off we are and the better off our fellow democracies are.

The second premise is that precisely because emerging democracies are democratic, they will face, the governments will face growing pressure from within to align their foreign policy with their domestic values and to integrate human rights concerns.

This pressure will come, in part, from young people who haven't carried with them the sovereignty versus human rights baggage, if you will, from the 20th century. The evolution of the human rights debate in the United States in a sense is instructive. Our Congress, our free press and our human rights and other advocacy organizations empowered with modern technologies have highlighted inconsistencies in U.S. policy, exposed human rights abuses abroad, and generally created what I call foreign policy accountability, holding us accountable for the extent to which human rights is injected into our foreign policy.

In emergency democracies, we have seen countless campaigns by NGO's, investigative journalists, bloggers, Facebook users and others pressing human rights concerns at home, and it's only a matter of time, we believe, before these agents of change apply their tools to their own country's foreign policy, and I'll give a few examples of that later in my remarks.

The third premise that we bring to bear is that new democracies can make the difference. We believe that the future of democracy and human rights around the world, in places like Libya, Burma, Zimbabwe, Venezuela, will,

in the end, turn not only on the strength of the democratic movements in those countries, which it will turn on primarily, and not only on the willingness of traditional democracies to stand with these movements, but also on the determination of emerging market democracies to tip the scales. When they take a stand, it disrupts the old alignments and paves the way for fresh coalitions to press for change. Simply put, people who are suffering under repressive rule need emerging market democracies to stand up for them.

Now, here I think we are seeing some quite encouraging trends that I'd like to try to highlight. First, emerging democracies are exerting growing leadership in other venues that may well pave the way for more assertive political leadership on the issues central to this conference.

For example, the most famous example is that emerging democracies have helped ensure that the G-20 has replaced the G-8 as the premier global venue for management of economic affairs. And in taking up their economic responsibilities, many emerging democracies are showing signs of recognizing and embracing the unavoidable link with political developments around the world.

A second trend is that, and this one has been in play for some years, emerging democracies are playing a never more important role in strengthening international peacekeeping, which is a critical ingredient to promoting freedom from fear in some of the world's most dangerous places. Indonesia has shown particularly striking growth on this front. They had 27 individuals serving in UN peacekeeping operations in 2003, and they now have

nearly 1,800. Indonesia has also established a training center for peacekeepers, and the U.S. and Indonesia have pledged to work together to turn the center into a network hub for regional training centers.

Brazil's and South Africa's contributions have also grown rapidly. Both had deployed around 100 personnel to UN peacekeeping operations at the beginning of the last decade, and each now contributes more than 2,000 today. Brazil has led, as many of you know, and provided the backbone for the UN Stabilization Mission in Haiti, and this is dating back to 2004. And it is notable that at the time of the earthquake, when the Brazilian contingent itself had suffered such substantial casualties, the Brazilian government decided to double the Brazilian contribution. This is not something I think that a lot of countries would have done in the wake of such a tragedy.

And, of course, one cannot talk about peacekeeping without talking about India, one of the world's very oldest democracies for which the phrase emerging democracy is a serious misnomer. In addition to long being one of the world's leading peacekeeping contributors, India has nearly tripled its contribution over the past ten years with its 8,500 blue helmets, making it the third largest contributor in the world today.

We're also seeing emergency democracies stand up and reach out to the poor, becoming players on the global development stage in a number of important ways. These new actors are less inclined to interact with less developed countries in a donor/donee relationship, but they typically engage as equals in developing collaborative solutions to development challenges.

Brazil, for example, has helped partners in Africa improve the crop yields of subsistence farmers by identifying and promoting the rapid acceptance of new crop varieties suited to grow in the local environment. Similarly, India, in partnership with the United States and other governments, is leveraging its scientific and technical expertise to develop, test and replicate transformative technologies to extend food security both in India and then beyond its borders. And India has just increased it contribution to the UN Democracy Fund, making it the second largest donor to that fund in the world. Third, emerging democracies seem increasingly comfortable, strengthening international norms on cross cutting human rights issues. If given fresh points of entry into a human rights conversation that had grown stale in certain quarters in recent years, these emerging democracies seem increasingly inclined to partner with traditional democracies.

At the Human Rights Council, countries affiliated with the group of 77 or the so called non-align movement have long been averse to singling out specific countries for criticism, which they call, or have called finger pointing. However, countries like Brazil and Indonesia have recently demonstrated a new willingness to press general global human rights concerns, taking a leadership role, for instance, in creating the position that Carl mentioned, the new Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Association and Assembly, the first international mechanism ever created to monitor the growing crack down on civil society.

Here I would note that Indonesia was a critical co-sponsor of that resolution from a very early stage, which, in turn, made it possible to bring other

emerging democracies along, such that we were eventually able to get this Special Rapporteur created through a consensus measure rather than a vote. That's how overwhelming the majority was and how many emerging democracies stepped up. Brazil also played a leadership role in pursuing in this last Human Rights Council session a groundbreaking cross regional statement signed by 85 countries calling for greater respect for the rights of LGBT persons and agreeing to seek the establishment of a Special Rapporteur on LGBT rights in the inter American system, the first ever Rapporteur on this issues.

On the UN Security Council, we see other examples. Brazil has generally been a bridge builder on the Council on human rights and thematic issues such as women, peace and security, which links the exclusion of women from conflict related decision-making to the maintenance of international security and the protection of civilians.

Our shared commitment to open government and corruption –- fighting corruption and promoting transparency has proven an important common bond with many emerging market democracies. We are working with Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico and others within the UN, the G-20, the OECD and international financial institutions to promote the recognition that corruption is a violation of basic human rights and a severe impediment to development and security. Indonesia has been a key partner in our efforts to advance the anti-corruption agenda in the G-20, serving as co-chair of the process that produced the sole action plan on anti-corruption.

We are partnering with a diverse group of governments and civil society and emerging democracies to launch an effort to bring greater transparency to government budgets, expenditures and the assets of public officials, and to find ways of leveraging new technologies to harness citizen engagement in governance. This is also a theme that President Obama laid out in his UN Address last fall.

Brazil is a co-chair of this open government effort with the United States, and the two presidents highlighted our shared commitment on open government during the recent Brazil visit.

President Obama also highlighted the launch of an open government dialogue with India on his visit last year, and the two countries jointly organized the first ever democracy and open government expo, which President Obama toured while in India. In this effort, countries are sharing best practices on the ways in which they have institutionalized transparent practices and spending procurement international aid flows and natural resources to make it harder for officials to steal and to strengthen the efforts of citizens to hold their governments accountable.

Emerging democracies are often at the cutting edge of these efforts, and they are helping to contribute to a global community of knowledge and experience, a community that includes not only governments, but civil society and the private sector.

Fourth, despite their traditional reluctance, which I've already alluded to, to hold particular countries accountable, emerging democracies have,

in fact, shown a growing willingness to speak out in the face of human rights abuses or crack downs. And here I would offer three recent examples, Iran, Ivory Coast and Libya.

On Iran, Brazil voted in Geneva last month to create a Special Rapporteur for human rights, having abstained on the annual UN General Assembly resolution on Iran since 2004. This, as many of you know, was the first country specific mandate adopted since the creation of the Human Rights Council. In part, because of this leadership and the willingness of other countries to follow the lead of dominant regional players, the resolution reinstating the Iran Human Rights Rapporteur also passed by the widest margin of any of the Council or Commission's resolution since 1997. I will grant that Iran's actions on the ground had a lot to do with that lopsided vote, as well.

India, too, abstained on Iran for the first time in the General Assembly vote, having always voted no in the past, and South Africa abstained on the Iran resolution the last two years, as well, having voted no since 2003. So we're seeing moves from no's to abstentions, from abstentions to yes on a range of country specific issues.

On Ivory Coast, which, of course, has come to a head this week, when it came to UN Security Council action in response to the contested election there and the intent by the former president to retain power, two important ideas were in tension with one another, non-intervention, on the one hand, and the importance of regional problem solving on the other.

However, ultimately all Council members, including Brazil, India and South Africa, joined consensus on repeated press statements and resolutions. This included imposing sanctions on Gbagbo and four others, a notable shift from the non-align movement's traditional distaste for sanctioning regimes and their leaders. Over time, the Council's products also called more forcefully for enforcement of the mandate to protect civilians. While South Africa was initially skeptical of the UN's endorsement of the election's outcome, their position evolved, and their support for the findings of the AU and ECOWAS may have been a turning point in the resolution of the electoral crisis.

Ultimately, all emerging democracies on the Council voted in favor of UN Security Council Resolution 1975, which carried with it a very forceful mandate accelerating the defeat of Gbagbo. And this support for these resolutions was despite misgivings by, any, many countries over whether the political track had yet run its course. They still were prepared to support robust enforcement on the ground.

This regional solidarity that I mentioned that is responsible for now Watara being able to consolidate control over the country having won the election, this regional solidarity will prove especially important in the remainder of this year. This is a year in which 17 of Africa's 47 countries will hold national elections, either presidential or parliamentary, and it will be essential to maintain regional solidarity behind democratic principals.

And on Libya, the third example I'd like to discuss, South Africa joined Gabon and Nigeria in support of UN Security Council Resolution 1973,

which took the unusual step of authorizing all necessary measures to protect civilians without the consent of a sovereign government.

While Brazil and India abstained on this resolution, they did not vote no, and they joined the consensus resolution several weeks earlier, Resolution 1970, that imposed stiff sanctions and an arms embargo on the Gaddafi regime, and that referred Libya and any crimes committed there, crimes against humanity and war crimes, to the international criminal court.

Now, obviously the doubts about enforcement action, robust enforcement action run deep. Yesterday's first expanded BRIC Summit, which includes, along with China and Russia, three emerging democracies, Brazil, India and South Africa, saw the BRIC express severe misgivings about the use of force in Libya. So we are going to need to enhance consultation and continue the dialogue, obviously, over the need for enforcement of 1973, lest we fail to protect civilians.

It is worth pointing out also just how contested country specific criticisms and actions are for the individuals within these emerging market democracies who are trying to shift their national narratives.

Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff, herself a former political prisoner who experienced torture at the hands of the Brazilian military, has been more outspoken than her predecessor on international human rights concerns. For example, she distanced herself last year publicly from President Lula's comments, comparing political dissidence in Cuba to common criminals. And

upon taking office, she pledged to criticize Cuba for its human rights shortcomings.

Such policy pronouncements spark critiques even within the halls of power in Brasilia. And tensions such as these are likely to surface more and more in the months and years ahead.

The fifth trend I think that is worth flagging here today is that we are, and I alluded to this earlier, we are seeing a growing number of examples of bottom up pressure from within emerging democracies to see greater attention to human rights and democracy beyond their borders. We in the U.S. government recognize that we are not the only ones who have domestic politics with which to contend.

As I alluded to earlier, in the United States, several decades ago, it was the Congress that pushed the Executive Branch to formerly report on human rights around the world, and it was the Congress that began restricting funding streams on human rights grounds.

Today it remains U.S. civil society, Carl and a lot of you in this room, and U.S. constituents who hold us and the government accountable not only for our policies at home, but also for our actions abroad.

Similarly, in the new democracies, it will take time for parliament, civil society and the media to turn outward, as well. There are very encouraging signs, though. We have seen the Burma Caucus in Indonesia's Parliament play an important role, putting the fate of the Burmese on the political map, and Indonesia, in turn, play a leading role injecting human rights into the ASEAN

Charter. We have seen growing Indonesian citizen pride over the country's role in launching the Bali Democracy Forum as Indonesia's self-identity increasingly takes pride in being a leading democracy in the region and in the world.

We've seen thousands of Brazilian citizens join a letter writing campaign to press the previous Brazilian President Lulu to offer asylum to Sakina, the Iranian woman sentenced to be stoned to death for alleged adultery.

In Indonesia, which has 13,000 non-governmental organizations, the United States has recently launched a new initiative pledging to fund those groups, those non-governmental groups that would like to partner with other human rights organizations in the region so to try to incentivize work beyond their borders, since they have such a huge amount to offer, having undergone the transition they have.

And since Egypt's recent revolution, it is noteworthy I think that Egyptian civil society has found ways virtually and on the ground to connect with Indonesians, Chileans, Poles and others in order to learn from their experience in moving from dictatorship to democracy.

So those are the trends and I think those are quite encouraging. Needless to say, however, there's always more to be done at home and abroad by all of us to consolidate democratic gains and to promote and protect human rights. And we should not underplay genuine disagreements even as we seek to forge more cooperation across borders.

There are several reasons our policies are unlikely to fully align in the very near term. We have different histories, that's obvious. Some emerging

democracies view the sovereignty shields as having protected them from external interference during the Cold War and at other times in their history.

We see the lessons of history slightly differently. Some emerging democracies believe that they threw off the yoke of colonialism or the repression of dictatorship on their own, relying not at all on external help, and they, therefore, discount the notion that such external help can play a positive role in fostering democratization.

We believe outside actors cannot dictate events and democratic progress, but that we all do have a constructive role to play. And moreover, we've come to see how difficult it is to be neutral in our dealings with repressive states. We are either factoring human rights into our foreign policy or we can be sending a signal to a repressive regime that the rights of citizens are not important to us.

We are at different stages, as well, of democratic and economic development. Many emerging market democracies are still consolidating their own gains at home, they are attempting to close extreme inequality gaps, and in so doing, would not be able to convince their own democratic voters that it would be, for example, a good use of taxpayer money to provide large amounts of democracy assistance to countries not as far along the democratic development spectrum.

We also, in truth, of course, have different interests. While many emerging democracies have powerful economies, they may still be seeking markets. While many of them may believe that democracy is a stabilizing force

in the long term, they may see the process of democratization as destabilizing in the near term, especially if it is a process that occurs in their region.

And even if our interests are similar, we may prioritize those interests in different ways or seek very different means to the same ends. Notwithstanding these different vantage points, we feel we are making progress together. And President Obama has invited more assertive leadership by emerging democracies. Indeed, one way to track the President's commitment to progress in these countries is just to check his travel schedule. Most of the trips that he has chosen to take in his first two years highlight the importance he places on the embrace of emerging democracies and regional democratic anchors.

He has visited Ghana, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Brazil and Chile, among other countries. The trips to India and Brazil in particular, which National Security Advisor, Tom Donilon, and Deputy National Security Advisor, Denis McDonough, has spent months and months planning, highlight the full on embrace of the rise of emerging powers. And this administration has signaled a desire to engage them even on contentious issues in the spirit of mutual interest and mutual respect.

When it comes to coalition building in Geneva and New York, we have approached emerging democracies early and often in the process rather than coming to them when a human rights action or resolution is already fully cooked. And we've engaged not only in New York or Geneva, but at a high level in capitals recognizing the challenge of overcoming ingrained resistance on some

of these issues. Building these relationships with new democracies does not come at a cost, I should note, to the U.S.'s traditional democratic alliances, they remain critically important to our efforts to foster democracy, promote human rights and accountability. But in a world of over 190 UN member states, we must also build bridges to these critical powers.

Perhaps our most effective tool for depolarizing tools, for depolarizing the traditional debate over human rights and democracy promotion are speaking more openly about our efforts to address our own shortcomings, and also bridging some of the ideological divides in the human rights and democracy debate.

President Obama's success in reinvigorating U.S. human rights commitments has made it easier for other governments to stand with us on these and other issues in international fora. The President has made it very clear that he believes human rights begin at home and that one of our most powerful tools is our example and our struggle, ongoing struggle to perfect our union.

This is included reaffirming the ban on torture, and, of course, the effort that he has made to close Guantanamo. It continues along multiple fronts, preparing a ratification package for the UN Disabilities Convention, committing the U.S. government to producing its own action plan to mainstream gender considerations into national security policy, ending Don't Ask, Don't Tell, including the United States, and our record in our own global trafficking report, et cetera, et cetera. But it also entailed spelling out what this administration will not do.

Back in his Cairo address in 2009, President Obama renounced the imposition of democracy by military force, saying, “No system of government can or should be imposed by one nation on any other.”

And he pledged to respect all democratically elected movements that reject violence and govern with respect for all their people. He said his administration would listen to the voices of “all peaceful and law abiding voices, even if we disagree with them.”

And he has also challenged the false divisions around the very definition of human rights and democracy. Here the President has emphasized an inclusive conception of human rights and democracy in speeches that have resonated greatly I think in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and beyond. The President keeps coming back to the centrality of human dignity. He’s spoken of the dignity of work, the dignity of peaceful protest, the dignity of being able to choose one’s leaders, the dignity of being able to speak freely and pray freely. He has spoken not only in terms of individual dignity, but also of the dignity of nations deserving of our respect.

The President and his Foreign Policy team have consistently made clear that elections alone, of course, do not democracy make, it’s also rule of law, independent media, independent judiciary, vibrant private sector, and civil society that drive democratic progress.

In Ghana, he said memorable, “Africa doesn’t need strong men, it needs strong institutions.” In his noble speech, he returned to one of President Kennedy’s most memorable ideas when Kennedy said, “let us focus on a more

practical, more attainable peace based not on a sudden revolution in human nature, but in a gradual evolution in human institutions."

As part of his challenge to false divisions, the President has emphasized the link between freedom from fear and freedom from wants, and given a greater emphasis to economic development in foreign policy that we have seen in generations. We have seen recently in a revolution sparked by the frustrations of a fruit vendor just how important these issues are and just how central the linkage is. President Obama highlighted these connections with the release of the first ever Presidential Policy Directive on Global Development. And Secretary Clinton spearheaded the introduction of a new tool to ensure that development gets the attention it deserves.

We had long set priorities, as many of you know, in the Defense Department's Quadrennial Defense Review, or QDR, but it was Secretary Clinton who introduced the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, or QDDR.

This administration's policies are rooted in the President's idea expressed in his noble speech that, "a just peace includes not only civil and political rights, it must encompass economic security and opportunity."

Beginning with his 2006 speech before the Kenyan Parliament while still a senator, I've mentioned this already, President Obama has also emphasized that corruption is a profound assault on human dignity and human rights. And Secretary Clinton has taken the step of highlighting corruption in the annual Human Rights Reports, the country reports that the State Department does.

And finally, the President has stressed that lasting change must come from the bottom up, and be indigenous, an approach that resonates greatly with those emerging democracies that pride themselves on the histories – on their own histories and the histories of their national movements, emerging democracies that are suspicious of outside interventions.

The President has repeatedly stressed that change is not something that the United States or any other country can force, nor is there one model for change. He says each nation gives life to this principal, a democracy, in its own way, grounded in the traditions of its own people, and America does not presume to know what is best for everyone, each country will pursue a path rooted in the culture of its people and in its past traditions.

However, this vision is not a recipe for America standing on the sidelines. The President has coupled his respect for other traditions with a challenge to developing countries to take responsibility to fix homegrown problems. And he has expressed confidence in the universality of human rights, that all people yearn for certain things, it is not western values that causes the people of Libya to risk their lives on behalf of democracy.

As the President said in Moscow in a meeting with civil society groups, these ideals are not the monopoly of one country. Wherever possible, he's invoked the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the international instruments that the very governments abusing human rights long ago joined. This humility has

helped us build these cross regional coalitions with what seem to be increasingly willing partners.

In conclusion, the Obama Administration has engaged in a short and long game when it comes to human rights and democracy promotion. We are vastly more effective in both when we are accompanied by regional powerhouses and emerging market democracies that have undergone such inspiring change of their own in recent years.

A broader coalition that includes emerging democracies testifies powerfully to the universality of the principals we are promoting, it denies abuse of regimes, the refuge they have long sought in regional blocks, and the comfort they have found in the diversion of polarization.

And finally, the leadership of emerging democracies is noticed by the people in repressed society. As emerging democracies offer a validation of bottom up change, a testament to how quickly a country's fortunes can be transformed, and a model for the social vibrancy, the economic growth and the unbounded political horizons that come with democratic change. So let me leave it there and just hear from you. Thank you.

MR. GERSHMAN: Well, this is now the time when Samantha would really like to hear from you. This conference has raised a lot of issues, and I think we've even had some internal debates, you know, in terms of what we're – if we're talking about, you know, countries just being a model and promoting democracy just by being a model or projecting or promoting. I think there's a consensus that we're not for imposing, but there's a, you know, I think

there are views here across the spectrum in terms of what's appropriate, and I think there are probably some differences among the different countries for which people have given papers.

I might note that when asked sometimes about what is it that the NED has done that has been sort of really interesting and effective, I always say that I think the most – one of the most important things we've done is what we call cross border work, and that really started, you know, after 1989, when Poland and now countries in Central Europe, to make their, you know, because they believed in democracy, but also to make their neighborhood more stable, reached out across borders to work for democracy. And, you know, we helped some 55 NGO's from the post communist world working not just further to the east and Eurasia, but also, you know, as far a field as Burma or Afghanistan.

So this is a very, very important dimension of what we do, and obviously the U.S. believes that, you know, it needs cross border work, too, from friends, and that's what we've heard from Samantha.

You know, what we want to do now is really hear from, you know, some of the speakers perhaps to give a chance to give a reaction to what Samantha said. She wants feedback. So I'm going to open the floor for people, you know, really to make statements. She's going to say something maybe in conclusion, but really now is the opportunity for people from the floor to say something. Yes, please.

MR. MILLICAN: Al Millican, AM Media. From your vantage point recently, how has the implementation of Sharia Islamic law affected democratic

and human rights advances and attacks in the emerging democratic world in particular?

MR. GERSHMAN: That's not a comment, but a question, but we'll take it. I don't know, was it addressed to me? Anybody have any comments to make? Please, over here.

MR. LARSON: My name is Paul Larson, I'm with George Mason University School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution. I guess my comment is, when we look at human rights, there seems to be a certain amount of prioritization that's required just by a limited amount of resources. And in terms of saving lives, addressing structural violence seems to be a much more cost effective method than doing a direct violence approach, because military interventions are significantly more costly than addressing structural violence.

So I guess my question for you is, how are you prioritizing those different cost comparative advantages or cost effectiveness? And my comment would be, it seems like we should be doing more structural violence.

MR. GERSHMAN: What do you mean by that?

MR. LARSON: For structural violence?

MR. GERSHMAN: Yeah, I mean addressing structural violence, give me an example.

MR. LARSON: Doing it with poverty prevention.

MR. GERSHMAN: I see, okay.

MR. LARSON: Those types of capacity building instead of the military forms of intervention.

MR. GERSHMAN: Okay. I see a hand here, and then a hand back there, and then in the very back, yes.

MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon. My name is Allison Johnson, I'm an International Political Economist. And I would like very much to explore deeper what we've been talking about today and yesterday around the right type of programming over time to support democracy and human rights, just coming from the USA perspective. Of course, we could also provide that kind of feedback for the emerging democracies and how they think about programming.

Because one of the things that we've been tracking through NED and NDI and IRI is a decrease of funding from the United States government over time for democracy promotion. How are you structuring things to approach Congress in this budget crisis, where we could put more funding into promotion of human rights and democracy in our work around the world? How do you see the five trends that you tracked in your speech matching reactions from Congress? Do you believe there's a window of space to dialogue on this, because over time, it probably is a more productive use of our U.S. tax dollar money to invest in that democracy promotion than in other programs. Thank you.

MR. GERSHMAN: Thank you. And, you know, let me just say that from the very beginning, the administration has been very good in its budget requests, but, of course, it's Congress that has the power of the purse. Yes.

MR. WEINTRAUB: Thank you. I'm Leon Weintraub, University of Wisconsin, Washington Semester, International Affairs. Near the end of your

intervention, you focused on the President's regard for human dignity, you mentioned rule of law, democratic elections, and you specifically cited the importance of the international – the Convention on Civil and Political Rights.

I notice you did not mention the other international Convention on Economic and Social Rights. And, you know, there often are claims for such thing as a right to clean air, right to food, right to shelter, education, even some would say a right to be free, for example, of the dumping of toxic waste. I wonder how you feel the administration is on these economic and social rights, where do they stand in relation to civil and political rights, are they a distraction or should they be handled in the same way?

MR. GERSHMAN: Thank very much. And is that Kelly in the back? Yes, Kelley Currie.

MS. CURRIE: Hi, Kelley Currie from the Project 2049 Institute. Thank you for this presentation, and it raises a lot of interesting issues. I was somewhat surprised that one word that you didn't mention throughout the entire presentation was China. It's been a topic on several of the panels, about how some of these emerging market democracies are shaping their policies in response to China's rise, in response to the pressures that China is putting on them and China's behavior around the world.

And it seems that there may be a time some cognitive dissidence also in between the messages that you're putting out that the administration supports democratic development, sees these countries as its natural partners, but also at times seems to privilege a relationship with China, which is obviously

not a democracy, and at times doesn't seem to be pushing too much for China to become more democratic or to engage in political reform. So these -– I think if you kind of look at the entire picture, it can be a little bit disconcerting to have that tone running through the administration's foreign policy. That's really just a comment I guess.

MR. GERSHMAN: Thanks, Kelley. Are there any -– yes, I see -– are there any other hands that -– did I see a hand? No. Yes, please.

MS. MEDLER: Hi, Ariadne Medler with the Brookings Institution. I think my question is on just – I think there's a change in discourse from democracy promotion to democracy strengthening, in a lot of ways with the NED and NDI and IRA and a lot of that programming, and some of the programs that are related to democracy strengthening I think are a lot harder to measure what our impact really is, and in a tight budget environment, when $8 need to go farther, how can this increasing focus on monitoring and evaluation really jive with democracy strengthening programs that are hard to get concrete numbers for? Any thoughts on that would be interesting I think.

MR. GERSHMAN: We don't, you know, actually we don't even use the term democracy, even though it's in the conference, we don't use the term democracy promotion anymore. Really a lot of the activists on the ground don't like it, you know, as if they need to be promoted. They're fighting, what they want is support and assistance, so we use the democracy assistance, we don't really use democracy promotion anymore. But it seems to have entered the

lexicon, there's nothing we can do about it, but we don't think in those terms as my point. Please, in the back there.

SPEAKER: Thanks. In his speech at the General Assembly, President Obama, as you mentioned, spoke out about the need for these new emerging democratic powers to speak up on behalf of those who are repressed in other places. And there's been a lot of initiatives to try to work with these countries. But is there maybe at the next UN speech, is there a plan at some point to hold those countries that haven't made progress in speaking out for the rights of others accountable or to press them more forcefully, maybe through more stick approach than just talking about cooperation? Thank you.

MR. GERSHMAN: Please, Sully.

MR. HOSEL: Sully Hosel from Kadir Has University in Turkey. This will be more a comment maybe rambling.

MR. GERSHMAN: That's what we want.

MR. HOSEL: Part of the –- and I think this is also partially an inflection of the things we have discussed here already about six countries. There are two different ways of looking –- there are several ways of looking at what the human rights issues in the world agenda are. And there is certainly a question of credibility when it comes to either formal imperial powers or the United States in terms of your understanding of what human rights are, because as you, yourself, said, there are different understandings of human rights, and the professor from Wisconsin, as well, suggested that a poorer country's understanding of what basic human rights are, and yours may be very different.

Secondly, of course, you have your record, which in large parts of the world, lead people to think that you're being hypocritical. Thirdly, there is also the issue especially on the part of the United States, of course, being the predominant power of being very selective, even on the issue of Libya. Libya and Bahrain are happening at the same time, I can understand why you can speak, be vocal about Libya, but keep quiet on Bahrain. There is also the issue of Israel, Israel's own citizens, let alone the Israeli policy and relation, the kinds of discrimination practices that are emerging, where you usually are either mum or very quiet, the so called constructive engagement, if there is any, that used to exist for South Africa, which was criticized when we had the South Africa panel.

So –- and that may be understood as partially domestic politics, partially the responsibilities of a great power. You cannot disrupt all balances in the world, you have your interests and all that. How do you work on trying to, if you will, break out of that first perception of what the U.S. does what it does, why the U.S. does what it does; and second, how do you get to a more common understanding of human rights, is it at all possible?

And in what kind -– where you said you are engaging in dialogue with partners, you have had Brazil on your side, and Iran now, and South Africa, after some reluctance, joined the United States on the issue of –- whatever, is it because you prevail over them with political arguments, or is it because you are in conversation with them changing your own language, your own discourse and whatever you stand?

MR. GERSHMAN: Thanks, Sully. Any of the other speakers, Moeletsi or anybody else want to grumble? I see a hand over the in the back there.

MR. LOBE: Jim Lobe, Inter Press Service. I just wanted to –- this may be a little unfair, but how does the thrust of your remarks and the importance of encouraging emerging democracies square with the kind of op-ed that was published this morning or yesterday, where President Obama joined the heads of states, or heads of government rather of Great Britain and France, while the Indians and the Brazilians and the South Africans were putting out a kind of different kind of statement? How does that help your effort? It just seemed quite different from the kind of approach that you were stressing in your speech.

MR. GERSHMAN: Okay. Well, we'll take maybe these two hands and then that'll be it.

MS. HICKS: Peggy Hicks with Human Rights Watch. I, too, wanted to pick up on the two last speakers' points. We heard from our Indonesian panel earlier, and one of the commentaries was about the fact that one of the reasons Indonesia can't engage as much on democracy as it might like is because it lacks the democratic credentials. And I wanted to reflect on that a bit with regard to how the U.S. engages on democracy. And Samantha has made some very good points about how the U.S. has taken that criticism on board and worked in this administration to engage differently, the openness that talked about economic and social rights. The way the U.S. undertook the UPR at the Human Rights Council was I think exactly the type of leading by example that

we want to see from the U.S. government, which would allow it to play a more positive role with the emerging market democracies.

But unfortunately, there are still gaps and lags that need to be addressed. A glaring one that's coming to light in the recent days is the fact that the U.S. itself doesn't have a standing invitation to allow Special Rapporteurs of the Human Rights Council within this country, they haven't been about to visit Guantanamo detainees on a confidential basis, and now the issue has come up with regards to manning, as well.

So taking on board the fact that, you know, that consistency and those democratic credentials have to be, you know, maintained as firmly and appropriately across issues and countries as possible, and again, reemphasizing a point made earlier, that Bahrain, to me, is a good example where we don't see as much consistency as we would like, and need for the U.S. voice to be just as strong there as in other places.

MR. GERSHMAN: Thanks very much. Why don't you give the mic right –-

SPEAKER: Thank you. Just a very quick point in the spirit of the last comment I think relating to the UN Security Council. You spoke approvingly of what's happened with the move from the G-8 to the G-20. You know, I'm surprised to learn that in the conversations here in this room this last couple of days, the theme of UN reform and the issue of the P-5 being so dominant has come up over and over again, and I just wondered, you know, whether you thought that a change on that front could come, and if it could, how you'd see

that playing into sort of reinforcing approval for the U.S., where there's now skepticism and a critique of hypocrisy. Thanks.

MR. GERSHMAN: Thanks very much for all these comments and questions. And, Samantha –-

MS. POWER: I'm not going to say much. I, again, would like also to –- very much to hear from some of the individuals from these countries in question. We have a little motto in this administration which is, we try to live by, but nothing about you without you, and this comes up a lot in the peacekeeping context. I would just make a few very general comments in response, and I'm happy to stick around for a couple of minutes, I've got to rush back to something here in a minute, but, you know, on any of the specifics you guys want to follow up.

But first on this broad question of kind of a prevention is simply to say that on structural violence and this idea that we wait too long until it becomes too costly and so forth, I mean I think that, you know, what foreign policy is every day for all of its limits is an effort at prevention and at dealing with the causes of structural violence.

I mean I had a long section of the speech on the emphasis that this administration has placed on development, on economic development, that's a prevention tool, right. If you get development right, if you have better partnerships, more collaboration, more country ownership, more of an emphasis on results, that's your best tool.

I mean I think the diplomacy that we've done, but that many other countries have done in, you know, isolating Gbagbo and the Ivory Coast context, that diplomacy is an effort to prevent violence before it comes about, that, you know, you're calling on people to respect the results of democratic elections, and in the event that they respect them, that, in turn, is going to prevent unfortunately the kind of violence that we have seen in recent weeks.

So, you know, I can just say from the inside, it's not like suddenly when there's an occasion in which things have gotten really bad that you suddenly start paying attention thinking, oh gosh, I wish we had prevented. I mean every day we have, you know, our aid missions and our diplomats here and in the countries in question trying to do this kind of work.

Additionally, as I suggested in the speech, the, you know, the importance of injecting human rights concerns into your day to day diplomacy, you know, cannot be understated. I mean that's a signal of the priority we place on this every bit as much as our resources and our programs. And sometimes, you know, I mean one of the things that we try to do is marry our diplomacy and our programs. Sometimes they operate in kind of different silos, and we've tried to address that, as I think other administrations have. It's challenging, but it's critical, and it's about, you know, making human rights not just the subject of a press release or of a very high profile, you know, intervention, but of the day to day routine business of what we do.

In terms of the congressional climate which came up I think in a few comments, I would just say that, as Carl indicated, our budget requests have

been very substantial, and the President and the Secretary are incredibly committed to defending those requests. We just – it is a very, very difficult budget climate, and so the role for civil society and for constituents in making the case that these are cost effective investments, that these are, you know, not just sort of esoteric, distant, you know, issues of foreign policy, but that they're very related to the foundation we're trying to build for our kids here at home and the stable world that will make it easier for us to come –- draw back our military presence and other things around the world.

And then in terms of the question of accountability or I guess a few questions around engagement with emerging democracies, I mean I think the, as I suggested, that the accountability, at least the most effective form of accountability, will come from, and is coming more and more from within those societies, and so that's really the important place to look and I think the important place, those of you who have those partnerships, and I know NED has been working on this, that ultimately is going to be the most sustainable and the most effective route to the ends that I think many people here share.

That said, of course, in our dialogues with these countries, you know, in instances we degree, we are expressing that, and so there is accountability. I mean this is not, you know, the differences that recur or differences that we err frequently and I think have made a lot of progress.

And then I want to make sure then, just to correct a misimpression that I heard in a couple of the last comments, I mean perhaps just the nature of being a U.S. official and giving a speech about the importance of emerging

market democracies, taking leadership on these issues, you know, a case which I think is obvious to all of you, you know, I hope I didn't imply somehow that these countries again were stepping up because the United States was asking or because we were –- I don't think that's the case at all, and I think the Security Council example is a good one, you know. When India, Brazil, South Africa, Turkey, when these countries are on the Security Council, they're responsible for maintaining international peace and security, and I think it's a responsibility that they take very seriously. And again, we may differ on how best to do that from time to time, but, you know, these are countries that want to step up to leadership roles, these are countries that, you know, want to see the Security Council Reform for that reason, they want to be part of that conversation and part of the enforcement apparatus.

So while my speech was about sort of what we're doing and trying to build these partnerships and so forth, the reason this conference is so important is really hearing the perspective of these countries themselves and how they see democracy and human rights fitting into the broader, you know, economic stabilization debate and the broader international peace and security debate.

So I just thank you, Carl, for pulling it together, and I hope I get to see the transcript or the findings or something so I can take more back in terms of what we can do better.

MR. GERSHMAN: Thanks, Samantha. And, you know, the papers I think and the presentations and the discussions we've had really I think show

the complexity of this subject. You know, there is not a, you know, simple unified view as to how all this works. And I think your presentation was –- really offered a comprehensive view coming from this country, which has sort of been absent in this conference, and we really thank you for bringing it to this conference, and obviously we'll share with you all the results of these discussions. Thanks for being with us.

MS. POWER: Thank you.

MR. PICCONE: We're going to take a quick five minute break and then we'll gather back there for the remaining two panels of the discussion. Thank you.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190