Other:

Obama Pledges to Use Technology to Target Human Trafficking, Simplify Visas for Trafficking Victims

Remarks by Secretary of State Clinton, July 19, 2012[1]

Secretary Hillary Clinton gave the following remarks in Washington, DC

Introductory Remarks Omitted

Secretary Clinton. I am sure when you received an invitation to a conference on data—you probably thought, "Oh, boy, how exciting." But I think you would agree, even having just heard from the prior three speakers, this really is an exciting time for data, because we are living in the midst of a data revolution. Massive amounts of information are being shared faster, through more channels, and reaching more people in more places than ever. Now, globally, Twitter users generate 340 million tweets every day. And some of you are probably tweeting as I speak right now. Remember, it is #gendergap. Companies around the world catalog billions and billions of customer transactions in a matter of minutes. Governments crunch census data to determine the makeup, habits, and challenges of entire countries or specific communities.

Some measures suggest the world created as much as 1.8 zettabytes—that was a new term to me—zettabytes of data last year. To put this in perspective, you would need more than 57 billion 32 gig iPads to hold all that information.

But are we just collecting it for the sake of collecting it? Data only becomes valuable when it is organized and put to work. And before we make big decisions—in business, in government, in life—we should do the research, run the numbers. It's how we minimize risk and maximize impact.

And data are making a huge difference in diplomacy and development already. MIT's Engineering and Social Systems lab is doing pioneering work modeling the growth of slum areas. For instance, in parts of Africa, they did it by combining data from mobile phone networks with information from the Kenyan census. Now urban planners can use that model to figure out where to install water pumps and toilets so that as many people as possible can use them. Instead of having a powerful person in a slum demand that the toilet be put in a certain place because that's where he wants it, now you can equip decision makers both locally within the slum itself as well as in local government to be able to say, "But more people will use it if we move it over there." It sounds like a small thing; it's revolutionary.

Or take Together for Girls, a public-private partnership the State Department helped build to prevent sexual violence against children. In many places, there is simply no information about how widespread the problem is, so we support collecting data at the national level. In Tanzania, for example it was found that almost 30 percent of girls and over 10 percent of boys have suffered an unwanted sexual experience. The Government of Tanzania then used this data to develop and implement a national plan to prevent violence against children. Concrete action is possible when we understand the scope and scale of a problem.

We keep statistics on everything we care about, from RBIs to ROI, the daily ups and downs of the Dow and our bank accounts. So if we're serious about narrowing the gender gap and helping more girls and women, then we must get serious about gathering and analyzing the data that tell the tale.

Now, the data already provides strong evidence that demonstrates the links between gender equality and increased prosperity and security. This has been a real focus for us at the State Department. We have been clear from day one that when we're making the case for elevating the roles of women, we can't just rely on moral arguments as important and compelling as they might be. We have to make a rigorous case, backed up with solid evidence and data.

Last September at the first ever APEC Women and the Economy Summit in San Francisco, I shared the compelling evidence mostly collected by the World Bank that demonstrates how women jumpstart and then drive economic growth around the world. As I said then, when we liberate the economic potential of women, we elevate the economic performance of communities, nations, and the world. And in these tough economic times, none of us can afford to perpetuate the barriers facing women in the workforce. And you combine that with the information Jim Clifton provided, which is constant through Gallup data that the most important thing to people in the world is a good job with a decent income to support themselves and their families. And leaders and governments around the world have started taking action, because you can't deny the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

data.

Now, we're not just focused on economic growth. In December of last year, I also spoke about the important role that women play in fostering global stability. While more limited than our economic data, there is evidence showing that women make unique contributions during peace negotiation processes. And afterwards, they provide vital support to bring peace agreements to life in local communities and to help build lasting security. All these data went into creating the U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, which is our government-wide roadmap for accelerating and institutionalizing our work to bring more women into all aspects of peace building and conflict prevention.

Now, these speeches called for bold ideas, for changing the way we approach business, global stability, economic growth, as well as how we approach diplomacy and development in the 21st century. Today I want to look more closely at how we can use data to inform and shape this work.

As we strive to achieve our foreign policy goals and to advance American global leadership by building peace, promoting democracy, growing economies, we already know that investing in women delivers returns for entire societies. But we are missing critical information to guide our investments better.

As Jim just said, for too many countries we lack reliable and regular data on even the basic facts about the lives of women and girls—facts like when they have their first child, how many hours of paid and unpaid work they do, whether they own the land they farm. And since women make up half the population, that's like having a black hole at the center of our data-driven universe.

It keeps us from fully realizing how advancing the status of women affects women, their families, their communities, their countries, and the rest of us. And it keeps those of us looking to close the gender gap from getting the most out of our investments from either the public or the private or the not-for-profit sector. Because ultimately data are a means to an end to a more peaceful, prosperous world where women are full participants who, like men, can reach their God-given potential.

And we now have an opportunity we've never had before. The technological advances of this century give us a chance to gather unprecedented amounts and types of information that can guide our decisions and help maximize our impact. Now let me hasten to add that we must of course be thoughtful and careful about how we do this and take care to protect the information we collect. We need the data, but we have to respect the rights of the people behind the data. So today I want to talk about the historic opportunity we have to improve the lives of billions of people and what it will take to seize that.

I'll start with the story of one of my personal heroes: Ela Bhatt, the founder of the Self-Employed Women's Association in India. She earned her law degree in the early 1950s at a time when not many women were in the law and certainly not many women in India. She used her degree to work for a local textiles labor union, but the law only granted rights and recognitions to industrialized laborers. All around her, she saw plenty of women doing lots of work in the informal economy.

Ela learned that only 6 percent of women in India were officially counted as employed. And she recognized that the first step to helping women who were obviously very hardworking but invisible to business and government would be to bring their work into public view. Now, one easy way to prove the economic value of women in the informal economy would be to ask them all to take the week off—and just see what happens. But Ela Bhatt had a better idea. She convinced researchers to collect and analyze data about all the work people—mostly women—were actually doing from their homes.

And once the numbers came out, policy makers couldn't ignore them. And in 1996, thanks in large part to Ela's leadership, the International Convention on Home Work recognized the rights and contributions of those who work from their homes and established new standards for employment conditions.

Data not only measures progress, it inspires it. As we have learned in this country, what gets measured gets done. Once you start measuring problems, people are more inclined to take action to fix them because nobody wants to end up at the bottom of a list of rankings.

So data are critical on both sides of the question—knowing what to do, and how to do it. And we want to achieve the best outcomes for women and men, girls and boys, because after all, if our investments aren't helping us meet that goal, we need to change our approach. For example, there is evidence that boys in some countries are falling behind girls in primary school enrollment. Once in secondary school, however, girls are more likely to drop out. With more and better data and analysis, we can understand the nuances that could point us toward more targeted and effective solutions to both problems.

So the question for us and for our work on improving gender equality becomes: What do we know, and perhaps more important, what don't we know?

The good news is we know more than we used to. For a long time, basic information about women was hiding in plain sight. But thanks to UN agencies, the World Economic Forum, the OECD, the World Bank, international NGOs, and research institutes, we now have a range of tools that are helping us understand the circumstances of women around the world and to quantify the social and economic benefits of gender equality. And today, as you heard, Dr. Kim launched an important addition to our toolkit—a gender data portal that will further sharpen our understanding of the gender gap.

The U.S. Government is also focused on filling in the gaps. Last year, for example, I launched the EDGE initiative—Evidence and Data for Gender Equality—to improve sex-disaggregated data on entrepreneurship and assets in developing countries, two areas where our information is particularly lacking. We also helped launch the OECD's Gender Initiative, which is gathering data on women in poverty, in science education, in management, and providing a toolbox of policy ideas. Everything we have learned from these new studies paints a picture that is sobering, but also hopeful.

The Human Development Report finds that inequalities between men and women

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

can reduce a country's overall progress in health, education, and standard of living by up to 85 percent. This points to a tremendous opportunity. Elevating the status of women and girls has been shown to have a positive impact on entire societies. And in country after country, education improves, spending on nutrition and health increases, productivity goes up, economies grow.

Just as investing in women and gender equality has a multiplying effect that brings about positive results for entire societies, investing in collecting and analyzing data on women and gender equality can exponentially increase those benefits.

Now, even with the strong evidence on the benefits of women's participation in the economy, there are still lots of gaps in our understanding. We know, for example, that 2.3 billion people around the world have access to the internet. We don't know how many of them are women. That means researchers don't have data to study how women in developing countries use the internet to educate themselves, to start or run a business, or to find the information they need to tend to the health and well-being of their families.

We also have studies suggesting that eliminating barriers to women's participation in certain industries or levels of management could increase the productivity of all workers from 3 to 25 percent. That's a huge range, and it encompasses vastly different countries and any number of economic barriers. For example, what are the barriers in Indonesia, and how are they different from the barriers in Nigeria? More gender-sensitive data and analysis could tell us.

If women farmers had access to the same seeds, equipment, irrigation as men farmers, they could increase their crop yields 20 to 30 percent and feed up to an additional 150 million hungry people. Yet we lack critical information on women's land use, property rights, and access to seeds and fertilizer. Without the data, it is difficult to address these issues, which means we're likely leaving much-needed value on the table.

We need more data in areas related to women's political participation and in their role in peace building. We know how many women sit in national parliaments, but what about local and regional bodies? We have very strong data from India, and some evidence from other countries, that women leaders are more likely to direct spending toward infrastructure related to women's roles and responsibilities, like better drinking water and sanitation. But we need to learn more about the ways and degree to which greater representation by women influence public spending and public choices, as well as the overall efficiency of the outcomes that are sought.

So we have strong evidence that women play roles in all kinds of things, and in particular in peacekeeping and conflict prevention. They raise issues in these kinds of negotiations, like human rights and human security, that are fundamental to forging a lasting and sustainable peace. But we need more internationally comparable data to examine how women's contributions affect conflict regions. And only then can we really create frameworks for making sure they are included.

Now, such examples as these only scratch the surface. To put it simply, we have neither invested enough in collecting gender-sensitive data nor in quantifying how increasing gender equality yields benefits to societies. So we have to push, not only for more data, but better data—data that illuminates the challenges and opportunities that women and girls face, on their own and relative to men and boys, and their effect on shared stability and prosperity. And we have to ask questions we've never asked before and make sure we're asking them the right way.

To achieve the benefits of this new age of participation, an era when every person on the planet will eventually be connected up in some way, we must find ways to lower the barriers that are still in legal systems, cultural taboos, economic discrimination, educational problems. That will give us a better chance of not only solving the problems but doing so in a sustainable and strategic way. So we are seeking the sufficient information needed to guide us.

Now, this room is filled with experts and researchers and practitioners at the forefront of addressing our data gender gap, and it's because of many of you that we have made the progress we have seen in the last few years. But we need to keep going and to be champions of the widespread movement for gender-sensitive data. As we fill these gaps, then we have to put the data we collect to use, improving outcomes and creating real changes in people's lives. So what should be our next steps?

First, let's dedicate the resources to collect new data, analyze and publish the data we already have. That takes time and commitment, and it does take political will at the highest levels to make gender-sensitive data a priority for donor and partner governments, corporations, foundations, research institutions, and multilateral organizations. It will also take coordination across these groups to ensure the questions we ask, the data we collect, the measures we use are compatible and comparable to each other.

Next, we need to capitalize on 21st century tools for collecting and analyzing information, like behavioral economics, which looks at the social, cognitive, even emotional factors that affect people's decisions, or the vast amounts of data that social media provide. We must find opportunities for innovative public-private partnerships to harness new technologies and reduce the overall cost of collecting and analyzing data.

And then for our efforts to be sustainable, we need to build the capacity of national statistics bureaus and share with future data scientists and policymakers the value and methods of gender-sensitive data.

So today, I'm pleased to announce a new initiative that will help carry today's work forward. We're calling it Data 2X—a symbol of the power women have to multiply progress in their societies. With contributions from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and USAID, Data 2X will develop new curriculum standards to ensure data producers and users train in gender-sensitive techniques. Working with key data organizations, including the UN, World Bank, OECD, PARIS21, and Gallup, the project will also publish a roadmap on how we together can fill priority gaps in gender-sensitive data as quickly as possible. And, in keeping with the spirit of this conference, Data 2X will report on its progress in one year's time.

I hope this set of commitments, as well

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

as the significant challenges that we are and will be discussing today, inspire others to action as well.

In my time as Secretary of State, I have—as you may have read—traveled a lot of miles and visited many countries. But it's not the miles I remember. It's the people along the way, like the remarkable women who have overcome backbreaking poverty to build communities of their own, or heroes who have refused to buckle or back down in the face of threats and intimidation.

Everything I have done and everything I have learned in my work over the years has convinced me that improving the rights and the status of women is not simply a matter of human dignity, although it certainly is. It is also essential to our shared prosperity and security. We will not be able to move forward on any of our larger strategic goals or improve our security here at home unless we take on the fundamental instability and strife that inequality creates in our world. That's one of the reasons we have put women at the heart of our foreign policy priorities at the State Department. It's the right thing to do, and it is also the smart thing to do.

Getting the gender-sensitive data we need is a critical starting point. That will help act as a blueprint for building a better future for us all. It will help move toward finishing the unfinished business of helping more women become full and equal participants in every aspect of society.

I look forward to working with all of you to make that future not only a measurable and quantifiable one but an undeniable reality. There is so much that we can do together. And I thank Gallup, which has been at this business longer than most of us, for reminding us that sometimes our own views and perspectives are not reflective of the aspirations, feelings, and experiences of other people. And one of the great challenges for all of us is to continue to put ourselves in the other's shoes, to try to walk those miles, here in our own country and certainly around the world. That gives us more insight and empathy and better equips us to make decisions for ourselves and others that will be closer to being right and will stand the test of time.

Thank you all very much.

Excerpts of Remarks by Secretary of State Clinton, July 24, 2012[2]

Secretary Hillary Clinton gave the following remarks in Washington, DC

Secretary Clinton. [T]his gathering is yet another example of what the [Holocaust] museum does so well. It brings us face to face with a terrible chapter in human history and it invites us to reflect on what that history tells us and how that history should guide us on our path forward. As Sara said when we were walking in this morning, human nature did not dramatically and profoundly change in 1945. We still struggle with evil and the terrible impulses and actions that all too often result in atrocities and violence and genocide. But I want to thank the Committee on Conscience for bringing attention to contemporary cases of extreme violence against civilians.

Let me begin by acknowledging that here in this museum, it's important to note that every generation produces extremist voices denying that the Holocaust ever happened. And we must remain vigilant against those deniers and against anti-Semitism, because when heads of state and religious leaders deny the Holocaust from their bully pulpits, we cannot let their lies go unanswered. When we hear Holocaust glorification and public calls to, quote, "finish the job," we need to make clear that violence, bigotry will not be tolerated. And, yes, when criticism of Israeli Government policies crosses over into demonization of Israel and Jews, we must push back.

****

But despite all we have learned and accomplished in the last 70 years, "never again" remains an unmet, urgent goal. At the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st, we have seen campaigns of harassment and violence against groups of people because of their ethnic, racial, religious, or political backgrounds, and even some which aimed at the destruction of a particular group of people, fitting the definition of genocide. The Khmer Rouge slaughtered those suspected of having a high school education or other supposed enemies. Saddam Hussein massacred Kurdish communities in northern Iraq. Entire villages in Sudan were wiped out by government-supported militias.

So in April, President Obama came to this place right here to underscore this Administration's commitment to stopping the mass slaughter of civilians. He laid out a broad vision, declaring that fighting atrocities "must be the work of our nation and all nations."

So today, I want to talk about our strategy for preventing and responding to these crimes and the specific steps we are taking, because we have seen the cost of inaction. In Rwanda, 800,000 people in a country of 7 million died in the 1994 genocide. I remember being in Rwanda with my husband when I was First Lady, listening to story after story from survivors about the loved ones they had lost and the horrors they had endured.

The world waited until the massacre at Srebrenica before acting in Bosnia. It took the stories of men and boys summarily executed by the hundreds in refugee camps, of women and girls dragged into fields and gang-raped by soldiers, of infants murdered because they would not stop crying. And yet we've also seen how decisive action can make all the difference.

Two years ago, I visited Pristina, the capital of Kosovo. When I arrived, throngs of men and women were lining the streets, clapping and waving flags and holding signs that said "Thank you America." What the United States and our NATO allies did there more than a decade ago may not be fresh in the minds of every American, but I can assure you they certain—those memories are certainly fresh in the minds of the people of Kosovo. During that time, families lived in fear that they would be dragged from their homes, loaded onto trains and trucks to ethnically cleanse communities. If we had failed to intervene when we did, who knows how many faces would have been missing from those crowds?

So we do have a moral obligation to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

confront threats such as these, because they are violations of our common humanity. And as the poll you've just heard about shows, the American people share this commitment and believe we do have a responsibility to act. But it isn't just the morally right thing to do. These crimes undermine stability in countries and across regions. They spark humanitarian crises and send refugees streaming across borders. They reverse economic progress and stymie growth for generations. They create bitter cycles of vengeance and retribution that can scar communities for decades.

President Obama was clear when he stated that preventing mass atrocities and genocide is a core national security interest as well as a core moral responsibility. So if a government cannot or will not protect its own citizens, then the United States and likeminded partners must act. But let me hasten to say this is not code for military action. Force must remain a last resort, and in most cases, other tools will be more appropriate through diplomacy, financial sanctions, humanitarian assistance, law enforcement measures.

The Administration has acted on this commitment. When the Qadhafi regime threatened a massacre in the city of Benghazi, we forged an international coalition to stop the assault. When Laurent Gbagbo violently clung to power in Cote d'Ivoire, we worked with UN partners to prevent the killing of innocents and to pressure him to relent. Now, he is standing before the International Criminal Court. When the Lord's Resistance Army escalated its attacks against civilians and its brutal work of turning children into soldiers, we helped governments throughout Central Africa increase their efforts to go after the leaders, including Joseph Kony. And we continue to work with international partners to end the ongoing violence in Syria and usher in a democratic transition.

Now, why we have acted in these cases to try to stop violence, to contain events that could create even more terror may not be a hard question to answer. But the questions of exactly when and how to act are difficult. The fact is that there is no one-size-fits-all solution. Every situation requires a tailored and careful response. And today, I want to discuss a few specific practical steps that we are taking to combat genocide and mass atrocities, and I want to highlight two core ideas.

First, we are putting new emphasis on prevention, and second, we are seeking to expand the range of partners contributing to this cause because no one country can be effective alone. Let me start with prevention. You want to stop atrocities before they start. How do you know what to look for?

Well, genocides and mass atrocities don't just happen spontaneously. They are always planned. Genocides are preceded by organized, targeted propaganda campaigns carried out by those in power. Extremist leaders spread messages of hate often disguised as something else—a song on the radio, a nursery rhyme, or a picture book. The messages filter down. Those in power begin to dehumanize particular groups or scapegoat them for their country's problems. Hatred not only becomes acceptable; it is even encouraged. It's like stacking dry firewood before striking the match. Then there is a moment of ignition. The permission to hate becomes permission to kill.

I remember going to Bosnia shortly after the Dayton accords were signed and meeting with a group of Bosnians. And one Muslim woman told me that when the violence started, she asked a neighbor whom she knew well, "Why are you doing this to us? Why is this happening?" She said that their families had known each other for many years, they had celebrated together at weddings, they had mourned together at funerals. And her neighbor replied, "We were told that if we don't do this to you, you'll do it to us first."

The United States and our partners must act before the wood is stacked or the match is struck, because when the fire is at full blaze, our options for responding are considerably costlier and more difficult.

There are responsibilities for this effort now across our government from the intelligence community to the Defense Department to the Treasury to the State Department. And at the center of our work is our core asset, our diplomats and development experts.

First, we are making sure that our officers serving in at-risk countries are trained to understand the warning signs, to provide accurate assessments of emerging crises, to take the first mitigating steps. That might mean engaging governments and their supporters. It might mean talking to local media about growing violence. It might mean supporting those who are countering propaganda.

President Obama was clear when he stated that preventing mass atrocities and genocide is a core national security interest as well as a core moral responsibility. So if a government cannot or will not protect its own citizens, then the United States and likeminded partners must act.

Second, we are putting technology to work advancing our prevention efforts. Because technology has changed the way we can detect and respond to mass atrocities. Until recently, it not only might happen, it did take days or weeks before outsiders knew about violence in a remote location. But now, a bystander with a cell phone and a YouTube account can show the whole world exactly what is happening.

So we are developing our own technological innovations. Our Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor is working on a project to detect when governments use malicious software to target protestors and then warn those being targeted. We also want to educate citizens about the risks of certain types of electronic communications and the availability of more secure alternatives. And as President Obama announced here in April, USAID is partnering with Humanity United on a tech challenge to identify new, high-tech innovations that will aid this cause.

Third, we are enhancing our civilian surge capacity. We already have personnel trained to analyze conflicts and defuse potentially violent situations. Now we will be using those personnel to focus on

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

atrocity prevention. We have deployed our Civilian Response Corps to countries such as South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sri Lanka, and Kyrgyzstan. We hope to train new teams to assess conditions on the ground, work with local governments to detect signs of impending atrocities, work with the local civil society and others who are representing populations at risk, and make recommendations to American officials on what we can do to prevent conflict. The new Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations will deploy these personnel to address potential atrocities and empower citizens to learn how to resolve conflicts themselves.

Fourth, we're deploying new tools through our National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security because women are often the first to know when their communities are in danger, and they are often the first to suffer. So we're working with women at-risk in areas where they are to make sure there are early-warning systems responsive to sexual and gender-based violence. For example, we have supported a project in the DRC to build a community alert network to protect civilians, including from conflict-related sexual violence.

Fifth, we can directly pressure those who organize atrocities and cut off the resources they need to continue their violence. We can target sanctions against groups using information technology to further human rights abuses as we've done in Syria and Iran. And those responsible for such crimes will not find safe haven in our country because our government will now deny entry visas to anyone responsible for or suspected of planning or committing a mass atrocity.

Lastly, we want to deter atrocities by making clear that those who commit these crimes will be held accountable. Our work over the last three administrations to bring Milosevic and Mladic and Karadzic to justice for their crimes in the Balkans is a testament to that commitment. Our message to perpetrators must be that we do not forget, and there will be consequences.

But that brings me to the second part of our approach. We need to expand the circle of partners who can help prevent and respond to crises, because a problem of this scale takes the skills and resources of governments, the private sector, and civil society, all working together. It starts with a robust diplomatic effort. And we have to strengthen our ties and our cooperation with likeminded governments and organizations, because if more countries are looking out for warning signs and training their diplomats on prevention techniques, we will all be more responsive. I applaud the African Union for their increased attention on the crises across Africa and of ECOWAS for responding effectively to the violence from Sierra Leone to Cote d'Ivoire.

We'll also be stepping up multilateral engagement to bring a greater focus on atrocity prevention. We're working to strengthen the U.N.'s core peace and security tools. Under our leadership, the G8 Peacebuilding and Peacekeeping Experts Group is focused on training and supporting peacekeepers to better identify and respond to violence that can and all too often does evolve into atrocities. To succeed, however, peacekeeping and special political missions will require the right resources, an understanding of the situation on the ground, strong leadership and personnel, and most importantly, the political will of member nations to back up these missions. That is often the most scarce commodity.

We're expanding our connections with the private sector because companies that respect human rights foster an environment in which atrocities are less likely to occur. And when they do, the private sector must send a strong message by refusing to do business with those responsible. Banks should refuse to finance the sale or purchase of oil from such countries. Jewelers should refuse to traffic in blood diamonds. And there are numerous examples of how economic pressure can get the attention of leaders when all of the other efforts have not.

We also need to do more to support civil society. And I started the first-ever Strategic Dialogue with Civil Society around the world because we want to be in an emergency response mode with civil society groups that are standing up against violence and harassment.

We're putting our elements of this strategy—prevention and partnership—into action through the Atrocities Prevention Board that President Obama announced here. Now, it might not be obvious that creating yet another government board will address a problem as entrenched as this. But the fact is a body such as this can drive the kinds of institutional changes that we envision. It can help galvanize efforts across our government to focus on prevention, to ensure that all our tools and resources are being put to good use. And it will give us an organizing principle, if you will, because it is difficult. There is so much information coming into this government on a second-by-second basis, and making sure it gets pulled together in one place where people can assess and analyze it and then suggest actions based on it is a challenge. So the board is the organizing entity that forces every part of the government to say, "This piece of information might be of use to the board. I better make sure it gets there."

****

But one thing must be noted: All nations have some influence and leverage that they can put to use if they are so engaged and focused. Even if nearly every country in the world takes a stand, we have seen recently how one nation or a small group of nations' obstruction can derail our efforts. That has been the challenge we have faced in the UN Security Council over our efforts in Syria.

As the Assad regime continues its bloody assault on its own people, despite crippling sanctions, condemnation, increasing political pressure, they have found support, primarily from Iran, Russia, and China. More than a hundred other nations and organizations have made clear that Assad must step aside in order for a transition to begin. And we are supporting the Syrian Justice and Accountability Center, which is compiling evidence of serious abuses and violations of human rights. We're supporting the UN Commission of Inquiry, which is gathering evidence about the crisis. We're sending a message to the Syrian regime and making clear that there will be consequences for their actions.

But I have to say that we are also increasing our efforts to assist the opposition. This is a very complicated and diffi-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

cult set of circumstances on the ground, and yet we know that the sooner it ends, the less violence there will be and the less chance for extremism to take hold. But it will be unfortunate if, indeed, the Assad regime and those around them decide that it's an existential struggle for them and they will maintain and even increase the level of violent response.

We think about and worry about and work on these issues all the time. And if it were easy, we wouldn't have to do things like have Holocaust memorials or atrocity prevention boards. But we are struggling with some of the deepest and most difficult impulses of human beings to protect themselves, to obtain power, to dehumanize others in order to enhance their own position and standing. And we have to do everything we can to keep pushing forward humanity's moral response and effective efforts.

I want to close, though, by saying that not every mass killing is announced by the explosion of mortars or the exchange of gunfire or concentration camps. They aren't always cases of governments slaughtering their own people. There are slow-motion crises that develop over time and don't capture daily headlines and are even more difficult to address, like the use of rape as a weapon of war. In the eastern Congo, it's estimated that 1,000 women and girls are raped every day, and it is a deliberate strategy used in the conflict there to dehumanize, to marginalize, to break the spirit of people. Or take the dehumanizing brutality in North Korean prison camps. They, I'm told, were joined by Shin Dong-hyuk, who was born in one such camp, and has made it his life's work to bring the world's attention to the conditions in his country. Or take the horrific problem of infanticide or, as it is rightly called, gendercide—families killing their own infant girls or allowing their baby and toddler daughters to die because their societies value only sons.

Now, whatever form atrocities take, however society explains, rationalizes, even tries to justify, we must be committed to preventing and ending all of these actions that truly dehumanize all of humanity. Now we have laid out our course for turning our commitment into action, but we recognize the plan we have laid out leaves many questions to answer, many ideas still to be formulated, and innovations to devise. But I am convinced we can make progress together. We have, in our lifetimes—those of us of a certain age—seen evil and hatred overcome. And in the tragic history that surrounds us here in this museum, we also see the stories of the heroes—the men and women who did the right thing, even when confronted and threatened by evil. And we're inspired. We're inspired by their courage and their resolve, what drove them to try to save a life.

That resolve continues to grow stronger. If one were to look at the great sweep of history, one has to believe that we can together overcome these challenges, that there will slowly but inexorably be progress. And at the root of that must be our resolve, and that resolve must never fail so that we can say and mean it, "never again."

Thank you all very much.

Excerpts of Remarks by Secretary of State Clinton, July 25, 2012[3]

Secretary Hillary Clinton gave the following remarks in Washington, DC at the Global Diaspora Forum

Secretary Clinton. [W]hy is this room packed and we have such interest on Twitter and through other means of connectivity? Well, it's because we all believe that diaspora communities have enormous potential to help solve problems and create opportunities in their countries of origin, because we believe that, as the title of this conference says, we can move forward by giving back. By tapping into the experiences, the energy, the expertise of diaspora communities, we can reverse the so-called "brain drain" that slows progress in so many countries around the world, and instead offer the benefits of the "brain gain."

Now, in terms of international development and our work to reduce poverty and improve lives, this can be a game-changing effort. But that is not all. It is also a recipe for spurring greater economic growth in the United States as well. And it holds the promise of advancing strategic interests like rebuilding societies after conflicts or disasters and improving relations with key countries.

Now, I saw this myself just two weeks ago when I visited Hanoi with a delegation of American businesses. This is a priority for us, because as I emphasized throughout my trip across Asia, economic growth and political reform are linked and we are supporting both. The business leaders were all buzzing about the opportunities they are discovering in Vietnam's burgeoning market. But a few savvy entrepreneurs were clearly way ahead of the curve. One was Jonathan Hanh Nguyen. He had left Vietnam as a young man, lived in the Philippines, and then studied in the United States, and when relations between America and Vietnam opened up in the 1990s, he was one of the first to see the economic potential. And he built a thriving business bringing well-known American brands into the Vietnamese marketplace, from designer clothing to fast food pizza, creating in the process thousands of jobs and bringing our countries closer together.

Now, that's one way the diaspora has and continues to make a difference, but it's certainly not the only way. One of the founding partners of the International Diaspora Engagement Alliance is the nonprofit OneVietnam Network, which uses the power of social networking to connect thousands of people in Vietnam—thousands of people of Vietnamese origin—in 30 countries, with health and development projects on the ground in Vietnam, like a cleft lip and palette clinic in Hanoi or dental missions in rural villages, that makes it easier for members of the diaspora to contribute directly to projects they care about and to see the impact of their donations.

So whether it's a profitable business venture or an innovative nonprofit, we can see just from the example of one diaspora, namely the Vietnamese diaspora, how you can help bring progress and prosperity to a once closed country.

Now, this story can be and is being replicated in country after country. For instance, we have Katleen Felix here today. She helped launch a new microfi-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

nance organization to connect members of the Haitian diaspora with access to capital to businesses and development projects on the ground in Haiti that would not qualify for traditional bank loans. So far, they've raised more than $1 million, created more than 760 jobs, and helped fund everything from clean water filters to halt the spread of cholera, to a new hen house in northeast Haiti that is earning income for 100 women.

We created the International Diaspora Engagement Alliance to support exactly these kinds of efforts. And I am so pleased that in its very first year the Alliance has already expanded into new and exciting endeavors. The Caribbean Idea Marketplace, for example, is a business competition sponsored by the governments of Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States, along with the Inter-American Development Bank, Scotiabank, Digicel, and other partners. It is offering up to a million dollars in matching funds to finance innovative entrepreneurial proposals from the Caribbean diaspora to create jobs and economic growth back in the region. The African diaspora marketplace is a similar effort that is already starting, supporting startups like EcoPower Liberia, which distributes an affordable electrical generator that runs on plentiful and cheap agricultural waste, and Promo Tunisia, which is promoting tourism and investment in Tunisia.

And today I'm pleased to announce that we are officially launching a new business competition for Latin America. This is the result of a partnership between the United States Government, Univision, the Inter-American Development Bank, Accion, WellSpace, and Boom Financial. We're going to find the best ideas and help them grow into successful businesses that create value and jobs throughout the hemisphere.

Now, we have other projects getting off the ground as well—a diaspora volunteer corps that will deploy highly skilled professionals on short-to-medium-term development assignments in the countries of origin; a new mentoring and networking web platform specifically for diaspora members trying to get involved and give back; an online portal created in partnership with the nonprofit Global Giving that will serve as a fundraising clearinghouse for diaspora organizations and initiatives.

We're working on all these fronts so we can try to help you harness the amazing energy out there to help people around the world lift themselves out of poverty and create new economic opportunities and bring together more partners to take on big, global challenges.

Now, one of those challenges that is front and center right now is the crisis in Syria, where the Assad regime continues to wage war on the Syrian people. We have a number of Syrian Americans here with us today, and I want to recognize the work of Syrian diaspora organizations to shine a light on what is happening in Syria and to carry the concerns of the Syrian people not only onto the pages of American newspapers, but also into the halls of Congress. They're helping to collect funds and humanitarian assistance for Syrians who are suffering because of this terrible violence, and they're trying to help those who've had to flee their homes and communities—some of them crossing over borders into neighboring countries. They're serving as a link between the international community and opposition activists on the ground.

We are obviously hoping to work to further a transition that will be bringing the people of Syria together to help form a new government, helping to rebuild the country, helping to avoid sectarian conflict. These are all extremely difficult challenges, but I think our efforts are enhanced by having the members of the Syrian diaspora, the Syrian Americans and others, being able to advise us.

The fact is that the United States has always benefited from the influx of talent and dynamism that diasporas of all kinds bring to our shores. And if you pick up The Washington Post today, you see that Baltimore, among other countries, is actually finally recognizing the importance that immigrants can play in revitalizing cities. And so they are reaching out and inviting—opening the doors of that venerable American city to immigrants from everywhere. Because in fact, we are well aware that our diversity is one of our greatest assets in the 21st century.

I met yesterday with the Prime Minister from—yes, the Prime Minister from Haiti, and he was very clear that they need more support from the Haitian diaspora. We saw that when the earthquake devastated Haiti, communities from New York to Miami and elsewhere in the world sprang into action. And Haiti has the unfortunate standing of losing more of their college graduates per capita than any country in the world. So reversing that, finding ways for people to help and even to move back, is one of the priorities.

Now, when countries across North Africa and the Middle East threw off autocrats and dictators and cried out for skilled professionals to help them build modern economic systems, modern political systems, Americans of Arab descent have been answering that call. And each year, Americans send billions of dollars in remittances throughout the world. In fact, remittances are the largest form of inflows into many, many countries. And what we're trying to do is figure out how to harness those remittances to do even more than what they are currently doing in supporting individuals and families.

So through the International Diaspora Engagement Alliance, through this forum, we're asking you for your ideas. We're asking you to help us. Give us the benefit of your experience and insight. We see so many places around the world being torn apart by ethnic, religious, racial, sectarian divides of all kinds. When I walk down the street, as I love to do in New York, and I see people living together and working together whose relatives back in the countries from where they came hate each other, kill each other, it just—it makes me so grateful for our country, but it also makes me so heartbroken that other countries don't have that opportunity, don't see beyond moving beyond the past. And I think Americans, like all of you, have such an opportunity to talk with, to support these kinds of changes in minds and hearts. Because democracy is not just an election; democracy is changing the way people relate to one another, work with one another, listen to one another. And there's no place that has more experience, since we are now the longest-lasting democracy, than we do. And there are no people with more credibility than all of you.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remarks by Acting Undersecretary Gottemoeller, August 30, 2012[4]

Acting Undersecretary for Arms Control and International Security Rose Gottemoeller gave the following remarks in Oslo

Undersecretary Gottemoeller. Thank you so much for having me here today at the Institute for Defense Studies (IFS) and thanks to Rolf Tamnes for organizing this event.

It was almost three years ago that President Barack Obama accepted the Nobel Peace Prize here in Oslo. In selecting the President, the Norwegian Nobel Committee stated that "[his] vision of a world free from nuclear arms has powerfully stimulated disarmament and arms control negotiations." That was in reference, no doubt, to his now-famous 2009 Prague Speech in which he stated that the United States would seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons, as well as to the efforts that followed.

New START

As the President directed, the United States has been working hard on the nuclear reductions agenda, and responsible nuclear weapons reductions are a central priority. One of the first steps—and the one that I was charged with—was the negotiation and ratification of a new arms treaty with Russia—the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or New START. With my excellent U.S. team, I spent most of 2009 and the first part of 2010 with my Russian counterpart negotiating the Treaty in Geneva, Switzerland. On April 8, 2010, President Obama and President Medvedev signed the New START Treaty. Then, following rigorous debates in the U.S. and Russia legislatures, the Treaty entered into force on February 5, 2011.

Norwegian Minister Counselor, Mr. Knut Langeland, underscored the international significance of New START when he stated to the UN Disarmament Commission in April 2011 that, "…the entry into force of the new START is an important step in building down existing nuclear arsenals with the objective to achieve their full elimination."

The Treaty has been in force for over 18 months now and the outstanding working relationship that developed during negotiations has carried over into its implementation. Both sides have worked cooperatively to resolve issues and questions as they have arisen.

For this Treaty year, which began in February, the United States has completed ten inspections and the Russian Federation has completed nine inspections.

Both sides have conducted delivery vehicle exhibitions. Shortly after the Treaty's entry into force in 2011, the United States conducted exhibitions of its B-1B and B-2A heavy bombers and the Russian Federation conducted an exhibition of its RS-24 ICBM and associated mobile launcher. That was the first time we had a chance to see the RS-24, the new Russian mobile missile with multiple warheads. We recently conducted an exhibition of a U.S. submarine that converted from a ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) and is now equipped with cruise missiles launchers (SSGN). The exhibition was conducted in order to provide assurances to the Russian Federation that the SSGN is incapable of launching SLBMs. This was the second of four SSGN exhibitions required by the Treaty.

The United States and the Russian Federation have also been sharing a veritable mountain of data with each other through our Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers (NRRC). Over the life of the Treaty so far, we have exchanged over 2,700 notifications. These notifications help to track movement and changes in the status of systems. For example, a notification is sent every time a heavy bomber is moved out of its home country for more than 24 hours.

In addition to the individual notifications, we exchange an aggregated database every six months. This living database of each side's strategic forces covered by the Treaty combines with the notifications to create a living, growing document that continuously tracks each side's strategic nuclear forces.

These data exchanges are providing us with a very detailed picture of Russian strategic forces and the inspections allow us to confirm the validity of that data. Of course, the verification regime is backed up by our own National Technical Means of verification, our satellites and other monitoring platforms.

Our experience so far is demonstrating that the New START Treaty's verification regime works, and it will help to pave the way for new verification measures for future treaties. Innovative and more intrusive verification measures will be needed for future nuclear arms reduction agreements. The United States has made it clear that we are committed to continuing a step-by-step process of nuclear arms reductions.

New Thinking

When President Obama laid out his vision for the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons in Prague in 2009, he made it clear that we will need to maintain our deterrence commitments, while also taking into account the threats of the 21st century. Success will only be reached through a careful process in which we maintain and support a safe, secure and effective stockpile—sufficient to deter any adversary and guarantee the defense of our allies- at the same time that we pursue responsible reductions through arms control.

Reductions in all categories of nuclear weapons- deployed, non-deployed and non-strategic- is more ambitious than anything we have attempted thus far. We are now spending a lot of time thinking about next steps in deterrence, stability and verification in arms control. I sometimes refer to it as a homework period, which is not a bad term for what we are doing. We are looking at fundamentals and lessons learned, as we work to develop new policies to advance our security.

In addition to exploring new ideas and concepts of deterrence and arms control, the President and his Administration are committed to reducing the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy. We are not developing new nuclear weapons or pursuing new nuclear missions; we have committed not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states that are party to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and in compliance with their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

nuclear nonproliferation obligations; and we have clearly stated that it is in everyone's interest to extend forever the more than 65-year record of non-use of nuclear weapons.

As we continue to reduce global nuclear stockpiles and include additional categories of weapons in that process, the importance of verification and transparency will only grow. Having confidence in what other states are doing is critical for creating conditions for further progress in arms control and disarmament, which is why we made our 2010 Nuclear Posture Review public and revealed the size of our stockpile—5,113 weapons as of September 2009.

As part of the implementation of the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review, the U.S. Government is currently reviewing its nuclear deterrence requirements to ensure that they are aligned to today's threats. What we already know, as President Obama said in Seoul in March, is we have more nuclear weapons than we need. This study will help shape our future negotiations with the Russian Federation.

ISAB Report

The State Department's International Security Advisory Board, or ISAB, is helping us with some "big thinking" on some of the national security challenges we face in coming years. This Federal Advisory Committee was established to provide the Department of State with a continuing source of independent insight, advice and innovation on scientific, military, diplomatic, political, and public diplomacy. The focus here is aspects of arms control, disarmament, international security, and nonproliferation. One of the ISAB's tasks was to undertake a study of how the United States could pursue and manage a transition from a world of mutual assured destruction to a world of mutual assured stability, characterized by increasingly interdependent states having incentives to cooperate on political, military, and economic issues, thereby reducing the need for adversarial approaches to managing security challenges. In examining the concept of mutually assured stability the ISAB was asked to consider possible components necessary for its success including: what would the United States need to see happen to have the confidence to consider very low numbers and, eventually, agree to the elimination of nuclear weapons? Their report titled, "Mutual Assured Stability: Essential Components and Near Term Actions" is posted on our website: www.state.gov/t/avc. It makes for an interesting read. While ISAB reports are not official State documents, their ideas are helpful as we make our own assessments.

Embracing New Technologies for Verification

The United States realizes that it is not just new policies that will help us with the next steps—we will need new tools, as well. We can negotiate the best treaties in the world, but they are only as good as the verification regimes. Today, we verify that countries are fulfilling their arms control treaty obligations, as mentioned earlier, through a combination of information exchange, notifications of weapon status, on-site inspections, and National Means, including so-called National Technical Means (NTM), like observation satellites and phased-array radars. All of the elements I've listed work together to make an effective verification regime. The question that I've been asking myself is: can we incorporate open source information technologies and social networking into arms control verification and monitoring, as well?

Our new reality is a smaller, increasingly-networked world: any event, anywhere on the planet, could be broadcast globally in seconds. That means it is harder to hide things. When it is harder to hide things, it is easier to be caught. The neighborhood gaze is a powerful tool, and it can help us make sure that countries are following the rules of arms control treaties and agreements.

New concepts, I recognize, are not invented overnight, and we don't understand the full range of possibilities inherent in the information age, but we would be remiss if we did not start thinking about whether new technologies can augment over half a century of arms control negotiating expertise.

We are just now starting to think about how governments can actively enlist their publics to help prove that they are in compliance with their arms control and nonproliferation obligations. To this end, on Tuesday, August 28, the U.S. Department of State launched the "Innovation in Arms Control Challenge" asking, "How Can the Crowd Support Arms Control Transparency Efforts?" We want to get ideas on if and how the everyday citizen can get involved in these efforts. While the contest can only be won by U.S. citizens or permanent residents, we encourage anyone who is interested in the subject to check it out. You can read more about the challenge on our website: www.state.gov/t/avc.

Looking Ahead

As you have heard, we have been pretty busy, but in order to be truly successful in our disarmament efforts, we will need the help of allies like Norway to move ahead. We especially appreciate Norway's forward-leaning and creative thinking on projects like the U.K.—Norway Joint Verification Experiment. Negotiating the next reduction treaty will not be easy, but I think that we are ready to meet the challenges ahead. This is due, in no small part, to the success of the New START Treaty. Its contribution to international security grows each and every day.

With that, I am happy to take some questions.

Remarks by Assistant Secretary Posner, September 5, 2012[5]

Assistant Secretary Michael Posner gave the following remarks in Nairobi, Kenya

Assistant Secretary Posner. I am delighted to be back in Kenya, a country I know well and where I have many friends and have spent considerable time. I want to commend the Kenyan government for hosting this conference and for the leadership role you are playing on Internet and information technology issues. I had the privilege of meeting with Minister Poghisio last December at the launch of the Coalition, and I am honored to be speaking after him today.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kenya now has well over 15 million Internet users, and leads East Africa in mobile penetration, with more than two-thirds of all Kenyans now connected. The fact that so many African countries are participating in this conference is a tribute to Kenya's leadership and convening power.

Kenya is not alone in embracing mobile and digital technologies. In neighboring Tanzania, for example, more than half of its citizens are using mobile phones. In Ghana, mobile penetration is now over 90%. These are statistics that were unimaginable a decade ago, and are cause for reflection and celebration.

Across Africa today, there is a new kind of race—a race to connect as many citizens as quickly as possible. By doing so, we are changing the development paradigm in ways none of us yet fully understand.

But while our technologies change, our fundamental principles and our development challenges do not. And so today I would like to say a few words about the role of Internet freedom, and how the free flow of information has implications for human rights and development.

I believe it's futile in the long run to try to separate one kind of freedom from another, to attempt to distinguish online freedoms from freedoms we enjoy in the physical world, or to try to keep the Internet open for business in a given country but closed for free expression. Because, as Secretary Clinton said at the first Freedom Online conference in The Hague in December, "There isn't an economic Internet and a social Internet and a political Internet: there's just the Internet."

Yet we continue to see attempts by countries to harness the economic power of the Internet while controlling political and cultural content. Some countries are devoting great resources to attempting to purge their online space or, like Iran, attempting to isolate their people inside what amounts to a national intra-net—a digital bubble. Such attempts may succeed for a limited time in some places; but at a cost to a nation's education system, its political stability, its social mobility, and its economic potential.

These are costs that no nation can afford. Whether developed or developing, the economies of the 21st century must compete to attract capital, to spark innovation, to nurture the entrepreneurial spirit of our people and provide the climate in which they develop enterprises that can provide jobs and sustainable growth.

Around the world, some groups tend to focus more on erasing the digital divide, extending Internet access that last difficult mile, and putting into the hands of the next two billion users a mobile device that also provides access to banking and education, medical and agricultural advice and so much more. Meanwhile, other groups tend to focus more on Internet freedom, ensuring that the evolving information and communication technologies remain the foundation of an open, global platform for exchange, where people can exercise their rights, and not a tool used to spy on or silence citizens.

Today, the world has not one but *two* digital divides—the divide between the two billion of us who have some form of Internet access and the five billion who have yet to get it, and also a divide between those who enjoy the free use of their connectivity, and those whose experience of the Internet is restricted by censorship of the information they can receive and fear of retaliation for the information they transmit. The access divide is narrowing, thanks to the efforts of people around the world and the hard work of people in this room. But the second divide, the freedom divide, is widening.

We must continue to work together to erase both divides, and these interests must be pursued in tandem.

This is a world in which citizens of democratic nations can have uncensored Internet access and thus membership in a global community that exchanges news, information, ideas, products, innovations and services. At the same time it's a world where citizens of some other countries remain trapped and isolated behind firewalls that stunt not just their political freedom but ultimately their economic opportunities. We must do everything possible to oppose what amounts to information curtain created by national governments that do not want their own people to have full and free access to the Internet.

There are no magic bullets that will erase this divide overnight, but the United States is committed to helping expand the benefits of information and communications technologies to other nations as an integral part of both our human rights and our development policies.

As President Obama wrote last week—in response to a question put to him during an Internet chat—"We will fight hard to make sure that the Internet remains the open forum for everybody—from those who are expressing an idea to those [who] want to start a business."

The United States takes a holistic approach to these issues. We recognize the linkages between broad-based access to 21st century communications and inclusive economic growth, and in turn between inclusive economic development and human rights. We know that human rights do not begin after breakfast. People need both. Without breakfast, few people have the energy to make full use of their rights. And after breakfast, they need both political and economic freedom to build profitable businesses and peaceful societies.

What does that mean in practice? It means the U.S. government is involved in a wide range of Information & Communication Technology development efforts from a variety of different agencies, from USAID to the National Science Foundation.

As a first step, companies, governments and civil society groups are starting to come together to work on this crucial issue. The goal is to find ways to achieve the UN target of providing entry-level broadband service for less than 5% of average monthly income. We recognize that governments have a role to play in creating the right incentives, ensuring healthy market competition, and supporting investment and continued infrastructure development that brings the Internet and mobile technology to more people in more places.

On the openness side, we have expanded our funding for Internet freedom advocacy and programming, for which the US Congress has allocated $100 million since 2008 to projects that provide technologies and knowledge to millions of people whose freedoms online are repressed. We are thrilled to be launching at this confer-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

ence the Digital Defenders partnership, an unprecedented collaboration among governments to provide support for digital activists under threat.

But just as we support individuals who are targeted every day for exercising their rights online, we are conscious of a broader threat to the future of Internet openness. Right now, in various international forums, some countries are working to change how the Internet is governed. They want to replace the current multi-stakeholder approach, which supports the free flow of information in a global network, and includes governments, the private sector, and citizens. In its place, they aim to impose a system that expands control over Internet resources, institutions, and content, and centralizes that control in the hands of governments. These debates will play out in forums over the next few months and years.

The United States supports preserving and deepening the current multi-stakeholder approach because it brings together the best of governments, the private sector and civil society to manage the network, and it works. The multi-stakeholder system has kept the Internet up and running for years, all over the world. We want the next generation of Internet users — whether small business owners or independent journalists—to be involved in shaping the future of the platform.

That next generation of users will not just be in the United States. Many of them will be here in Africa. That is why we need to ensure that stakeholders in Africa and the rest of the developing world are able to participate in the various multi-stakeholder forums where Internet governance issues are decided. And that is why we value our partnership with the governments of the Coalition and welcome Kenya's leadership, which leads by example in demonstrating that the right way to foster both access and openness—to harness the potential of these new technologies—is through inclusion and collaboration with everyone in this room.

Remarks by Acting Undersecretary Gottemoeller, September 6, 2012[6]

Acting Undersecretary for Arms Control and International Security Rose Gottemoeller gave the following remarks at The Hague

Undersecretary Gottemoeller. Mr. Director-General, Ambassadors, Colleagues, I am honored to speak today in this important room. I appreciate the opportunity to join the permanent representatives of States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention, and disarmament and nonproliferation colleagues in support of The Hague Week on Disarmament and Non-proliferation, as well as the 15th Anniversary of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. We can all be proud of the great strides we have made toward eliminating an entire category of weapons of mass destruction since the Convention's entry into force in 1997.

We will soon be approaching another anniversary. The Cuban Missile Crisis happened fifty years ago this October. We have come a long way since then, but today arms control is at a crossroads. We are facing new challenges and entering new terrain. We have not tried to limit non-deployed or non-strategic weapons before, which President Obama called for the day he signed the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) in April 2010 in Prague. We are thinking about how we would verify reductions in those categories and people have different ideas about what terms like 'non-strategic' even mean. Even more complicated: the lower the numbers and the smaller the components, the harder it will be to monitor compliance. To make matters more complicated, other weapons of mass destruction—chemical and biological weapons—pose even greater verification challenges, because they are dual use and difficult to disentangle from normal industrial or commercial processes. In order to deal with these new problems, we are going to need innovative ideas about how together, we can improve and augment the tools needed for the verification of treaties and agreements controlling weapons of mass destruction, as well as create new ones.

Today, I'd like to talk to you about one such idea—the incorporation of publicly available technologies and social networking into arms control verification and monitoring. Now it is important to point out that this is not a policy speech, this is an ideas speech. I've been making similar remarks around Europe and at universities and think tanks in the United States. The first incarnation was delivered at Stanford University for the Drell Lecture, named for noted arms control expert and physicist, Sidner Drell. The purpose of that lecture series is to think of new ideas for arms control. We have ambitious goals and we will need big ideas to meet them. It is also important to note that while I will focus on arms control, these ideas could lend themselves to nonproliferation policy, and safeguards policy as well.

Nowadays, we verify that countries are fulfilling their arms control treaty obligations through a combination of information exchange, notifications of weapon status—where in the country is that ICBM?—on-site inspections, and National Means, including so-called National Technical Means (NTM). NTM are big assets—observation satellites, phased-array radars—that individual countries manage and control. It has long been a rule of arms control treaties that we don't interfere with each other's National Technical Means—we allow each other these eyes and ears to monitor treaties. All of the elements I've listed off work together to make an effective verification regime.

I should say what we mean in the United States by effective verification. Ambassador Paul Nitze defined it as follows: —if the other side moves beyond the limits of the treaty in any militarily significant way, we would be able to detect such violations in time to respond effectively and thereby deny the other side the benefit of the violation. In our view, that's effective verification, and it has been the benchmark for verifying compliance in the United States. To help meet this benchmark, I've been asking myself, can we incorporate publicly available information technologies and social networking into arms control verification and moni-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

toring?

Our new reality is a smaller, increasingly-networked world where the average citizen connects to other citizens in cyberspace hundreds of times each day. These people are exchanging and sharing ideas on a wide variety of topics: why not put this vast problem-solving entity to good use? Today, any event, anywhere on the planet, can be broadcast globally in seconds. That means it is harder to hide things. When it is harder to hide things, it is easier to be caught. The neighborhood gaze is a powerful tool, and it can help us make sure that countries are following the rules of arms control treaties and agreements.

Open Source Information Technologies and Social Networking

But how exactly can publicly available information technologies improve arms control verification? Social verification can take place on a scale that moves from active participation, like public reporting and crowd-sourced mapping and analysis, to passive participation, like ubiquitous sensing or data mining and analytics. On this scale, the open source information technologies in use can improve arms control verification in at least two ways: either by generating new information, or by analyzing information that is already publicly available.

Let me give you some examples, to give you an idea what I'm talking about.
In 2009, in recognition of the 40th anniversary of the Internet, the U.S. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) held a competition where 10 red weather balloons were moored at visible fixed locations around the continental United States. The first team to identify the location of all 10 balloons won a sizable cash prize—$40,000. Over 4,300 teams composed of an estimated 2 million people from 25 countries took part in the challenge. A team from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology won the challenge, identifying all of the balloon locations in an astonishingly short time of 8 hours and 52 minutes. Of course, to win in such a short time or complete the challenge at all, the MIT team did not find the balloons themselves. They tapped into social networks using a unique incentive structure that not only incentivized people to identify a balloon location, but also incentivized people to recruit others to the team. The MIT win showed the enormous potential of social networking, and also demonstrated how incentives can motivate large populations to work toward a common goal.

Social networking is already being incorporated into local safety and emergency response systems. RAVEN911—the Regional Asset Verification & Emergency Network—is a multilayer mapping tool that supports emergency first response in Cincinnati, Ohio. RAVEN911 uses live data feeds and intelligence gathered through Twitter to provide details that cannot be given on an everyday geographic map, such as the location of downed electric power lines and flooded roads. Authorities are cooperating with communities throughout the region to develop and implement this emergency management system, in order to help fire departments assess the risks and potential dangers before arriving on the scene of an accident or incident. This open source system gives emergency responders a common operating picture, to better execute time-critical activities, such as choosing evacuation routes out of flooded areas.

In addition to collecting useful data, the ability to identify patterns and trends in social networks could aid the arms control verification process. In the most basic sense, social media can draw attention to both routine and abnormal events. We may be able to mine Twitter data to understand where strange effluents are flowing, or to recognize unexpected patterns of industrial activity at a chemical production plant. In this way, we may be able to ensure better compliance with existing arms control treaties and regimes, such as the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC).

Sound far-fetched? Just consider that even today, tablets such as your iPad have tiny accelerometers installed—that's what tells the tablet which way is up. But the accelerometers also have the capability to detect small shakes, like an earth tremor.

Now, imagine a whole community of tablet users, all containing an earth shake app, dispersed randomly around the country, and connected into a centralized network node. An individual shake could be something as simple as bumping your iPad on a table. But a whole network of tablets, all shaking at the same time? That tells you that something happened; knowing where all the tablets are and the exact time they started shaking can help you to geo-locate the event. It could be an earthquake, or it could be an illicit nuclear test. Of course, other sensors and analysis would have to be brought to bear to figure out the difference.
This is called ubiquitous sensing, that is, collecting data and basic analysis through sensors on smartphones and other mobile-computing devices. These sensors would allow citizens to contribute to detecting potential treaty violations, and could build a bridge to a stronger private-public partnership in the realm of treaty verification.

Application to the CWC

Since we are here at the OPCW, I want to dive a little deeper into how this can apply to the CWC. Compliance with the CWC is already monitored through a comprehensive international system of declaration and international inspections. Could this already robust system be further integrated with publicly available information, providing independent confirmation of official conclusions? It is something to think about. The Advisory Panel on Future Priorities of the OPCW has already identified this as an idea worth studying when it recommended that the organization should seek to find acceptable ways of using open source information to enhance the verification process back in 2011. Open source information covers a wide variety of data, including general media stories, self-reporting from companies and information officially released by governments. A recent informal paper from the Technical Secretariat noted that open source information can support the work of the Secretariat and of States Parties in the implementation of the CWC and the task of ensuring destruction of chemical weapons and working to prevent their re-emergence. The paper details a number of ways that publicly available information is already used within the Secretariat for purposes related to verification. The paper then goes on to suggest several additional

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

ways that publicly available information might be applicable. I applaud this effort to explore these ideas, whether or not those particular suggestions turn out to be useful to the Organisation.

The Challenges Ahead

Of course, for any of this to work, there are technical, legal and political barriers ahead that would need to be overcome—it is no easy feat to pursue these ideas. On the technical front, it would be necessary to work together to make sure nations—or industries—cannot spoof or manipulate the public verification challenges that they devise. We also have to bear in mind there could be limitations based on the freedoms available to the citizens in particular countries. On the legal front, there are many questions that must be confronted about active vs. passive participation. How can we prevent governments from extracting information from citizens without their knowledge, or manipulating results collected in databases? Further, in some circumstances, how can active participants be sheltered from reproach by authorities? It may be possible, through careful handling and management, to mask sources of information, even if locations are public.

On the political front, we cannot assume that information will always be so readily available. As nations and private entities continue to debate the line between privacy and security, it is possible to imagine that we are now living in a golden age of open source information that will be harder to take advantage of in future. These questions deserve to be considered.

Conclusion

In the end, the goal of using open source information technology and social networks should be to augment our existing arms control verification capabilities, and I challenge this community to think about how it can be done. As you leave here today, I challenge you to help us find new ways to use the new information tools at our disposal to move the world closer to successfully tackling the control and elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. If we were clever enough to invent these weapons, then surely we are clever enough to get rid of them.

Thank you again for inviting me here to speak. I would now be happy to take some questions.

Remarks by Acting Undersecretary Gottemoeller, September 7, 2012[7]

Acting Undersecretary for Arms Control and International Security Rose Gottemoeller gave the following remarks in Moscow, Russia

Undersecretary Gottemoeller. Thank you so much for having me here at the 2012 Moscow Nonproliferation Conference. Thank you for inviting me to speak. I have a fond regard for this conference, because I helped to organize some of its predecessors while I was at the Carnegie Moscow Center. Anton, under your capable leadership, the reputation of the Center for Energy and Security Studies increases every day. I have been travelling across Europe for the last two weeks and it is a great pleasure to be back here in Moscow. I always say that after spending three years at here, this city feels like a second home.

Cuban Missile Crisis

As you heard this morning, we are fast approaching the 50th anniversary of the Cuban Missile Crisis. At that time, the tension and pressure of the Cold War had built up so much that our nations teetered on the edge of annihilation. Thanks to the resolute and sober judgment of our leaders, we were able to surmount that crisis and we learned to mitigate the tension in our relationship through constant—and sometimes painstaking—communication.

To say that things have changed dramatically since October 1962 is an understatement. The Cold War ended and the world as we know it has been forever changed. It is hard to imagine that my predecessor who served at the State Department in 1962 could have predicted that 50 years later, I would be standing in Moscow, talking to a group of Russian and international policymakers, as well as to academics, experts and students about how we can work together on disarmament.

Thinking About the Next Steps in Bilateral Reductions

In Prague in 2009, when President Obama laid out his vision for the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons, he made clear that the road would be long and the goal may not be reached in his lifetime. But, in order to achieve this vision, we will need to follow a step by step process in which we maintain nuclear stability at the same time that we pursue responsible reductions in our nuclear arsenals through arms control.

The New Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty or New START was a first step on this path. When New START is fully implemented, we will be at the lowest levels of deployed strategic nuclear warheads since the 1950s—pre-Cuban Missile Crisis. The implementation of the Treaty is going very well, and the Treaty's robust verification system is providing the predictability and mutual confidence that will be essential to any future nuclear reduction plans.

We are now spending a lot of time thinking about next steps in arms control. I sometimes refer to it as a homework period, which is not a bad term for what we are doing. We are looking at fundamentals and lessons learned, as we work to develop new policies to advance our security.

Nonstrategic Nuclear Weapons

We would like to further the partnership between the United States and the Russian Federation on these issues. The entry into force of New START was an important step on the road, but not the end of the process.

One of the items on the agenda is the reduction of nonstrategic nuclear weapons (NSNW) and it is clear that there will be new challenges facing us. Although the 1990 Presidential Nuclear Initiatives reduced the readiness and numbers of NSNW, we have not tried to formally limit non-deployed or non-strategic nuclear weapons before, which President Obama called for the day he signed New START. We are thinking about how we

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

would verify reductions in those categories; experts have different ideas about what terms like 'non-strategic' even mean. Even more complicated: the lower the numbers of nuclear weapons and the smaller the components, the harder it will be to effectively monitor compliance.

That is why, over the course of the past few years, the Administration has taken a number of steps towards charting a path to reach this goal. We have been conducting internal reviews, while also reviewing this matter with our allies, including our NATO Allies, through the Deterrence and Defense Posture Review (DDPR). We have also been engaging with our Russian colleagues in a strategic stability dialogue.

In approving the Deterrence and Defense Posture Review at Chicago this past May, the Allies determined that NATO's current posture meets the criteria for an effective deterrence and defense posture. NATO has already dramatically reduced its holdings of and reliance on nuclear weapons, but has indicated that it is prepared to consider further reducing its requirement for nonstrategic nuclear weapons assigned to the Alliance. The context is important here: NATO would consider such steps in the context of reciprocal steps by Russia, taking into account the greater Russian stockpiles of nonstrategic nuclear weapons stationed in the Euro-Atlantic area.

The Allies have supported and encouraged the United States and Russia to continue their mutual efforts to promote strategic stability, enhance transparency, and further reduce their nuclear weapons in every category.

NATO Allies look forward to developing and exchanging transparency and confidence-building ideas with Russia, with the goal of enhancing European security and stability by increasing mutual understanding of NATO's and Russia's nonstrategic nuclear force postures in Europe.

I have been quite interested in how many non-governmental organizations are producing research and policy suggestions on the subject of NSNW. They have come up with ideas, starting with minimal transparency measures- such as exchanging white papers, moving on to other types of information exchanges; then hosting site visits to current or abandoned facilities; and conducting mock inspections. On this broad spectrum, these are all ideas worth thinking about.

ISAB Report

Beyond specific actions items, we are also exploring how we view stability and security between our nations through a post-Cold War lens. The State Department's International Security Advisory Board, or ISAB, is helping us with this kind of "big thinking." This Federal Advisory Committee was established to provide the Department of State with a continuing source of independent insight, advice and innovation on scientific, military, diplomatic, political, and public diplomacy aspects of arms control, disarmament, international security, and nonproliferation. One of the ISAB's tasks was to undertake a study of how the United States could pursue and manage a transition from a security foundation of mutual assured destruction to a security foundation of mutual assured stability, characterized by increasingly interdependent states having incentives to cooperate on political, military, and economic issues, thereby reducing the need for adversarial approaches to managing security challenges.

I would like to give credit to my predecessor, Ellen Tauscher, who coined the term "mutual assured stability."

Among the topics that the ISAB was asked to examine and assess in this area were the possible components of mutual assured stability: what would the United States need to see happen to have the confidence to consider reductions to very low numbers and, eventually, agree to the elimination of nuclear weapons? Their report, titled "Mutual Assured Stability: Essential Components and Near Term Actions" is posted on our website: www.state.gov/t/avc. It makes for an interesting read. While ISAB reports are not official State documents, their ideas are helpful as we make our own assessments.

The Indispensability of P5 Leadership

Of course, it is not just the United States and the Russian Federation that must show leadership on these issues. We must be joined by the United Kingdom, France and China. The Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty accords these P5 nations special status. They hold among them the overwhelming majority of nuclear weapons in the world, and progress on nuclear disarmament cannot be achieved without their active participation. But they must do more than participate; they must lead collectively. There are certainly more bilateral steps for the U.S. and Russia to take, but there is much the P5 can do to build the foundation for future multilateral steps. The recent P5 Conference in Washington, D.C. is a good example of this.

The Washington conference, in which Anton participated, was a part of a newly-established regular, multilateral dialogue among the P5, which includes discussion of nuclear verification and transparency. The P5 are committed to the implementation of the Action Plan that was adopted by consensus at the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The first constructive step in this direction took place at the Paris conference in June 2011, when the P5 met to discuss transparency, verification, and confidence-building measures—pursuant to the Action Plan—following on the groundbreaking meeting of this new P5 process in London in 2009.

All the P5 states recognize the fundamental importance of transparency in building mutual understanding and confidence. In Paris, we exchanged information on nuclear doctrine and capabilities and discussed possible voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures. We also conferred on the steps we have taken to implement our Article VI commitment, including reporting, a topic of great interest to the NPT community and one for which the P5 acknowledges a special responsibility.

The Washington P5 Conference began on June 27 with a U.S.-hosted public event titled "Three Pillars for Peace and Security: Implementing the NPT." This forum addressed how each of the three pillars of the NPT—nonproliferation, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and disarmament—plays a part in the move towards a negotiated, effectively verifiable elimination of nuclear weapons. At the conference, the P5 reaffirmed their unconditional support for the NPT and the NPT Review Conference's Action Plan, reaffirmed the commitments to promote and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

ensure the swift entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and its universalization, discouraged abuse of the NPT withdrawal provision (Article X), stressed the need to strengthen International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and promote universalization of the Additional Protocol, and worked to pursue their shared goal of nuclear disarmament under Article VI of the NPT.

The P5 continued their discussion of how to report on their relevant activities, and considered proposals for a standard reporting format. The P5 also discussed ways to kick start negotiations on a verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices that has stalled in the Conference on Disarmament. The P5 agreed on the work plan for a P5 working group led by China, to develop a glossary of definitions for key nuclear terms. We expect this process will increase P5 mutual understanding and facilitate further P5 discussions on nuclear matters.

We regard this year's Washington P5 Conference as a success, much like its predecessors. It has ushered in an energetic intersessional period. China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States agreed to continue to meet at all appropriate levels on nuclear issues, to further promote dialogue, predictability, and mutual confidence. We plan to hold a fourth P5 conference in the context of the next NPT Preparatory Committee in 2013.

The P5 has also been working with other relevant parties to promote the early commencement of Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT) negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament (CD). The FMCT is the next step in multilateral arms control, and it is time to move forward on it. Meeting several times over the past year, key stakeholder countries have discussed the way ahead, and this has already resulted in a more positive and cooperative atmosphere among these countries with regards to FMCT. Currently, I believe it is our very best chance at progress on the issue, and has the best potential to move the CD to action on the Treaty.

Conclusion

The United States looks forward to continued cooperation with both the Russian Federation and the rest of the P5, as we all work towards nuclear disarmament. We have much to do and many obstacles in our way, but together we can meet these challenges through communication, transparency, diplomacy and plain old persistence: step by step, we will make progress.

In closing, let me return to the Cuban Missile Crisis. We survived those terrifying days of the Cuban Missile Crisis, because our leaders chose reason and diplomacy over fear and brinksmanship. When negotiators from the United States and the Soviet Union first began having bilateral nuclear reduction talks, I am certain that in their minds they carried with them the darkest moments of that crisis. The reality of how close we came to our own destruction—the destruction of the world—must never be forgotten. We must remember why we are here talking today, why our nations meet each other at the negotiating table and why we must show leadership among our allies, partners and friends.

Thank you again for inviting me to join you today. I am now happy to take some questions.

Remarks by President Obama, September 25, 2012[8]

President Barack Obama gave the following remarks at the Clinton Global Initiative

Introductory Remarks Omitted

President Obama. [T]oday, I want to discuss an issue that relates to each of these challenges. It ought to concern every person, because it is a debasement of our common humanity. It ought to concern every community, because it tears at our social fabric. It ought to concern every business, because it distorts markets. It ought to concern every nation, because it endangers public health and fuels violence and organized crime. I'm talking about the injustice, the outrage, of human trafficking, which must be called by its true name—modern slavery.

Now, I do not use that word, "slavery" lightly. It evokes obviously one of the most painful chapters in our nation's history. But around the world, there's no denying the awful reality. When a man, desperate for work, finds himself in a factory or on a fishing boat or in a field, working, toiling, for little or no pay, and beaten if he tries to escape—that is slavery. When a woman is locked in a sweatshop, or trapped in a home as a domestic servant, alone and abused and incapable of leaving—that's slavery.

When a little boy is kidnapped, turned into a child soldier, forced to kill or be killed—that's slavery. When a little girl is sold by her impoverished family—girls my daughters' age—runs away from home, or is lured by the false promises of a better life, and then imprisoned in a brothel and tortured if she resists—that's slavery. It is barbaric, and it is evil, and it has no place in a civilized world.

Now, as a nation, we've long rejected such cruelty. Just a few days ago, we marked the 150th anniversary of a document that I have hanging in the Oval Office—the Emancipation Proclamation. With the advance of Union forces, it brought a new day—that "all persons held as slaves" would thenceforth be forever free. We wrote that promise into our Constitution. We spent decades struggling to make it real. We joined with other nations, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, so that "slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms."

A global movement was sparked, with the Trafficking Victims Protection Act—signed by President Clinton and carried on by President Bush.

And here at CGI, you've made impressive commitments in this fight. We are especially honored to be joined today by advocates who dedicate their lives—and, at times, risk their lives—to liberate victims and help them recover. This includes men and women of faith, who, like the great abolitionists before them, are truly doing the Lord's work—evangelicals, the Catholic Church, International Justice Mission and World Relief, even individual congregations, like Passion City Church in Atlanta, and so many young people of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

faith who've decided that their conscience compels them to act in the face of injustice. Groups like these are answering the Bible's call—to "seek justice" and "rescue the oppressed." Some of them join us today, and we are grateful for your leadership.

Now, as President, I've made it clear that the United States will continue to be a leader in this global movement. We've got a comprehensive strategy. We're shining a spotlight on the dark corners where it persists. Under Hillary's leadership, we're doing more than ever—with our annual trafficking report, with new outreach and partnerships—to give countries incentives to meet their responsibilities and calling them out when they don't.

I recently renewed sanctions on some of the worst abusers, including North Korea and Eritrea. We're partnering with groups that help women and children escape from the grip of their abusers. We're helping other countries step up their own efforts. And we're seeing results. More nations have passed and more are enforcing modern anti-trafficking laws.

Last week I was proud to welcome to the Oval Office not only a great champion of democracy but a fierce advocate against the use of forced labor and child soldiers—Aung San Suu Kyi. And as part of our engagement, we'll encourage Burma to keep taking steps to reform—because nations must speak with one voice: Our people and our children are not for sale.

But for all the progress that we've made, the bitter truth is that trafficking also goes on right here, in the United States. It's the migrant worker unable to pay off the debt to his trafficker. The man, lured here with the promise of a job, his documents then taken, and forced to work endless hours in a kitchen. The teenage girl, beaten, forced to walk the streets. This should not be happening in the United States of America.

As President, I directed my administration to step up our efforts—and we have. For the first time, at Hillary's direction, our annual trafficking report now includes the United States, because we can't ask other nations to do what we are not doing ourselves. We've expanded our interagency task force to include more federal partners, including the FBI. The intelligence community is devoting more resources to identifying trafficking networks. We've strengthened protections so that foreign-born workers know their rights.

And most of all, we're going after the traffickers. New anti-trafficking teams are dismantling their networks. Last year, we charged a record number of these predators with human trafficking. We're putting them where they belong—behind bars.

But with more than 20 million victims of human trafficking around the world—think about that, more than 20 million—they've got a lot more to do. And that's why, earlier this year, I directed my administration to increase our efforts. And today, I can announce a series of additional steps that we're going to take.

First, we're going to do more to spot it and stop it. We'll prepare a new assessment of human trafficking in the United States so we better understand the scope and scale of the problem. We'll strengthen training, so investigators and law enforcement are even better equipped to take action—and treat victims as victims, not as criminals. We're going to work with Amtrak, and bus and truck inspectors, so that they're on the lookout. We'll help teachers and educators spot the signs as well, and better serve those who are vulnerable, especially our young people.

Second, we're turning the tables on the traffickers. Just as they are now using technology and the Internet to exploit their victims, we're going to harness technology to stop them. We're encouraging tech companies and advocates and law enforcement—and we're also challenging college students—to develop tools that our young people can use to stay safe online and on their smart phones.

Third, we'll do even more to help victims recover and rebuild their lives. We'll develop a new action plan to improve coordination across the federal government. We're increasing access to services to help survivors become self-sufficient. We're working to simplify visa procedures for "T" visas so that innocent victims from other countries can stay here as they help us prosecute their traffickers.

This coming year, my Office of Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships will make the fight against human trafficking a focus of its work. They're doing great work. And I'm also proud to announce a new partnership with Humanity United, which is a leader in anti-trafficking—a multi-million dollar challenge to local communities to find new ways to care for trafficking victims. And I want to thank Johns Hopkins University, which will be focusing on how to best care for child victims.

Now, finally, as one of the largest purchasers of goods and services in the world, the United States government will lead by example. We've already taken steps to make sure our contractors do not engage in forced labor. And today we're going to go further. I've signed a new executive order that raises the bar. It's specific about the prohibitions. It does more to protect workers. It ensures stronger compliance. In short, we're making clear that American tax dollars must never, ever be used to support the trafficking of human beings. We will have zero tolerance. We mean what we say. We will enforce it.

Of course, no government, no nation, can meet this challenge alone. Everybody has a responsibility. Every nation can take action. Modern anti-trafficking laws must be passed and enforced and justice systems must be strengthened. Victims must be cared for. So here in the United States, Congress should renew the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. Whether you are a conservative or a liberal, Democrat or Republican, this is a no-brainer. This is something we should all agree on. We need to get that done.

And more broadly, as nations, let's recommit to addressing the underlying forces that push so many into bondage in the first place. With development and economic growth that creates legitimate jobs, there's less likelihood of indentured servitude around the globe. A sense of justice that says no child should ever be exploited, that has to be burned into the cultures of every country. A commitment to equality—as in the Equal Futures Partnership that we launched with other nations yesterday so societies empower our sisters and our daughters just as much as our brothers and sons.

And every business can take action. All

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the business leaders who are here and our global economy companies have a responsibility to make sure that their supply chains, stretching into the far corners of the globe, are free of forced labor. The good news is more and more responsible companies are holding themselves to higher standards. And today, I want to salute the new commitments that are being made. That includes the new Global Business Coalition Against Trafficking—companies that are sending a message: Human trafficking is not a business model, it is a crime, and we are going to stop it. We're proud of them.

Every faith community can take action as well, by educating their congregations, by joining in coalitions that are bound by a love of God and a concern for the oppressed. And like that Good Samaritan on the road to Jericho, we can't just pass by, indifferent. We've got to be moved by compassion. We've got to bind up the wounds. Let's come together around a simple truth—that we are our brother's keepers and we are our sister's keepers.

And finally, every citizen can take action: by learning more; by going to the website that we helped create—SlaveryFootprint.org; by speaking up and insisting that the clothes we wear, the food we eat, the products we buy are made free of forced labor; by standing up against the degradation and abuse of women.

That's how real change happens—from the bottom up. And if you doubt that, ask Marie Godet Niyonyota, from the Congo. Think about Marie's story. She was kidnapped by rebels, turned into a slave. She was abused—physically and sexually. They got her pregnant five times. In one awful battle, her children were killed—all five of them. Miraculously, she survived and escaped. And with care and support, she began to heal. And she learned to read and write and sew, and today Marie is back home, working toward a new future.

Or ask Ima Matul. She grew up in Indonesia, and at 17 was given the opportunity to work as a nanny here in the United States. But when she arrived, it turned out to be a nightmare. Cooking, cleaning—18-hour days, seven days a week. One beating was so bad it sent her to the emergency room. And finally, she escaped. And with the help from a group that cared, today Ima has a stable job. She's an advocate—she's even testified before Congress.

Or ask Sheila White, who grew up in the Bronx. Fleeing an abusive home, she fell in with a guy who said he'd protect her. Instead, he sold her—just 15 years old—15—to men who raped her and beat her, and burned her with irons. And finally, after years—with the help of a nonprofit led by other survivors—she found the courage to break free and get the services she needed. Sheila earned her GED. Today she is a powerful, fierce advocate who helped to pass a new anti-trafficking law right here in New York.

These women endured unspeakable horror. But in their unbreakable will, in their courage, in their resilience, they remind us that this cycle can be broken; victims can become not only survivors, they can become leaders and advocates, and bring about change.

And I just met Ima and Sheila and several of their fellow advocates, and I have to tell you they are an incredible inspiration. They are here—they've chosen to tell their stories. I want them to stand and be recognized because they are inspiring all of us. Please—Sheila, Ima.

To Ima and Sheila, and each of you—in the darkest hours of your lives, you may have felt utterly alone, and it seemed like nobody cared. And the important thing for us to understand is there are millions around the world who are feeling that same way at this very moment.

Right now, there is a man on a boat, casting the net with his bleeding hands, knowing he deserves a better life, a life of dignity, but doesn't know if anybody is paying attention. Right now, there's a woman, hunched over a sewing machine, glancing beyond the bars on the window, knowing if just given the chance, she might some day sell her own wares, but she doesn't think anybody is paying attention. Right now, there's a young boy, in a brick factory, covered in dust, hauling his heavy load under a blazing sun, thinking if he could just go to school, he might know a different future, but he doesn't think anybody is paying attention. Right now, there is a girl, somewhere trapped in a brothel, crying herself to sleep again, and maybe daring to imagine that some day, just maybe, she might be treated not like a piece of property, but as a human being.

And so our message today, to them, is—to the millions around the world—we see you. We hear you. We insist on your dignity. And we share your belief that if just given the chance, you will forge a life equal to your talents and worthy of your dreams.

Our fight against human trafficking is one of the great human rights causes of our time, and the United States will continue to lead it—in partnership with you. The change we seek will not come easy, but we can draw strength from the movements of the past. For we know that every life saved—in the words of that great Proclamation—is "an act of justice," worthy of "the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God."

That's what we believe. That's what we're fighting for. And I'm so proud to be in partnership with CGI to make this happen.

Thank you very much, everybody. God bless you. God bless America.

Remarks by Secretary of State Clinton, September 25, 2012[9]

Secretary Hillary Clinton gave the following remarks at the United Nations

Secretary Clinton. Thank you very, very much, Maria, and I am delighted to be able to join you for this meeting. Sometimes when you look at the busy schedule of the UN General Assembly, you see only the headlines, the problems, the hotspots, the conflicts, the challenges, and all of those are certainly important. But you also have to look at the trend lines, and you're here because you know that water is an issue that cuts across borders and affects every human being.

You know better than any that water management and resource issues are both a moral imperative and a strategic investment, and I want to thank everyone who has participated in this, because whether

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

you're talking about economic development or improving global health, whether you focus on promoting food security or building peace or coping with climate change or providing sustainable energy, access to clean water is critical. And the problems that are already coming to the forefront around the world will only intensify as populations grow and demands increase.

Now, this year alone in the United States, we've experienced extreme drought conditions in some parts of our country and devastating floods in others. We are well aware that Europe, Asia, and Africa have all experienced similar challenges. Now, you've already heard about our Intelligence Community Assessment on Global Water Security, and I hope that you will have if you didn't today have a chance to really study it, because water scarcity could have profound implications for security. The report found that dwindling supplies and poor management of water resources will certainly affect millions of people as food and crops grow scarcer and access to water more difficult to obtain. In fact, in some places, the water tables are already more depleted than we thought and wells are drying up.

In other parts of the world, water resources could become a real source of manipulation and increasing instability. And we want to get ahead of what those potential problems might be. We can't wait until we already have a crisis. So I think water should be a priority in every nation's foreign policy and domestic agenda, and we need to work together to advance cooperation on shared waters. Here at the UN, we have to work in our continuing efforts to ensure no child dies of a water-related disease and certainly no war is ever fought over water.

Now, to give just one example of what we need to be doing, the United States is working with the UN Development Program and other partners from not only governments but the business world, civil society, philanthropy, and academia on the shared waters partnership to help build really robust institutions. And also, as part of that, we will be looking for ways to establish online platforms to facilitate cooperation and to facilitate regional dialogues. All of us are here today because we understand the urgency. It is for me a critical issue that we have to start asking ourselves what are we going to do today and tomorrow to address.

Many of you are already working on developing practical solutions. How can we better connect and share what you've already learned? How can we build more effective institutions for managing shared water resources? And how do we bring safe drinking water and sanitation to all the world's people? I'm sure it's been said many times already today, but there are countries where there are more cell phones than toilets. How do we look for every possible creative, innovative approach to safe drinking water and sanitation? I'm excited, because I think this is now getting the attention that it so richly deserves. I thank Under Secretary Otero for leading our efforts inside the United States Government, and I look forward to hearing the results of your deliberations and working with you to try to implement your very practical solutions. Thank you all.

---

1. State Dept. Press Release, July 19, 2012.
2. State Dept. Press Release, July 24, 2012.
3. State Dept. Press Release, July 25, 2012.
4. State Dept. Press Release, August 30, 2012.
5. State Dept. Press Release, September 5, 2012.
6. State Dept. Press Release, September 6, 2012.
7. State Dept. Press Release, September 7, 2012.
8. White House Press Release, September 25, 2012.
9. State Dept. Press Release, September 25, 2012.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S105270361200127X Published online by Cambridge University Press