

**ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING WORKSHOPS FOR MEMBER
CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS OF THE CAMEROON FREEDOMS
OBSERVATORY**

Nationwide, from 6 to 23 July 2021

**SPEECH BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE CAMEROON HUMAN RIGHTS
COMMISSION**

Yaoundé Ntou'Ngou Hôtel

Tuesday, 6 July 2021

The Coordinator of the Active Citizenship Support Programme

The Vice-Chairperson of the Cameroon Human Rights Commission

**The Representative of the UN Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in
Central Africa,**

**Distinguished Commissioner, Member of the Cameroon Human Rights
Commission,**

The Permanent Secretary of the Cameroon Human Rights Commission

**The Head of the Project to Improve the Conditions for Exercising Freedoms
in Cameroon (PICEF),**

The trainers,

**The Regional Coordinator of the Cameroon Freedoms Observatory for the
Centre,**

Distinguished Representatives of Civil Society Organisations,

Distinguished guests, all protocols observed,

Dear participants,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am honoured to speak this day at this Workshop which aims at strengthening the organisational capacities of the member associations of the Cameroon Freedoms Observatory (hereinafter: "OLPC") - which I would gladly rechristen "Cameroon Observatory of Fundamental Rights".

I wish to begin by extending the deep gratitude of the members and staff of the Cameroon Human Rights Commission (hereinafter: 'CHRC') and the 241 civil society organisations (hereinafter: 'CSOs') that are members of the OLPC, to the European Union as a funding partner of the Project to Improve the Conditions for Exercising Freedoms in Cameroon (hereinafter: 'PICEF'). As Pierre Rosenberg said answering Philippe Beaussant's speech at the French Academy on Thursday 23 October 2008, "*You have before you an orchestra of violins and violas da gamba, flutes and harpsichords.*"

One of the objectives of this project is to promote a better-structured intervention of human rights organisations that collaborate with the Cameroon Human Rights Commission and to strengthen their operational capacities in promoting and protecting human rights. These ambitions were reflected in the creation of the OLPC, which to date brings together 241 human rights organisations that are active in the field, thus enabling an unprecedented network of civil society in the country, parallel to the network of 547 CSOs affiliated to the CHRC.

The series of organisational capacity building workshops for OLPC member CSOs responds to one of the central concerns identified during the Consultation on the State of the Human Rights Movement in Central Africa which took place in Kampala, Uganda from 5-7 April 2017. The meeting was organised by the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ), the Foundation for Human Rights Initiative (FHRI), the International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH), the Open Society Foundations (OSF) and the Pan-African Human Rights Defenders Network (PAHRDN). The purpose of the Consultation was to conduct a critical introspection on the situation and future of the Human Rights Movement in Central Africa, with a focus on the issues of legitimacy, legality, appropriation, sustainability, relevance and impact of this Movement in our sub-region, to remobilise it through new strategies, based on creative, clear, practical and incisive recommendations.

The trends then observed in the human rights movement in Central Africa are largely confirmed in Cameroon, which is likely to compromise the credibility and limit the effectiveness of CSOs dedicated to the respect for human rights in accomplishing their missions. The most recurrent data are related to weaknesses in the internal

governance of the organisations, which generally involve conflicts of leadership, lack of vision, conflicts of interest, opacity in management, limited knowledge of the laws and institutions working in human rights, the non-existence or inadequacy of procedures, positioning struggles, membership of political platforms, and even participation in political competitions.

However, the good health of a CSO depends on certain factors that are fundamental to its performance. These include a clear vision of the objectives pursued and exemplary leadership, a judicious choice of teams, transparent and efficient management of available resources, fulfilment of the association's missions according to appropriate procedures, respect for the duty of integrity and equanimity incumbent on human rights defenders, development of the capacity to forge and maintain ties with other organisations and institutions pursuing the same objectives, and promotion of healthy emulation with other CSOs.

It is clear that human rights organisations are not always given the red carpet, whether by government or by businesses. They may therefore face obstacles or appear powerless at times. These are challenges that need to be recognised. However, as you know, the work of human rights defenders, as exhilarating as it is, is also a demanding job.

This training is designed to enable OLPC and its Member Organisations, individually and collectively, to play their role effectively. Consistent with the recommendations of the Kampala consultation, the work of this workshop will certainly enable you to know, and to overcome, the structural, functional and situational difficulties that could hinder your actions as human rights defenders, or even compromise the operational efficiency of your organisation, and therefore that of the OLPC as a whole.

It was agreed in Kampala that the public and private actors of the Human Rights Movement in Central Africa mainly need to strengthen their capacities so that the sub-region benefits from a more effective, competent and professional Human Rights Movement. With regard to organisational capacity building, which is the subject of this training, it was recommended that all parties should lead by example:

- i) in the governance of human rights structures and beyond, as it has been found that many CSO leaders often do not respect the rights of their staff and do not respect the remit and rights of their colleagues (freedom of expression, freedom of opinion, etc.) and therefore do not lead by example
- ii) specialisation as the most effective way for smaller CSOs and for magistrates and lawyers dealing with human rights issues

- iii) establishing and respecting basic rules of work methodology such as the respect for the adversarial principle in dealing with cases of alleged human rights violations or abuses and the thoroughness of investigations to avoid biased reports
- iv) developing fruitful cooperation and synergies
- v) organising seminars and workshops for initial or ongoing training to update their knowledge
- vi) building their capacity on the ethics and integrity of human rights defenders, and finally
- vii) by instituting a management controller to ensure good governance standards are applied.

In this regard, the CHRC is setting a good example, as less than a month after the swearing-in of its new officers and members appointed by presidential decrees on 19 February 2021 - and before any deployment of the newly promoted on the ground - the CHRC, with the support of various partners including the United Nations Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa represented here, benefited from an initial training session for its members and some of its staff at the Mont Febe Hotel, from 25 to 28 May 2021. Two other special workshops will soon be organised to train the members and staff of the new human rights institution (hereinafter: "NHRI") of Cameroon on the new part of its remit, that is, the national mechanism for the prevention of torture, and then on the drafting of its rules of procedure.

I can therefore strongly encourage the leaders of the OLPC and, through them, all CSO members of the Observatory to make the most of this and future workshop series. In this way, you will contribute effectively, usefully and efficiently to the development of a human rights culture, the promotion of the rule of law and the strengthening of Cameroonian democracy.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It was noted at the Colloquium of 23 and 24 May 2019 on "*l'application des droits et libertés par les personnes privées: la liberté d'expression en droit comparé*", organised by the *Centre de Droit public comparé* of the University of Paris II Panthéon Assas, the institution that houses France's best law school, that the old dogmatic individual/public power relationship is outdated, as relations have become multipolar. The responsibility to respect, protect and implement human rights at the national level therefore lies both with the State, as a signatory to the relevant regional and international instruments, and with various non-state actors, whether

they are natural or legal persons, legally constituted or not. Especially since statistics from the National Human Rights Institution of Cameroon have established that 2/3 of the allegations of non-respect for human rights in our country in 2019 were attributable to... non-State actors. All of them, therefore, have an important role to play in the appropriation, promotion and strengthening of respect for human rights.

Since the Vienna World Conference on Human Rights, which led to the adoption of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action on 25 June 1993, CSOs have been formally recognised as important actors that can foster the entrenchment of a human rights culture in society. Thus, CSOs are nowadays an essential link in the chain of promotion and protection of human rights.

We are pleased to note with you the proliferation of associations and non-governmental organisations in our country, whose diverse fields of action span civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights.

All this, it must be recalled, was made possible following the promulgation by **His Excellency Paul Biya, President of the Republic**, of the Cameroonian Constitution of 18 January 1996, Law No. 90/053 of 19 December 1990 - recently amended and supplemented by Law No. 2020/009 of 20 July 2020 relating to freedom of association - and Law No. 99/014 of 22 December 1999 to govern non-governmental organisations in Cameroon.

The dynamism of Cameroonian CSOs is today unanimously recognised. We should therefore be pleased to note a number of commitments by your respective associations - with obviously variable results - in areas such as the defence of the rights of vulnerable groups, the fight against all forms of discrimination, the fight against human trafficking, the promotion of good governance, the encouragement of citizens to take part in the management of public affairs, facilitating remedies for victims of human rights violations, supporting government actions and interacting with regional and international human rights protection mechanisms, through issues as relevant as the security of persons and property, the fight against arbitrary detentions and arrests, the fight against enforced disappearances, the fight against torture, the fight against harmful cultural practices such as female genital mutilation and certain widowhood rites, access to justice, the right to a fair trial, conditions of detention, access to socio-political and economic life for the persons with disabilities, access to health care, access to education, child labour, early marriages, gender-based violence, consumer rights, the fight against corruption, women's empowerment, the rights of refugees or displaced persons, environmental protection, the right to decent housing and employment, the rights of the elderly, the rights of minorities and indigenous peoples or the fight against illegal migration.

Thus, your organisations are there to monitor and relay the pulse of the people, groups, communities and victims whose complaints they support and for whom they act on a daily basis, sometimes being, as the poet Aimé Césaire would say, "*la bouche des malheurs qui n'ont pas de bouche*" ["the mouth of misery that has no mouth"]. They denounce abuses and other violations of human rights, sometimes challenging the authorities to take action, making your voice "[*the freedom of those who slump in the dungeon of despair.*]"

This means that our civil society today is a catalyst for great hopes for the expression of the interests of the people who aspire to the full respect of their rights.

However, there is no doubt that only CSOs that demonstrate probity, professionalism and self-sacrifice can support the government in implementing the State's commitments to respect human rights. It is therefore worth emphasising that improving the situation of human rights and freedoms in Cameroon requires a well-structured, professional and credible civil society.

This is the ambition of PICEF, implemented by the National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms, which is now the Cameroon Human Rights Commission, based on Law No. 2019/014 of 19 July 2019, which establishes it, organises it and governs its functioning.

*

The Coordinator of the Active Citizenship Support Programme,

Distinguished participants,

Let me now situate the general issue of human rights in Cameroon. I will start with the characteristics of the actors in the human rights landscape here and elsewhere before defining the specific positioning of the CHRC as a sovereign institution in charge of human rights.

Concerning the categories of actors in the promotion and protection of human rights, the current global landscape enables us to distinguish, from the least important to the most important: CSOs, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), international organisations, treaty bodies and the classic branches of state power; it is understood that the CHRC, as an NHRI, is also part of the organs of the state.

CSOs are "active minorities", "self-appointed forces" (Hubert Védrine, *Les Cartes de la France à l'heure de la mondialisation*, p. 21) that operate at the level of each country. Any citizen who decides in the privacy of his or her room to create a CSO and surrounds himself or herself with a few relatives or acquaintances can have it set up overnight, *in the absence of any democratic mandate and without his or her*

expertise in the field having been attested to by any academic or professional body. Therefore, you will not be surprised to hear that one of the promoters of a Cameroonian CSO that regularly intervenes in the defence of the right to physical integrity, the right to participate in the management of public affairs (elections) and that calls for the overthrow of the Head of State to establish a transitional period is a mechanic by training who, above all, does not have the required expertise around him.

CSOs do human rights activism in ways that are typical to them, but their action is often trapped by five biases:

- i) the bias of funding which leads them either to exaggerate the reality in hope for the desired funding or to speak the language and work on the priority themes of donors and not on their own nor on those of the country where they are active. This is how some CSOs, far from acting out of conviction or in the interests of the people they claim to protect, become relays or parrots who are content to repeat the speeches dictated by donors, sometimes lurking in the shadows
- ii) the bias of seeking visas for their members or their relatives or for third parties in return for payment, by presenting them as people persecuted by the regime. This phenomenon was denounced on television a few years ago by Professor Kum'a Ndumbe III
- iii) the bias of incompetence or lack of professionalism that sometimes leads them to wage absurd battles such as that of a CSO that recently denounced "atrocities and acts of torture" following the landslide in Bafoussam, in the West Region, even though no allegation of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment was recorded in the course of this natural disaster
- iv) the political bias that leads some CSOs to betraying the integrity of the human rights defender by joining political party platforms or by making political demands such as support for insurrectionary marches and the call to overthrow the government in order to set up a transitional government
- v) the bias of conscious manipulation, which often consists in passing off legitimate acts of criminal repression as acts of persecution of a category of citizens (e.g. the case of the Hausa-language commentator for *Radio France Internationale* who was caught with the telephone of the son of the governor of a Nigerian state who had been murdered by Boko Haram, or the case, dating back to two decades, of a journalist

who, wishing to join his wife in a European country, insulted the Head of State. Once he was arrested, he began pretending to be a martyr for freedom of expression and was thus able to obtain the much sought-after visa.)

As for non-governmental organisations (NGOs), which are actually national associations that operate in several countries or whose members come from several countries, they are not very different from national CSOs. Hubert Védrine, the former French Minister of Foreign Affairs, who should certainly not be asked to do too much, classifies the 30,000 or so NGOs that exist throughout the world into several categories in his book mentioned above: "[*one encounters everything*]," he writes, "[*the best and the rest: generosity, dedication, networks, activism, interests, lobbies, beliefs and many real powers in disguise*]" (p. 20); so that without discernment, we very often have the wool pulled over our eyes in such a landscape, especially as the '*hierarchies of powers*' and '*global power relations*' are reflected in it. He explains: "[*It is, therefore, civil societies and NGOs from rich countries, with high media visibility, the means to communicate, and therefore the power to impose their interpretation of an event, that will exert the most influence in the world: the Americans, not those from Niger, Bolivia or Bangladesh! It is not the Nigerian NGOs that will intervene in Northern Ireland or demonstrate in Seattle!*]" (*ibid.*). Otherwise, how is it that we hear more noise in Paris about the 20 deaths in Ngarbuh than about the 43,000 deaths in the US war against Afghanistan since the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001? How is it that in Brussels there was more concern about the 10 terrorists executed in Chad in 2015 than about the 17,274 people murdered in the United States in 2017 or the 10,129 people killed in the United States in 2018 by firearms, with media and doctrinal sources mentioning even 40,000 deaths by firearms in this country in 2017, 60 per cent of which were suicides and 40 per cent homicides, i.e. an average of 3,334 deaths per month and 112 deaths per day...

NGOs frequently carry specific biases that distort understanding and sometimes undermine the noble cause of Human Rights in our country:

- the absurd idea that the State is the sole holder of human rights obligations since it is the only one to sign treaties, which means that the designated culprit and the only one responsible for all human rights violations in a country is the State. If this is the case, why do Security Council resolutions denounce the atrocities and attacks of Al Qaeda, the Islamic State or Boko Haram? Why do these same NGOs devote reports to human rights abuses committed by this or that terrorist group, to violence against women or parents' violations of children's rights? Why does the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child explicitly refer to parents or other persons responsible for the child as having "the primary responsibility for the upbringing and development of the child"? Why is the issue of "business and human rights"

promoted by the Francophone Organisation of National Human Rights Commissions and by all NHRIs in the world?

- the misconception that the rulings of regional and universal non-judicial human rights mechanisms are nonetheless binding, since these mechanisms have been created by binding treaties or because certain treaty provisions oblige States to implement treaties in force

- the idea that human rights standards are absolute dogmas that apply uniformly in all countries and admit no deviation or exception and that the State must apply them or be treated as a rogue State, disregarding the national margin of appreciation by national authorities, enshrined in the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights and in total disregard of the fact that even the Western conception of human rights is not uniform and that, in the United States, freedom takes precedence over dignity when it comes to respect for private life, while in Europe the opposite is true

- failure to abide by the principle of proportionality: non-state actors are responsible for 85-95% of human rights abuses in the Far North and North West/South West where they massively violate the right of millions of children to education by advocating school boycotts and attacking training institutions, pupils and teachers who are often harassed, chased, abducted, killed or beheaded; the right of millions of people to health by burning hospitals. The right to property is violated by arson of public and private property or by stealing livestock and other goods. The freedom of trade and industry is violated by attacking businesses and burning shops, etc. How can it be explained that in this context, 95-98 per cent of an Amnesty International report on these regions is devoted to allegations of human rights abuses by states and only 2-5% to abuses by Boko Haram? Normally, the proportionality principle requires that the majority of the report be devoted to denouncing the most massive abuses and their perpetrators.

As for international organisations, they generally have a more objective and technical approach when they are universal (UNHCR, UNDHR-AC, UNHCR, Commonwealth, Organisation internationale de la Francophonie, etc.), although they are often the target of numerous manoeuvres and attempts at manipulation by interested actors who bring up human rights when they do not invade them with allegations of human rights violations – often very selectively – to persuade them to make decisions or express themselves in their own interests.

The landscape of regional or sub-regional organisations is very mixed. Some regional organisations proselytise their conception of human rights and want to impose their values throughout the world by conversion, such as the specific protection of LGBT-I people, whom they now refer to as "key persons", while others effectively protect human and people's rights within their sub-regional space, such as

ECOWAS, whose Court of Justice has been given jurisdiction in this area for direct recourse from citizens, without the requirement of prior exhaustion of domestic remedies and without further concern for what happens outside their geographical space. Others are progressively laying the groundwork for the protection of human rights, such as CEMAC, through its revised Treaty of 2009, whose preamble also reaffirms the commitment of Member States to human rights, the rule of law and gender issues, and through the increasingly bold case law of its Court of Justice in this regard.

At this juncture, I would like to appeal for the valorisation of national and African human rights instruments and mechanisms, because the other regions of the world systematically give priority to their own instruments and mechanisms, and do not hesitate to give them preference over universal instruments and mechanisms.

As for the major powers, they are in the unilateralism of empires: it is what they are doing that is right and they evaluate what others are doing in terms of their national interest.

The penultimate category of human rights actors that I will mention briefly before turning to NHRIs are the bodies created by the human rights treaties, known as the "*treaty bodies*"; they speak the law, but sometimes with a great deal of activism, no doubt because of their extensive interactions with CSOs and NGOs, or because of the origin of their funding. Thus, while the treaties specify that such and such a body makes recommendations, their statements are often "judicialised", i.e. structured like court decisions, and at the end, we see the mention: "decides". The authors of *Traité international des Droits de l'homme*, a 1721-page reference work published in Paris in 2018, point out that *the treaty bodies do not have binding decision-making powers. Their decisions and observations are no more than recommendations* (p. 279) and have only *persuasive authority*, especially when cited by national, regional or international judicial bodies. Treaty bodies are above all *authorised interpreters of the treaty they supervise* and their rulings, therefore, have a certain *interpretative authority*, which enables them to play a role *in the contemporary construction of international human rights law* (p. 280).

It is my firm belief that this way of presenting recommendations of treaty bodies as judicial decisions confuses the different categories of rulings of international mechanisms and dilutes the force of the truly binding statements. This uniformity no longer makes it possible to distinguish between a judgment and a recommendation, the conclusions of a study and the position of an expert; above all, it does disservice to the noble cause of human rights. The community of human rights defenders repeatedly deplores the non-compliance with the judgments of the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, whose decisions are undeniably binding. On this point, States should do everything possible to give legal force to and

bring their peers to respect the decisions of the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights.

There are also "*stowaways*", "*passengers with no ticket*" among the members of the human rights community. Political parties are among those. While the existence of human rights focal points within political parties is legitimate, as are specialised bodies for monitoring human and peoples' rights issues, it is more difficult to understand why a political party would claim to produce a report on the state of human rights in the country, because the noble cause of human rights, as Paul Reuter – an eminent French jurist – said during a plea before the International Court of Justice concerning legal construction, requires from all those involved "the clarity and serenity that pushes back interests and passions". However, a political party by definition defends specific interests, to gain or retain power. This disqualifies it as such from producing a human rights report with integrity, in any country whatsoever. It is for this reason that the Code of Conduct for CSO members of the Cameroon Freedoms Observatory expressly prohibits member CSOs from joining political party platforms or polluting the noble cause of human rights with political positions.

Distinguished participants,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let us turn to NHRIs, and especially the CHRC. Their specificity lies in their being independent bodies set up by States to promote and protect human rights free from all the biases mentioned above and with integrity. Unless this is done effectively, i.e. with measurable results, we will leave the country open to the destructive forces of all networks and powers that manipulate human rights for purposes that have nothing to do with this noble cause.

Although human rights fall within the scope of international cooperation and are used by some countries for ulterior motives, States rightfully consider that respect for human rights is a matter of national interest, since respect for human rights - in all sectors of activity - is an important lever for progress, development and the flourishing of the peoples under their responsibility. Some countries have given their NHRIs very broad mandates, including the fight against corruption or the role of national ombudsman. In some neighbouring countries, the NHRI is ranked among the priority institutions for the release of resources, so that funding is always sufficient and available.

The distinctive feature of NHRIs is related to their pluralist and inclusive composition, which reinforces their independence and efficiency compared to the networks, lobbies and real powers that often hide behind CSOs or human rights NGOs. The CHRC thus includes a doctor representing the National Order of Medical Doctors, a lawyer representing the Bar Association, a representative of persons with disabilities, a representative of journalists' unions, a representative of women's associations, an expert in prison administration, an expert in trade union issues, an academic specialising in human rights, etc. A strong and effective NHRI is the best way to ensure the effectiveness of respect for human rights in a State and to safeguard the best interests of the State in promoting and protecting human rights.

NHRIs are so important that they exist in about two-thirds of the States in the world and in 47 out of 53 African countries. They are governed by the Paris Principles adopted on 20 December 1993 by UN General Assembly resolution 48/134.

NHRIs are grouped at the global level in the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions which has 117 members with sub-sets in each continent (Africa, Europe, the Americas and Asia-Pacific). The Network of African National Human Rights Institutions has been operating since the Yaoundé Declaration adopted during the first meeting of African National Human Rights Institutions in February 1996. It was re-founded in 2007 and is currently housed in Nairobi at the Kenya NHRI.

The Commonwealth of Nations and the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie each have their network of NHRIs, with 46 and 34 NHRI members respectively.

There are therefore several NHRI networks that work independently, just like national NHRIs. The independence of NHRIs is firstly affirmed from the personal point of view of their members, through their mandate which can only be revoked in exceptional circumstances, the system of incompatibilities and the consideration of real or apparent conflicts of interest. The organic independence of NHRIs is also ensured by the freedom to exercise their mandate: the CHRC does not receive instructions or a roadmap from the Prime Minister as to how to carry out its missions; its members are not exposed to reprisals (arrest or hindrance); the budget of the CHRC is adopted by Parliament and experience shows that this budget is easier to release than the one-off allocations granted to the Commission on the instructions of the Government. As an advisor to the Government and Parliament on human rights, the NHRI makes recommendations and can support both in their activities to promote or protect human rights. Concerning the judiciary, the NHRI ensures the proper functioning of the public service of justice as part of the respect for the right to a fair trial, from the judicial investigation to the complete execution of the court decision. It can be seen that there are significant differences between the other State bodies and the NHRI, although it is also one of the State bodies.

Cameroon's NHRI is currently ranked A, the status of NHRIs fully compliant with the Paris Principles. But the CHRC will be evaluated in two years, as part of the accreditation process of the Global Alliance of NHRIs. The challenge is to maintain our A status, which is a source of various rights and prestige. This status will only be maintained if we meet all or most of the pre-defined criteria.

*

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The work done by human rights defenders is very complex, in that it requires historical, political, philosophical and, of course, legal knowledge, with the application of national law, African regional law and international human rights law. It requires the use of appropriate and sometimes specific intervention methods. However, it is exhilarating, since it contributes concretely to the improvement of the well-being of the people through full respect for their individual and collective rights.

However, to fulfil your mission in the best possible way, you must not only systematically refer to the Constitution, to regional and universal human rights instruments, but also to case law, while scrupulously complying with the regulations governing the OLPC. These instruments call on you to respect the institutions and the law. They call on you to demonstrate responsibility, probity, impartiality, integrity and transparency. Do not lose sight of the fact that, as professionals in human rights protection, your errors and mistakes in this area are increased by the weight of bad faith.

If we agree with Anatole France that "*[the future is the convenient place to dream]*", I would hope that this training will contribute to increasing the operational efficiency of the OLPC, while promoting healthy emulation of the actors called upon to lead the Human Rights Movement in our dear and beautiful country.

Long live human rights!

Long live national and international cooperation on human rights!

Long live Cameroon, united, strong, and indivisible!