Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and let me

commend you for calling this very important hearing on the increasing

worrisome situation in Sudan.

I welcome Assistant Secretary Frazer to the Committee. I look

forward to working with her and hearing her testimony.

I would like to commend you for the outstanding work that you

have done in your previous capacities in the National Security

Council and as an Ambassador to South Africa, and it was a pleasure

traveling with you to Liberia recently to observe the elections

in Liberia, which I thought went extremely well and we look forward

to the runoffs on next Tuesday, a week from now.

I know that you travel to other countries and I would be interested

at some time to assess what your findings were.

Since you are certainly new in this position, you just happen to

be the messenger. So we don’t want you to take it personally. Perhaps

we will see some changes under your tenure.

We certainly feel that the loss of Dr. John Garang was a tremendous

setback to the peace accord in Sudan. As the Chairman said,

I have been traveling to Sudan since the early 1990s and Dr.

Garang has been a tireless warrior for the people of South Sudan

and we were all saddened with his untimely death, and certainly

we feel it has been a setback to the process.

I had the privilege to attend the wake in Yay, the day before the

funeral in Juba, and you could see on the faces of the Sudanese the

sorrow and sadness that sort of besieged the country.

We will have to move forward, but I hope that all of the work

that he has done and even his death has not been in vain.

My objective for listening to your testimony at this hearing is to

get a clarification on United States policy toward the current regime

in Sudan. We do have a National Unity Government, which

was recently formed, but I have serious concerns about the commitment

of the ruling National Congress Party to real, true, lasting

peace in Sudan.

We must not let up pressure on the government. We must ensure

that they fully implement the Comprehensive Peace Agreement

and end the violence in Darfur without any further foot-dragging

and excuse-making.

At the same time, we must provide increased assistance to the

Government of Southern Sudan, led by Salva Kiir, who I first met

in 1994 and who has certainly been a close ally of Dr. John Garang

for as long as the movement has been going forth.

One hundred and five Members of Congress sent a letter to Secretary

Rice yesterday expressing the following concerns: One, recent

developments in Darfur, including the kidnapping and killing

of African Union troops and humanitarian workers, the closure of

main roads leading out of the capitol of Western Darfur.

It is estimated by the United Nations that nearly three-quarters

of a million refugees are beyond the reach of humanitarian aid,

which means that we will start seeing tragedy again by the fact

that resources cannot get to these people.

Delay in the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement,

which mandates the immediate withdrawal of government

troops from disputed areas, government reform of civil service, security

forces and a judiciary and the establishment of an investigatory

commission into the genocide in Sudan.

An apparent softening of United States policy toward the Government

of Sudan was also expressed in the letter to Secretary

Rice.

I have followed the crisis in Sudan, as the Chairman mentioned,

for a long time, for at least 21 years that the war had been going

on between the Islamist Government in Khartoum and the Sudan

People’s Liberation Army and Movement (SPLM).

As you are well aware, more than 4 million people were displaced

in that civil war since 1989 and over 2 million people have died as

a result of that struggle that had gone on when Sharia law was im-

posed on the entire country to those who are Christians, Animists,

agnostics, and atheists and felt that they should not be under

Sharia law, because they did not believe in the Koran.

During that time, the National Islamic Front, the NIF Government,

led by Omar El Bashir, committed innumerable brutalities

and unimaginable scope against the people of the South and

marginalized the areas of Southern Blue Nile and Nuba Mountains.

It was the longest running war in Africa, until January 9, when

the parties signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA).

I was there in Nairobi for the signing and was cautiously hopeful

for the long-awaited peace in Sudan. However, once again, when

the North/South conflict reached the point where an agreement

was imminent, the government began its attack on innocent civilians

in Darfur, which caught us all by surprise.

With the help of the Janjaweed, they destroyed villages and communities,

maimed, raped, killed, terrorized the people of Darfur.

We know that the AU mission is simply not deployed at the adequate

numbers to quell the violence in Darfur and that its mandate

must be strengthened to protect civilians. Still I commend the AU

for the tremendous role it has played, but more is needed to protect

the innocent civilians of Darfur.

The people of Sudan have suffered tremendously under the hand

of this government, which by the way came to power in a bloody

coup in 1989, as I mentioned. Concerned citizens of this great country

have devoted years to ending the bloodshed in Sudan, first

South Sudan and now Darfur.

We could be looking at a crisis in East Sudan soon as well, if the

government does not stop its genocidal behavior in that region.

The message must be clear and concise. Until the following occurs,

the United States is ill-advised and must not normalize relations

with the Government of Sudan. It is just that simple. The crisis

in Darfur is resolved peacefully is when we should look at a

normalization of our relations with the Government of Sudan.

When the Janjaweed and allied militia are disarmed and demobilized

is when we should look at normalized relations with Sudan.

When the Government of Sudan is cooperating with the ICC is

when we ought to normalize relations with Sudan. When suspects

are handed over for trial to the ICC is when we should normalize

relations with Sudan.

When the Government of Sudan negotiates in good faith in the

East is when we should normalize relations with Sudan. When the

Government of Sudan is cooperating fully to disarm, demobilize,

and hand over the LRA leaders who are killing children, have done

it for 18 years and go to Sudan for cover, that is when we should

normalize relations with Sudan.

When the CPA is being implemented in good faith and without

delay, including the implementation of the Bayee Commission Report,

withdrawal of the government forces from the South as called

for in the CPA, setting up of key commissions as called for in the

CPA, revenue sharings as called for in the Wealth Sharing Agreement,

that is when we should normalize relations with Sudan.

The Sudan crisis is not abating. We must be firm with Khartoum.

We must ensure compliance. We must stop the killing.

No more visits from the Sudan intelligence chief or other architects

of genocide should be tolerated in this country.

No more waiving of certain sanctions, like that allowing Sudan

to hire lobbyists in Washington for $530,000 so they can clean up

their image.

I look forward to hearing your testimony.

Thank you very much. Thank you for your testimony

and I would just like to ask a few questions.

With USAID, how is it going to organize itself? We are hoping

that there would have been some peace dividends after the signing

of the accord. And will there be a permanent mission in Southern

Sudan, or will you work out of Khartoum, or would there be a special

coordinator to deal with the eight projects, which would be

very important to the South, since they are certainly in need of development?

Secondly, with a brand new government being set up, I wonder

if the SPLM will be given specific support in setting up regional

governments in Nuba and Southern Blue Nile and other places.

Since they have to start from scratch, it seems that they would

need financial and technical support and I wonder whether the

United States Government, through USAID or other agencies, have

any formal plan to work with the Government of South Sudan.

Also I noted that, and I am not sure of the funds that the Chairman

was talking about, but there was $100 million requested from

the emergency supplement and it was reduced in Congress by almost

two-thirds. Only $37 million was appropriated.

I wonder if the Administration is going to come forward with a

new request and whether there will be a need for us to try to develop

a strategy to get those funds in play.

You mentioned about the commissions that were called for in the

CPA, which you mentioned in your testimony in response to the

First Vice President’s visit here.

I wonder whether pronouncements that are being made by the

Government of Sudan, are they real or is it just because Salva Kiir

is coming here and to try to have a smooth series of meetings here

that the Government of Sudan is acting as if it is trying to play

ball?

I mean it is very difficult to tell the real intent, but I wonder

whether the feeling of the Administration is that these are things

that are just being done because of the visit here by Salva Kiir.

Thank you very much. This is my final two questions.

The State Department, as you know, in the last Administration,

did a very intensive interviewing of I think over 1,200 individuals

that built up a case to declare genocide in Darfur. It would

appear to me that this information would certainly be helpful for

the ICC. I know that there is the problem of formal relations, although

the U.S. did abstain and therefore allowed the International

Criminal Court to proceed, and for that we are very

thankful.

However, we do feel that since we did indicate, by our abstention,

that we felt that there should be prosecutions going on in

Sudan by the ICC, it would appear that we would try to cooperate

with the court and to allow the court, if they asked, to review any

materials that was taken that Secretary Powell built a case of

genocide upon.

So I would hope that some way there can be cooperation between

ICC and our State Department.

Just finally, if you might indicate to us, recently a senior diplomat

was sent to Khartoum and I just wonder, is the State Department

intending to name him as an Ambassador?

Of course, as an Ambassador, are we getting ready to normalize

relations with Sudan?

Last question or two. We mentioned that there has

been 105 armed personnel carriers delivered to the AU mission to

go into Sudan, but from what I understand, they were supposed to

be delivered but the Government of Sudan has blocked them from

being delivered and have refused to cooperate.

I wonder if you could comment on that? And just finally, I don’t

know whether Mr. Roger Winter speaks Arabic, but I was under

the impression that he was some type of an envoy. I don’t think

anyone knows Sudan any better than Roger Winter. I think that

all Members of the Committee have a great deal of respect for his

long-time interest, and more than interest, but he has dedicated

his whole life working in Sudan, even before becoming part of the

government, and I just wonder what role will he play, if in fact we

have a more senior diplomat in Khartoum?

I have no more questions. I just want to say that the

Government of Sudan, once again, 105 armored personnel carriers

are supposed to go in, but they hold them up. ‘‘We may let a third

in. We will get back to you next week.’’

You know it is the same thing they have been doing decade after

decade after decade. Now I know we need to try to work along with

them, but you see it is the same bloody hands that let Osama bin

Laden live in that country from 1991 to 1996, that planned the

bombing of the Nairobi and the Dar es Salaam, U.S. Embassies,

people I knew had been there a week before and knew families that

worked in that Embassy who are dead now.

Same government and once again, we are going to start fiddling

while Rome burns and dealing with this government. We ought to

have a policy that tell them they either have to make the policy

work or we ought to come down with some serious policy against

them.

This business about, we let a few in and we may let them out,

and some of our humanitarian groups now have not been issued

any more permits to come in, the Doctors Without Borders were

given a hard time because they were outspoken.

It just continues as people die everyday in this new millennium.

It makes no sense at all.

Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We realize that one lobbyist

can’t change this Administration, probably. However, the

thing that is baffling is why would the Administration, even though

one lobbyist can’t necessarily change the policy of this Administration,

why would the Administration break an 8-year sanction, regardless

to whether the lobbyist can change it or not, to change

your sanctions law to allow lobbyists be paid $530,000 by the Government

of Sudan to lobby the Congress and the Administration?

On one hand we say that we want to really show Sudan that we

are serious. How do you show them that you are serious when you

allow them to have a lobbyist come in?

I know it wasn’t made on your level. However, I am simply saying

it sends the wrong message. It sends the message that the Administration

is not serious about Sudan.

We had sanctions on gum arabic. The Administration will allow

gum arabic to come into this country unimpeded, because gum arabic

is something that some corporations want and the Administration

is not going to stop gum arabic from Sudan from coming in,

in spite of the fact that we have sanctions on Sudan.

So you see the thing that is frustrating is that we say the right

things, we talk things, but then on the other hand, it seems like

we concede and we cajole and we finesse this Government of

Sudan.

We don’t have to do that. We are the most powerful Nation in

the world. We don’t have to play around with Sudan. There is no

excuse for it. It is disgraceful. It absolutely makes no sense. Why

do we have to play around with Sudan? We don’t play around with

anybody else. When we are serious about something, as we can see,

we make our feelings known. But why do we play around with

Sudan? It makes no sense at all to allow a law to be changed, to

allow a lobby firm to come in to lobby.

If I were Bashir, I would say, ‘‘Things are going all right, you

know they wink here and nod and we are just going to do the same

thing.’’

If I were the governor of Sudan, I would continue to do what I

am doing anyway, because I would say, ‘‘They are not serious. Why

aren’t they serious? Well, they are letting our gum arabic come in.

They are letting us violate the CPA. They allowed a lobbyist to

come in.’’

They sent a top former Ambassador, a very distinguished person,

to be here. Not to be an Ambassador, but to just keep an eye on

things that are going on.

I think that, and I can’t understand why, our Government continues

to allow this dastardly, murderous government to have a

wink and a nod. I just can’t understand. It is not a question. It is

just a statement.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

. I just want to say that you know we commend your

department for the success in Liberia and the runoff that is coming.

Outstanding job done by the State Department.

We are pleased and fingers are crossed that Burundi will move

forward, and although the United States was not totally involved,

watch and encourage, I am sure, South Africa to move forward.

We are pleased that the difficult job in the DRC is being moved

forward and your recent visit to Zimbabwe, to Tanzania rather,

dealing with the elections in Zanzibar and that tension that has

been there for a decade or so is commendable.

We do feel that things that the Department is doing is moving

in the right direction. That it is the right thing to do.

However, as you can see, Members of Congress are very frustrated

at the United States policy in Sudan. We have been frustrated

for a long time and we think that because of the lack of real

commitment on the part of the Administration, that all of those

things that are going well gets lost, when we sit around and allow

a government like that to have the privileges that it does. And I

hope that the message gets back up the food chain that we are very

serious about the situation and that we expect our Government to

start acting in a more assertive and in a more responsible manner

as it relates to Sudan.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.