Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the committee.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of the members, and

there is no question that Congress has been very active legislatively

in providing support. The Darfur Peace Accountability Act

was signed by the President just as I was arriving on my first trip

as Envoy in October. And of course you signed the Executive order,

but also for the money that Congress has appropriated. The United

States Government has spent $2.7 billion in Darfur, mostly on humanitarian

assistance to keep people alive in the camps and also

to provide support for the African Union troops.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit my formal written remarks

for the record, but since we have limited time, I am going to go

through a much shorter summary of those remarks here.

The President appointed me as a Special Envoy for all of Sudan

on September 11th in his speech before the General Assembly at

the United Nations. This was 5 months ago. The President and the

Secretary both gave me a charge to take much more aggressive actions

in dealing with this crisis, and that is what we have done.

I have been going myself to Darfur as a USAID official and NGO

worker since 1990. My first trip there was during a Darfur war between

the poor people and the African tribe and the largest tribe

and the Arabs in the late 1980s. That was nowhere near as bad

as this, but I realized then this is an unstable area.

The second war took place in the mid-1990s between the Masalit

people and the Arabs and now we have a war much more massive

than that.

I teach of course at Georgetown University. I am a professor

there. I also do this job, and I do want to say that I am very proud

of college students across the country who have been mobilizing on

this issue. The first organized college campus on the Darfur issue

was Georgetown. They started a group called Stand that now has

spread to 2 or 300 college campuses. So I am proud of my students

at Georgetown and I want to thank President DiGioia for allowing

me the time to do this as an extra duty.

I want to go through the assumptions that we have made in developing

our policy. The first is, and I know this is difficult for people

to accept, but the best way for us to protect the people in

Darfur is a political settlement that is negotiated by all the sides,

including some of the people who have committed some terrible

atrocities because they are going to be there regardless of what

happens. We can’t expel them. There are a million people in some

of the tribes that contributed troops to some of the atrocities. They

are not going to leave Darfur. We have got to find some way of negotiating

a settlement so that the tribal peace that has been broken

by these atrocities can be put back together.

These people economically are dependent on each other. Without

the farmers, the herders can’t live and without the herders, the

farmers can’t live. And now they are at war with each other, and

that is very bad for the people of Darfur.

We believe we need coercive measures only when it appears that

the negotiations are failing. We are making very small steps, and

they are very small steps. It is very frustrating for me, but we are

making some progress, if unsatisfactory from my perspective.

War has been dangerously regionalized. It has now poured across

the border into Chad and into the Central African Republic. It is

destabilizing those countries. What people don’t realize is we don’t

dominate the world economy the way we used to. The gross domestic

product of Sudan has doubled in the last 6 years and will double

again in the next 6 years. According to the Sudanese Government,

oil production per day, barrels of oil, is 356,000 barrels per day last

year. It is going to go up to 520,000 barrels this year. Their economy

is one of the fastest growing economies. It grew 12 percent

just last year. It is one of the fastest growing economies in the

world right now, and it is the oil revenue coming in, but also the

country around greater Khartoum is industrializing.

So you have two worlds. You have a rapidly growing economy in

the greater Khartoum area, the Arab League Triangle, as it is

called, and the rest of the country is in one of the poorest locations

of the world. The Level 6 development and the rest of Sudan is one

of the most depressed I have seen in the world, particularly in the

south. Some was neglected for decades even before the war started.

The property issues, the livelihood issues, and the security issues

of the people of Darfur must be settled peacefully by negotiation in

order for the stability to return to Darfur. I estimate that several

million head of cattle, sheep, and goats were looted from the African

tribes, from the people who are now in the displaced camps.

There is 2.4 million in the displaced camps and in refugee camps.

If they go back to their villages without their tools, land and villages,

they will die. They need those implements for their livelihoods.

They need those animals for their livelihoods and they have

been looted.

Now in terms of our diplomatic efforts, the focus now very clearly,

indisputably, in United States policy is on human rights and on

humanitarian issues. We have no military or economic interest in

Darfur. I am saying this; I know you all know that. But there are

people in Sudan who are demagoguing this issue suggesting—one

suggestion from a senior leader is we want to build a military base.

That is the most ridiculous charge I have ever heard. What would

we do with a military base in Darfur?

The other charge is we want all of the oil in Darfur. There is a

tiny little corner that has oil that we know of in the southeastern

region. Tiny little area. There is no other oil in Darfur. Some people

say there is oil. Maybe there is. The United States is in the

international market. Oil is fungible. We can buy it anywhere. We

need to buy it on the international market. We have no interest

economically on the oil from this country in Darfur. And the

charges that that is the reason motivating American policy by Sudanese

leaders is an outrageous demagoguing statement. It is not

very helpful.

Another policy is to energize the CPA implementation. We know

unless there is peace in Darfur, the people in the south are not

going to vote to keep Sudan unified. When that vote takes place

under the CPA, they are looking at what happens in Darfur and

they are saying they did it to us before, they are doing it to them,

they could do it to us again. So I urge the Sudanese Government

to understand unless they settle the Darfur crisis, they are only ensuring

what the vote will be in 4 years when the Sudanese people

in the south under the CPA vote in a referendum on their future.

They should be creating the incentives in the Sudanese Government

to wanting to have people stay in Sudan.

The charge is made we want to divide the country. That is not

true. That is not our policy, but it is the job of the Sudanese Government

to keep the incentives to keep the country together. And

they are not doing it. It is my view and the President’s view that

we need to expand the international coalition supporting peace, so

we have been actively recruiting Arab League countries and Asian

states to support us. Their policies are not the same as our policies.

We can get into the discussion of the Chinese relationship if you

wish, but we have successfully—I spent a week in Beijing. I have

been to Egypt a couple of times now. We support one negotiating

process. When I arrived in Sudan, I was stunned by the fact there

are seven different negotiating processes going on. Everybody concerned

about this in the world had a separate track for resolving

this, and that is one way of simply having a forum shopping where

the Government of Sudan didn’t like one form so they changed to

another form and it was chaotic.

So we agreed in the Abuja and the Addis compromise that the

AU and the U.N. are in charge of mediation. Our job is to support

them. When I met with the rebels in Chad, I told them I am not

here to negotiate with you and my good friend, the foreign minister

of Sweden, who is the U.N.’s Special Envoy; I have known him for

18 years. I trust him. We talk all the time and Salim Salim for the

African Union, former Foreign Minister, Tanzania. They are the

two leads on this. Our job is to support them, and I told the rebels

they needed to be reasonable and to take their lead in terms of

these negotiations.

The Addis and the Abuja compromise is incredibly important to

getting 10,000 more troops and another 3,000 police, and we have

been supporting it every day since it was agreed to.

And finally, I have been encouraging actively, as well as Secretary

Rice and Jendayi Fraser, unification politically of the rebel

movements into one unit. The reason we have a peace agreement

between the north and the south is because John Garang didn’t

have any competitors negotiating with the north. Right now, there

are 12 to 15 different rebel movements all trying to negotiate separate

peace deals with the Government of Sudan. It is simply chaotic,

and we can’t have a peace settlement with the rebels in this

disarray. They must unite politically and they must put aside their

egos and tribal rivalries to do what the southerners do.

Let me talk about the current situation. It is deteriorating as we

speak, and I am very troubled by it. In the USAID, I don’t want

to put my old USAID/NGO hat on, but for a moment we use the

thing called the GAM rate, the Global Acute Malnutrition rate. It

means something in public health. If the rate is under 10 percent,

it is acceptable. If it is over 15 percent, it is a crisis. In three

camps, Kalma Camp, Abu Shouk, and Kickabia Town, and these

are big camps near urban areas, the rates now are 22 percent, 22

percent and 25 percent. They are way above the emergency level.

There is extremely disturbing. These are not remote camps that

are difficult to get to far away in some remote area of Darfur.

These are right next to capital cities. Because of the chaos in the

provinces now, and there is chaos, rebel movements fight with each

other, the Janjaweed have been out of control. In a couple of cases

they have threatened to kill the governor of one of the provinces

who represented the central government, and the Janjaweed militia

is paid, directed and equipped by the Sudanese Government. So

they are out of control in some areas of Darfur.

But to have these kinds of rates in these cities is extremely disturbing

to me as a former USAID officer, and it means we have a

crisis growing in these areas. We need to watch this closely. Humanitarian

access has rapidly deteriorated.

Just to give you some idea of how bad things are in terms of the

NGOs and U.N. agencies and the ICRC, in 2005, 24 vehicles were

looted in the USAID community. In 2006, 113 were looted. A 400

percent increase.

In 2005, there were 244 attacks against the USAID community.

In 2006, it was 423. Almost double. So we are facing a crisis in

terms of direct targeting by the rebels and the government. The

rebels tend to just loot things. The government is now using violence

in their allies. It is very disturbing to me because without the

NGOs and U.N. agencies, the 2.4 million people cannot survive in

those camps. They can’t provide food and health care in those

camps without us helping them. The ultimate goal of

all of this is a political settlement that allows them to go back

to their home so they can be self-sufficient.

We are willing as a government to be very generous in a reconstruction

effort, but there is not going to be any reconstruction effort

in Darfur unless there is peace. I told the Arabs that, I told

the Africans that, I told the government that. We will only be generous

with our other friends in Europe and other countries if there

is a peace, negotiated peace settlement that is actually implemented.

The Sudanese Government has a history of signing peace

agreements and not implementing them. If they are not implemented,

they are useless. It is a waste of time.

Finally, in terms of the current situation, there are 350,000 new

IDPs since May 2006. This is an extremely disturbing statistic, and

it is a result of fighting between the rebels with each other and the

rebels and the government and the Janjaweed militia. And this

chaos is causing more and more displacement which means more

and more suffering.

Let me make some comments. I know the hearing is about Khartoum.

John Garang was my friend for 18 years. I went to the south

for the first time in 1989, and the southerners are very close to me.

And the peace agreement is something I helped Jack Danforth in

terms of negotiating with Colin Powell, and so I am very proud of

it. There is a peace dividend for the south. $73 million is going directly

into the southern treasury every month. Almost $1 billion

was transferred last year. There is a Government of Sudan now.

It is very fragile, but it is there. There is no war and famine in

the south. There is massive improvements and trade. The food

prices in Juba, the capital of the south, have massively dropped

since all the roads have been opened up because it was an isolated

city with Uganda and Kenya. There are private companies now

moving in with trucks and bringing goods in and so life is changing.

Two hotels have been built, much to my astonishment, in

Juba.

And finally there has been a reduction from 40,000 to 10,000 in

the number of militias. They are sort of independent entities, many

of which have been created and formed by the Sudanese Government

to disable the south during the war. But we still have 10,000

people who are under arms who are not under anyone’s direct control

formally, and that is what is causing some of the instability

in the south and southerners are properly worried about this. I

have raised these and other issues with President Bashir in my

meetings with the foreign minister, with the vice presidents and

with the head of the internal security.

There is an impasse on Abia, which is sort of the Jerusalem of

the Dinka tribe in the south. Abia is of central importance. It is

the spark that could light and collapse the CPA. It has not been

dealt with. I visited Abia and met with the tribal leaders both in

the Arab side and the southern side in order to tell them that we

need to reengage in the process because negotiations called for

under the CPA have been paralyzed. There is little progress on the

border demarcation. There are incidents with militias out of control

in Malakal. I have visited twice now and there is evidence that militias

need to be completely demobilized now. I was promised by

the Sudanese Government that was going to happen by the end of

December. It has not been done. There are other armed groups in

the south that are killing people not in a massive scale. There are

incidents and it is not good for trade and for economic growth and

for the people of southern Sudan to live under this security.

And finally, without a census being implemented, we are going

to have problems having the elections that are scheduled for next

year. That is the elections held before the referendums, before the

peace agreement in 2011. So we, the Sudanese Government, needs

to put $1 million from the treasury, they have the money, into the

fund to begin the census process or we are not going to have elections

and we need those elections for a stabilization not just for the

south but for the whole country. Those elections are important for

the Sudanese state.

And finally, there are three central objectives of American policy,

and we are watching these on a daily basis to determine if there

are any progresses being made, because if progress is paralyzed in

these areas we will go to the strategy under Plan B.

Number one, unencumbered humanitarian access and the protection

of noncombatants. A critically important issue for us is the effect

of this war on the people on the ground.

Two, the restart of negotiations for a political solution, which is

the only way this crisis is going to end and for people to go back

to their villages and for the property issues to be dealt with and

the livelihood issues and for reconstruction to start.

The rebels need to reengage with the government. The government

needs to reengage with the rebels. The government has now

twice bombed rebel meetings which we called for in order to find

a unified political hierarchy within the rebel movement. They are

also trying to unify militarily in the battlefield. That is the argument

they use. I told them we need to have a ceasefire. I told

President Bashir we needed to have a ceasefire and Salim Salim

is going to leave this weekend to go to Khartoum to urge a

ceasefire to go back to the negotiating table.

The third part of our strategy is the implementation of the Addis

compromise for a hybrid U.N.–AU force to bring stability and to

protect the NGOs and U.N. agencies and to protect civilians and

finally to enforce any peace agreement.

I need to say this to the Sudanese Government: Unless there is

a neutral outside body with experience in disarming and demobilizing

militias, militias from both sides of the conflict, there will

never be peace in Darfur. The only institution in the world that

has this kind of experience is the United Nations. I watched them.

They weren’t very good about this 18 years ago. They are now very

good about it. We have no ulterior motive. We need the U.N. there.

We need these troops in a hybrid force. We understand Sudanese

sensitivity on this in order to enforce a peace agreement because

without that force we are not going to be able to demobilize all of

the militias. The place is awash in weapons and people cannot go

back to their lives with all of these weapons sitting around.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Plan B is classified. I am not sure how the *Washington*

*Post* got that story. That is what they do in a democracy.

I understand that. We are indeed looking at what the paper said,

which is true, and the other things in the article are accurate. This

is not the only part of Plan B, but since it is classified, in order

to go in more depth on this I would certainly be glad to come back,

Mr. Chairman, and speak to you in a classified session. But there

are sensitivities about the other options that are being considered

now. But what was in the newspaper was accurate. However, it is

not complete.

Mr. Chairman, let me say first there is a disturbing

event or disturbing trend in this event that internalizes the war.

There are now 100,000 Chadians that are displaced by fighting in

Chad and there have been two attempts to unseat the government,

and the charge has been made that the Sudanese Government is

behind that instability. Those people in the displaced camps are

not on the front page of the newspapers around the world. So Secretary

Rice and the President asked us to send in a DART team

with people from USAID, the PRM office, American diplomats and

military officers to assess what can be done to support the displaced

people in Chad. Because this instability is very dangerous.

Very dangerous. It is also destabilizing the Central African Republic

at this point. So we did have a military office there, and they

did do this assessment, and there is going to be a follow-up to the

findings for humanitarian purposes. And so let me just leave it at

that, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the things that I can discuss publicly.

It is getting worse. As a result of this cross-border

war, you know, some tribes—like there is the Zaghawa tribe, which

is part of the rebel movement in Chad. In Darfur, some of their

tribes also live in Chad. In fact, President Deby is a Zaghawa himself.

I think the Masalit, there are some Masalit people who also

live on the Chadian side. The largest tribe in Darfur would live

only in Darfur. There are none of them except those who are displaced,

who are in refugee camps but in terms of just living there.

So part of this conflict is cross-border because tribal lines and

ethnic lines are cross-border, but the stress, as you mentioned, Mr.

Chairman, on the environment, on limited water resources with all

of these displaced people is very severe. That is why the United

Nations High Commissioner has gone in along with some NGOs,

funded by both USAID and the State Department, to provide assistance.

I believe we are looking at ways to strengthen that assistance

now.

I meet Ban Ki-Moon a week before he actually took

office. So he had not actually become the Secretary General, but we

had a good discussion in his offices in New York. I go quite often

to New York now to talk with senior people in the U.N., and particularly

with Jean Guehenno, who is the Secretary General of

peacekeeping Options, who is in charge of getting these troops

working with the African nation in Darfur. I believe Ban Ki-Moon

is not only focused on this, but the member states want to be focused

on it. I think he is committed to it. I think he is very disturbed

by the human rights abuses that have taken place, the

atrocities that have taken place, and he has told me that I could

call him personally, directly, if I needed to at any point. I haven’t

done that quite yet because I have been traveling the last month

around the world. But the appointment of Jan Eliasson by both

Kofi Annan and Ban Ki-Moon as a Special Envoy means we have

a very senior, experienced international diplomat to help with the

mediation process, on the political process. That is critically important

and Ban Ki-Moon did say to me that Jan Eliasson has his full

support, and we have seen every evidence that that is the case

since he took office.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make

the thing work. A negotiated approach to this is the best approach.

If that does not work, we are going to have to reassess our policy.

Thank you, Congresswoman. It is nice to see you

again. The first thing I should say is that it is not in the Chinese

national interest in a country where they are getting 5 to 7 percent

of their oil to be in unstable political circumstances with

insurgencies going on. It is not in their interest. I might add that

some things have taken place in the last 2 months which also are

changing Chinese interests. Chad had for many years recognized

Taiwan, not the People’s Republic of China. You know there is a

sensitivity about that with many countries. In the last 2 months,

the Chinese Government had broken relations with Taiwan and established

them formally with the People’s Republic of China. And

the Chinese oil and gas company, which is owned by the Government

of China, has now bought a large interest in the oil wells of

Chad. And so the war that is going on between Chad and Sudan

is not in the Chinese interest because the Chinese now have oil interests in both countries, and so it is in their interest commercially

for this conflict to end and not to spread.

So I think that is very important because people in all countries

operate based on national interest, and I think that is one of the

things that was clear from my conversations with the Chinese

when I went to Beijing last month. Two, I think the Chinese recognize

that our friends in Africa—despite what they rhetorically may

say or not say at the human rights commission—they are very

upset in Africa about what is happening in Darfur. I have foreign

ministers and prime ministers and presidents who I have known

for many years, they are furious at what is happening. We saw evidence

of this with the election of John Kufuor one of the great new

leaders of Africa, in my view one of the greatest leaders in Africa

as the new president of the African Union instead of President

Bashir who wanted to take that job. That didn’t happen as an accident.

It happened because Africans are upset about this.

I think how the Chinese react to the crisis in Sudan will affect

their relations with the rest of Africa, and the Chinese know that.

The Chinese told us that they are concerned about that, and they

understand the sensitivity among African states about what is happening

in Darfur. The African Union has 7,000 troops there. If they

weren’t concerned about it, they wouldn’t have done something that

they have actually only done once before in the history of sending

African Union peacekeeping troops there. So I think the Chinese

understand they have an interest in resolving this in a political negotiated

settlement so we don’t have another war.

That is another thing. We have had three wars in 20 years, three

wars in 20 years. I think the people of Darfur have suffered

enough. We need a final peace agreement that will, in fact, resolve

the issues that led to the first three wars. Now the government

made it much worse, as I said in my formal testimony, by arming

one tribe to slaughter other tribes, which is what they did in the

south, but the fact of the matter is, there are real development

issues that have to be resolved in Darfur in order for the whole

place to be put back together again. And it is in the Chinese interest,

I believe, for that to happen.

So I think we can work together. I was a little disappointed with

what happened recently in terms of the visit. I just have to be very

candid with you. I was hoping for a little bit more diplomatic pressure

from the Chinese, but we don’t have a good readout in detail

on what happened privately. You can’t always, you know, public

statements are one thing, what happens privately is quite another,

and we are still waiting to hear in more detail in fact what happened

in those meetings.

Ms. Woolsey.

Sometimes it gets a little out of control.

Okay. Just in terms of the DAR team, the DAR

team are composed of hydrologists, water—I mean, food aid experts,

nutritionists, public health doctors, and they go in and determine

what the interventions are that are needed to get to international

standards. There are accepted international standards in

terms of malnutrition rates, the amount of water in a camp, and

that is a technical subject you need DAR team member—this is not

a broad political statement. This is on humanitarian issues. What

is the ration of food? What is the right kind of food?

And the DAR team has actually been in Darfur

since the crisis started. They were among the first international

people from the aid people were from USAID and the State Department

in Darfur beginning in 2003. I actually was at the rally in

northern Darfur. The governor was having a dinner for me when

the Janjaweed attack started, and I didn’t even know what the

Janjaweed were and what they were doing. And that is when we

began to beef up the aid program. The aid program is quite large;

50 percent of all the food being eaten by refugees and displaced

people is from the U.S. Government. The death rates in the camps

are now well below what they were in the villages before the war

started because people are getting a regular ration of food, which

they had to grow their own food before, and there were droughts

all the time. There are water problems. It is a very, very arid area,

particularly in the north. The Sahara desert is moving south. There

are serious problems with different diseases. The kids in the camps

have all been immunized now against all the major childhood diseases

that spread like measles and malaria, interventions. So the

children are much healthier now than they were before the war

started. The tragedy is that the government should have had

health clinics—you know, Sudan was a very poor country before

they found oil, and they didn’t have the money to do this. They

have the money now, and that is what is disturbing to me. When

I went there to start a USAID program there in 2001, just after

I took over as administrator, I offered the Sudanese Government,

I said, we will match you; you have oil revenue, and we will put

this money in. This is before the war started. We did it anyway,

but we didn’t get the match.

But there are huge programs. There are now 13,000 aid workers,

most of them are Sudanese. They work for CARE and World Vision

and the Save the Children and the International Rescue Committee

and the International Medical Core and all of the other aid agencies,

UNICEF the World Food Programme, United Nations High

Commission for Refugees, and the international community and

the Red Cross. There are about 1,000 of the 13,000 who are expatriates

who are from the United States or Europe or other African

countries working there. It is a very large problem, it is very complicated.

We can’t do this forever. We need to have these people

self-sufficient, back in their homes. Some of the schools have been

built in the camps. Sometimes this is the first time the kids have

gone to schools because, in the rural areas, there are no schools.

So life in the camps, other than the insecurity, have actually improved

as a result of the $2.7 billion that we have been spending.

That is in three camps. We actually halved, 50 percent

reduction, in the very high malnutrition rates at the beginning

of this in 2004. These are the only two camps that I know of which

have rates that have gone up this level, and it is very alarming.

We are looking into it now, and it is because of the insecurity. The

NGOs are there, but some of them are having to leave because they

have been attacked. A French woman was raped 3 weeks ago who

was working for one of the aid programs. There was a massacre of

commercial—and these are not aid workers, but they are commercial

trucks hired by the NGOs and the U.N. to bring aid, goods in,

and one of the rebel groups attacked them. We are not sure which

one. They massacred all 30 people. They were truck drivers and

porters. They looted everything and took all the trucks, and all 30

people are dead.

Mr. Natsios, again, thank you for your superb leadership and

that of your staff, who really are courageous people. Let me ask a

couple of questions. You know, the mission of peacekeepers is often

undermined by the rules of engagement. Who can forget

UNPROFOR in the former Yugoslavia, having traveled there many

times, many times during that terrible fight and seeing what happened

in Srebrenica, so-called U.N. safe haven, and the rules of engagement

were such that the peacekeepers were far less—they certainly

weren’t peace makers. I know because I have met a number

of the African Union peacekeepers both in country, and I have gone

to Addis and talked about the rules of engagement for the current

deployment. There are certainly deficiencies in the rules of engagement

for them to protect, and I will never forget—I asked a question

at one of the meetings in Addis: What are you doing with regards

to trafficking, an issue that I care deeply about, and everyone

looked around the room and it was almost like, where is that

trafficking information? And nobody seemed to know. And then I

asked people in the field. There was little or no conveyance of what

is expected of a soldier when he or she is deployed, and we all

know, having seen what happened in the Congo, that peacekeepers

not only can rape and hurt 13- and 14-year-olds, but it also destroys

or significantly damages the mission. So I would hope as we

go forward on this peacekeeping effort, the hybrid, that trafficking

is kept very much in the mix.

But my first question is: Are you persuaded that the rules of engagement

are going to be such that people indeed, including the

refugees, are protected? Secondly, if I could ask a question with regards

to indictments. Nothing sharpens the mind like getting indicted

by a criminal court. You know, we all know that Mengistu

escaped and never was held to account. There are a number of dictators

around the world who never were held to account, but

Milosevic was, although he died before we got the kind of justification

or justice, I should say, we all hoped for. Charles Taylor, as

we all know, will be in April held to account at The Hague as part

of the Sierra Leone court. Joseph Kony, his LRA keeps saying one

of their most important preconditions in negotiation is to drop the

indictments that the ICC has issued. And my question is, since

there is a group of investigators currently looking at whether or

not people like Bashir and others should be indicted as part of the

ICC indictment, do you think that would be helpful if there were

to be an indictment to sharpen the mind? My hope would be that

these people would be held to account. And frankly, I would hope

it would go even further, those who have been complicit in making

this happen, and that would include Chinese intermediaries who

certainly have made it all possible. We know Rommel could not

have carried on with his panzers and then could not carry on with

the fight when they ran out of oil. Well, this is kind of the reverse.

The oil is providing the means, the weapons and the funding, to

make first the slaughter in the south and now the slaughter and

genocide in the north possible. You don’t do it when you don’t have

the money. So, you know, I am still very, very concerned about

what the Chinese are doing vis-a-vis not just Sudan but other dictatorships

like Mugabe in Zimbabwe.

And, finally, on the NGOs, if you could, knowing your passion as

former head of the USAID and also the work you have done for a

lifetime on behalf of humanitarian work, what we could do as a

Congress, what all of us could do to send the clearest message possible

that you put sandbags around those NGO health workers and

you know the people that are putting their very lives on the line.

Every time I travel to Africa, I am always touched by how many

of those selfless individuals have had malaria, have had it many

times, have suffered all kinds of parasitic infestation in their own

bodies, and they stay there because they love the people they are

trying to serve. And now they are being targeted for death, for rape

and other kinds of mistreatment. So if you could speak to that,

what can we do in the international community?

Let me tell you, Congressman, something that happened

2 weeks ago that I was just appalled at. There was an incident

in Nyala where 20 NGO and U.N. workers were having a

brunch, a brunch, and the secret police came in and beat them all

with sticks and sexually assaulted one of the women. They have

been charged with crimes, and they were not allowed to leave, and

some of them have very serious wounds from the beatings. Now,

our understanding at this point is, this was a local chief, a local

police chief who got out of control to do this. This was not ordered

from Khartoum, so far as we can tell, and they are attempting to

deal with this. Today the workers were allowed to return for medical

care to Khartoum. It is very, very disturbing. It is one thing

to have an incident where they loot, where they are basically trying

to steal something, but when they go in—because they didn’t steal.

These people, the police didn’t steal anything. They just went in

and beat all these people up. The message to the NGOs of course

was, we don’t want you here, which is very dangerous, very dangerous

in terms of the 2.4 million people who are vulnerable without

the presence of the U.N. agencies, the ICRC and the NGO community.

So I am very disturbed by this. What happened was an

outrage, an absolute outrage. The fact that they were charged by

the courts for this, the people that should have been charged were

the people who committed the atrocity by beating the workers up.

So I call on the Sudanese Government to deal with this now, now.

In terms of the rules of engagement, I have to tell you I haven’t

gone into any detail with Jean-Marie Guehenno and with President

Konar, who is the chief administrator of the African Union, and

with the other senior staff at the African Union on this issue of

rules. I will get back to you on this in terms of the details. But you

are correct, that is a critical issue and how that is resolved has to

be negotiated in terms of the details of how you that should be

done. I should say the African Union troops, before the Abuja peace

agreement in May, were actually on their own. I don’t think they

had any orders to do this, but some of the troops are very, very

good, I have to say, do an excellent job, were protecting women who

were going out in groups because women were getting raped on a

systematic basis as they left the camps when they would get firewood.

And the soldiers properly said, ‘‘This is an outrageous thing

that is going on, we have to stop this.’’ So they would provide military

escorts for the women in groups as they would go out. This

stopped after May because the agreement was, we have a peace

agreement now, and we don’t need this. There are high levels of

insecurity now. There is a chaotic situation, some of the peacekeeping

troops have been killed, have been ambushed. And because

of the chaotic conditions, they, in many cases, have called those off.

They are not doing them with the regularity they used to do it, and

as a result, the rape rates went up in October against the women

in the camps.

And in terms of the question of indictments, you can reach your

own conclusions, Congressman, but you and I both know that

human psychology is a complex thing. It could have unintended

consequences to do the indictments. The Sudanese Government is

very worried that the purpose of the U.N. troops going to Darfur

is to arrest them for war crimes trials, which is one reason that

they are resisting the U.N. going there with the African Union.

And so it seems to me the question is, justice or peace, which is

more important right now? For me, personally—this is not administration

policy—peace is most important because the war crimes

trials are not going to help the people in those camps. My concern

is that, while the death rates are down in those camps, those people

are extremely vulnerable. There is chaos in the province. People

are out of control who have guns. There are too many guns. And

until those people can go back safely, voluntarily go back to their

villages and renew their lives and support themselves and there is

a peace settlement that can enforce this with troops, those people

are very vulnerable.

So my first concern is the people who are in those camps and the

people who are vulnerable, who weren’t in the camps, who live in

villages, from a tribe that might be under attack as a result of

their ethnic background. So that is my first concern.

I wrote a chapter in a book on this subject, and it came out, unfortunately,

just as I took office. And I had somewhat militant

views, even more militant perhaps than yours, Congressman. The

difficulty is it complicates the diplomacy a little bit.

I have. Yes, absolutely. And there have been some

incidents of the troops that infuriated me in the Congo, what has

happened, and then there were some incidents in West Africa with

aid agencies. I mean you know about the incidents 5 or 6 years ago.

There are new protocols put in place. They are training everybody,

retraining them, going over what the protocols are, and I believe

the U.N. and AU leadership are enforcing the rules, trying to enforce

the rules. So I am worried about this just as you are, and I

have asked the question, I went to New York, said, ‘‘Are we making

sure these rules are in place?’’ And they said, ‘‘Yes, we are.’’ I have

to say that Pakistani and Indian troops, particularly—and I think

there are a couple other African countries that had troops in the

south. I don’t remember all the troops, and I don’t want to forget

someone. But the Pakistani and Indian troops are really doing a

very good job. They prevented Malakal from blowing up. If General

Lidder, who is a great Indian general, is the leader of the peacekeeping

force in the south, had not been in command with those

troops, I think we could have had a catastrophe in Malakal. I told

the Sudanese it is in their interest to have those troops in Darfur

because Malakal would have been a bigger disaster in the north

than the south if it had blown up. It is right along the border.

Ms. Jackson Lee.

This is worse than the big dig, Congresswoman.

First, Congresswoman, I hope I am not making an

announcement I am not supposed to make. There will be a supplemental

budget, and there is money in it for Sudan. I would urge

Congress to appropriate the money that we have requested. We

have worked very hard, Jendayi Frazier and her staff from the

Sudan program group and USAID and the staff there, on what we

need to protect people and to support the peacekeeping operations,

both for the humanitarian and the peacekeeping operations in

Darfur. So please support the administration request when it is

proposed. I don’t have all the figures in front of me because I don’t

know whether it has actually been submitted or not.

We have a program that was started—Dr. Rice,

Secretary Rice and I went to Darfur, it was in the summer of 2005,

and she met—she had an incident, actually, because she met with

the women who had been raped privately, and the police wanted

to come in, in the meeting, and she said, absolutely not, and there

was a little tussle. She said—and she physically forced the police

out. And I was a little worried this was going to get out of control,

but she met with the women without anybody else in the room.

And she was so infuriated when she came out. She told me, I

want—this is when I was still aid administrator—Andrew, I want

a program in place to deal with this structurally. So we put in

place a program together. And many of the NGOs and the U.N.

agencies, UNICEF, are carrying this program out now. It is

though—I mean, there are things we can do, and we are doing

them to create structures so that this does not happen in the future.

However, when rape is used as an instrument of terror, which

is what it is, it is very difficult for NGOs or these programs to try

to build institutions that deal with this through the legal system

to work. But there are programs in place dealing with violence

against women, and they are beginning to have an effect in parts

of Darfur, but there are some areas that we haven’t reached yet.

In terms of the feeding in Chad, the largest donor, I believe, to

the refugee camps is the U.S. Government. The State Department’s

PRM office, the refugee office is the largest donor worldwide to the

United Nations High Commission for Refugees, but the U.N. is

doing very good work. I met with the leaders of the UNHCR, ICRC

and the NGO community when I was in Chad. Ambassador Wall

had a luncheon for me with them, and we had a long discussion

about what they needed and what was going on. And I met our

field staff from the U.S. Government who was doing this assessment

to see what additional resources are needed to support the

international community’s humanitarian efforts in Chad. So that is

ongoing now.

If you want more information on that, Congresswoman, we would

be glad to provide it for you. We are as concerned as you are about

that. The President said to me repeatedly, are we doing enough in

the camps? Are we doing enough, besides the political negotiations?

Because until we have a resolution, our job is to protect these people

from violence, and most of the people who have died, it is not

from violence. It is from malnutrition and from disease because

when people leave their village, they become extremely vulnerable

in any crisis anywhere in the world, and so those 100,000 displaced

people are very vulnerable right now, and that is why we sent the

team in.

I don’t want to discuss everything that is in plan

B at a public hearing, but I would be glad to come back, and I will

go into more detail with you. I don’t want to discuss it in this

forum right now because the actual documents are classified, and

I don’t want to get into any trouble.

I spent a week there. I spent 3 days, there, took

a week to go and come back, in January. I am going to go again.

We did have good conversations about them understanding what

our policy is. Because I think they are under some misimpressions

because the Sudanese Government was telling them what we were

trying to do which was complete nonsense. I think it was very helpful

for me to go. I think I need to make a few more trips. I will

do that. I will make a commitment to you; I will go back. The Chinese

were open with us. They were very helpful. We had good conversations.

I do think there are some other things perhaps

they could do to work with us, to help us with that.

Those are very good questions, Congressman. Let

me first say that Salva Kiir is a man of honor. He has grown into

a very strong leadership position. I think he is very honest, personally.

And I think he has very high ethical standards, and I believe

he is taking action to try to deal with the rumors and the reports

of corruption. The Sudanese Government is using this to attack the

south. I might add, Sudan, which means the Sudanese northern

government, is 13th on the list of corruption on the transparency

international list if I am not mistaken. So I think it is a little odd

for them to attack the south on this issue, given where they are

on the rankings. But there is an issue with corruption and the reason

for it is, these are new institutions, they are very fragile. They

don’t have accounting systems. Americans aren’t more honest in

the Federal Government than people anywhere else in the world.

You know why we don’t—we don’t have a lot of corruption in the

career bureaucracy, I mean, even though people make charges,

though, our public officials in this country are for the most part

honest; it is because there are so many levels of oversight. It is the

Congress. It is the GAO. It is the IG, the special attorneys, lawyers

that they have investigating things. It is the congressional staffs.

I mean, layers—and news media. Those institutions don’t exist yet

in the south. They don’t exist in the north either for that matter.

But as we build up—as the southerners build up those institutions,

they will put in place the disciplines needed to prevent corruption.

Corruption is a problem in many developing countries where a lot

of money is moving through the system when the systems aren’t

there to control abuse. I know many of the southern leaders. I have

known them for years. I believe that they care about their people.

You know, some countries I go to, there is a kleptocracy. The elites

are rapacious, corrupt and predatory. That is not true in southern

Sudan. The people who lead the south care about the people of the

south. They care about the suffering of the people in the south. Are

there some people who have tried to enrich themselves? There appears

to be some evidence of that, but it is not wide scale. And the

way to deal with that is to put the systems and institutions in

place which we are working with in USAID, the State Department,

the World Bank and the European Union because the southerners

say, help us; they are asking for our technical help. We put people—

I think USAID has technical staff from the United States in

many of the critical ministries to help them put these systems in

place. So we are working on it. We are working on it.

There are rising expectations, and I have to tell

you I have been through 14 peacekeeping and reconstruction programs

in the last 18 years. Iraq and Afghanistan are the biggest

ones, but we did Liberia. We did Angola twice. We did Mozambique.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DROC) is in the middle;

Rwanda, after the emergency; Haiti; Colombia; now, Nicaragua.

I have been through many of these. In every post-conflict

situation, every one in the world, no matter what continent, there

are always higher expectations than can be delivered on because in

the post-conflict setting. Institutions are always weak and fragile

because there has been a war. You know, in the south, there were

never these institutions in the first place. We are building them

from scratch, or the southerners are building them from scratch

with some outside technical assistance. Are there some high expectations?

Yes, but we also should not think that only the public sector

does reconstruction. The biggest thing that is a change for the

south is all the food prices are dropping in the cities because there

is no more, and the merchants are pouring in from Nairobi and

Uganda. There were only 100 businesses in Yei when I visited

there 5 years ago.

Four years later, there are 1,800 small businesses,

1,800. We didn’t start all these. Now we had a microfinance program

USAID started and a little bank, but the fact of the matter

is people in the south are very entrepreneurial, very entrepreneurial.

And peace—and the roads. The most important thing we

are doing—we are doing a lot of social things, health and education

programs are critically important, but we are finding out that the

road system is most important because that is what is causing the

economy to begin to boom now. It is one of the richest agricultural

areas in Africa. Southern Sudan could feed all of Africa. It is extremely

rich soils 10 or 20 million—I have lost the count—head of

cattle in the south. It is very rich agriculturally. And when there

is peace, people actually do pretty well, and if we bring in modern

agricultural technologies, which the USAID community is generally

beginning to do, we can use modern scientific agriculture to really

improve the productivity of the southern agriculture system, which,

by the way, was John Garang who had a Ph.D. in agricultural economics,

that was his dream. I know it is the dream of Rebecca

Garang, his widow who is a minister of transport, and of Salva

Kiir, who talks about it to me all the time, more agricultural help

in the south, because most people are farmers or herders. There

are very high expectations, very high expectations.

Well, I am in the United States, so I am sort of focusing

on what we are doing. But I don’t want to neglect our European

friends. The Europeans have put a very large amount of

money in supporting the African peacekeeping troops, the salaries,

the logistic systems. The State Department built the barracks for

the 7,000 troops, and the wells and the support structures. But the

Europeans actually are spending a little bit more money than we

are on supporting the 7,000 troops in Darfur. And without the Europeans,

we would not be able to provide the other half of the aid

community resources necessary to support the NGOs, the U.N.

agencies and the ICRC. So it is both of us together. I am just being

a little nationalistic because I am before the U.S. Congress, but

they are partners of ours. I talked to Pekka Haavisto. Pekka

Haavisto is the special envoy for the European Union on Darfur.

He is a good friend of mine. We talk all the time on the phone.

Whenever I go into a meeting, I call him up and say, should I say

something that was not in my notes? And he says, mention this.

I call him up before he goes into meetings, and I suggest things he

says, and we work together. I know the British are very concerned

about this. The Danes, the Danish Government, the Dutch Government,

the Norwegian Government, there are many governments in

Europe that are deeply concerned about this and are working with

us on it. I met the foreign—he doesn’t have the title, but he is the

foreign minister of the European Union, Dr. Solano, and his views

and the European Union’s views on what is happening and what

needs to be done are virtually the same as ours.

So the Europeans are being very helpful. They have a different

decision making process than we do. They have 25 countries that

have to decide on things. So it is a little bit harder for them to get

consensus, but I think they are fed up and Dr. Solano made some

public statements about the need—I think it was he or someone

else from the European Union—on the issue of sanctions. So we are

working with them on a daily basis literally in the field operationally

in terms of funding the reconstruction of the south. They are

as engaged as we are, and there are a lot of European NGOs and

aid agencies now doing work both in the south and in Darfur.

They tell me I assign too many readings to them.

Well, let me just make a general comment that if

swooping in was the way this was going to be solved, I would have

advocated it a long time ago. The best solution is a negotiated solution

because the people have to go back to their villages. We have

to get everyone to agree to that. We have to get their land back

for them. Their land has been taken by some of the nomads who

are at war with them. They need to go back to their villages and

be able to farm their land, and they need their animals back. Moving

2 or 3 million animals domesticated from the people who looted

them back to the farmers is not going to be easy to do. So I think

the best way to do this is through negotiation. There are other options

we are considering. I do not want to go over those options in

a public setting. It is inappropriate. I would be glad to brief you

privately or in a group to discuss other things that are in plan B,

but I have to just say to you, the best option is for the Sudanese

Government and the rebels to negotiate a political solution to this

crisis.

Thank you, Congressman. I will remember that.

We do not yet have confirmation on the $15 million,

Congressman. We will get back to you. I actually walked in

the room just after you had had your little discussion. It was discussed,

your talk, and Amr Moussa mentioned it to me a couple

times. I had to speak to an audience that was really focused on

what you had already said. I am not sure they were listening to

my luncheon speech at that conference as a result of your comments,

but I do appreciate your comments. I think they are appropriate.

We will check on them, and we will get back to you, sir.

I think sometimes it is good to disrupt meetings,

Congressman.