Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I want

to thank you for holding this most important hearing on the horrendous

situation in Sudan.

Before dealing with Sudan, I would like to ask Deputy Secretary

Zoellick to carry to Secretary Rice our strong admiration for the

powerful, historic and courageous speech she made in Cairo and in

Saudi Arabia on the importance of opening up non-democratic regimes.

This is the first time in history that an American Secretary

of State in Cairo and in Riyadh made speeches calling on democratization

by Saudi Arabia and Egypt, and I strongly applaud her efforts.

Mr. Chairman, with this forum and others, our Committee continues

to press diligently for more action to stop the human rights

abuses in the Darfur region of Sudan, even as the international

community chooses to maintain its focus on securing the peace.

After 20 years of civil war, South Sudan has been liberated. But

it now faces the daunting task of achieving stability and prosperity.

While South Sudan now has the good fortune to look toward the

future, Darfur still is in the midst of a genocide that harkens back

to the worst moments in human history. As the only survivor of the

Holocaust ever elected to Congress, I feel particular kinship to the people of Darfur.

Mr. Chairman, as you know well, my commitment to promoting

human rights stems from my own early experiences with oppres-

sion and genocide. But we need not look back as far as World War

II to find an example of a situation in which more timely intervention could have prevented a tragedy.

This week, my wife and I have the privilege of meeting in my office

a genuine hero, Paul Rusesabagina. His courageous action during

the senseless ethnic violence of Rwanda during the 1990s saved

over 1,000 lives and has been commemorated in the remarkable

film, *Hotel Rwanda*. Mr. Chairman, the world could use more heroes,

but the situation that gave rise to this one must not be allowed

to play out on the African Continent again.

While there is no doubt that one has to deal with the devil at

times to bring peace, we should not let Khartoum cover a multitude

of sins just because it reluctantly and belatedly reached an accord with South Sudan.

International pressure, led by the United States, has reduced the

large-scale violence against the people of Darfur over the past few

months, primarily in the areas where the African Union monitors have been present.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in areas where there are no monitors, genocide

by attrition continues. Protection of civilians in the Darfur region

has been pitifully poor. For some months now, I have been

calling for the United Nations to implement a clear, immediate, civilian

protection strategy to safeguard the people of Darfur from genocide.

African Union troops responsible for monitoring the cease-fire in

Darfur were given neither the mandate nor the capacity to enforce

it. Even more sickening, the African Union deployment required

the consent of the sponsors of genocide sitting in Khartoum. The

African Union now plans to increase its ranks in Darfur to 7,731

troops by September. But this is still woefully insufficient to monitor

Darfur, a territory the size of France.

In my judgment, no fewer than 15,000 troops are needed to protect

civilians against Khartoum and its Arab militias.

Mr. Chairman, even increasing the troop strength in Darfur is

not enough. The African Union needs to add teeth to its mandate

of the forces in Darfur so that soldiers can take any measure necessary

to protect citizens from attack. The African Union finally

has agreed to augment its deployment with logistical communications

and other support from NATO and the European Union.

But even if that happens—and it will take some time before that

happens—I strongly urge NATO and the European Union to step

into the breach and to implement a robust protection mission until

the AU troops can fully deploy. With the defeat of the European

Constitution by both Holland and France, Europe is in disarray. I

can’t conceive of a more effective and meaningful and lifesaving

move by the European Union than to take military action in Darfur

to save lives. If the European Union does that, if the European

Union provides NATO with the necessary forces and commitment,

we will rapidly forget the collapse of the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, the genocide in Darfur is not just an African crisis.

It is a crisis of all humanitarians, and as such, it obligates all

of us to act with great urgency. I want to commend Secretary

Zoellick for his outstanding work in Africa, and I look forward to

his testimony for what the United States is prepared to do to stop

the slaughter in Darfur.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I hope I will not embarrass my good friend, the Secretary, by

saying this was probably the best presentation I have had in 25

years of sitting on this Committee, both orally and in terms of the

prepared materials.

The State Department is now embarking on a new mission,

which is called the Pedagogic Mission of the Department of State,

which we sorely need. I want to commend you and congratulate

you, Mr. Secretary. You raise so many issues that it will be difficult

to focus on just a few in the limited time I have.

Let me hark back to the end of last week when Chairman Hyde

and I had two competing proposals for UN reform. Those were competing

proposals in terms of penalties. They were virtually identical

in terms of describing the problem. Clearly, your presentation demonstrates

the ultimate absurdity of having the Sudan perform a

function under the UN Human Rights Commission while participating

and perpetrating some of the most outrageous human rights

violations in contemporary history. So our hearings and our legislation

do tie together.

I have one specific area—two, really, two specific areas—I would

like to explore with you. The first one is, I know I speak for every

single Member of this Committee on both sides in saying that what

we appreciated most about your presentation was its candor. Some

time back, a high-ranking official gave us a cookie-pusher, soft and

gentle, nonsubstantive presentation; and I cautioned him that if

that goes on, the hearings will be empty. Let me assure, you, Mr.

Secretary, the hearings where you will appear in the future will be

attended by every Member of this Committee because we appreciate

candor.

I also want to call my colleagues’ attention to the fact that—you

have referred to it several times during a very complex and invaluable

presentation—that the United States carries the bulk of the

financial burden of aid; and, obviously, we carry and will carry the

bulk of logistical support for the African Union troops. This is a reminder

to all of my colleagues who emphasize that all we do is engage

in military ventures. I am very proud of what we are doing

in this area; and I think it is very important that we, in our own

appraisal of our own foreign policy, have some balance and recognition

of what the United States is doing globally.

My key question relates to a time line. It is self-evident that,

given all of the deficiencies, the African Union forces in sufficient

numbers will not be in place any time soon. Whether they will be

there at the end of the year or middle of next year or whatever,

they will be inadequate, inadequately prepared, inadequately supplied,

equipped—you name it. Has the Administration considered

the possibility of calling a NATO emergency session, to call on our

NATO allies, particularly the ones who have no forces in the two

main areas where we are currently committed, so that an interim

major NATO force could be put in place to prevent what we correctly

call genocide?

In point of fact, it was the House that designated what is going

on in Darfur genocide the first time. The Senate followed suit, and

then we had the UN calling it a gentler name. It seems to me that

here we have a ready-made, more-than-capable and, to a very large

extent, underutilized NATO contingent that could be supplemented

by non-NATO advance-country forces, ranging, as you have indicated,

from Canada to Sweden, to participate in an immediate

major deployment to prevent continued large-scale loss of human

lives.

The picture is not that complex. The details are complex. Your

presentation was extremely valuable to all of us who follow the situation

closely. I know I speak for all of my colleagues. We learned

a great deal. But the underlying realities are very simple. Hundreds

of thousands of people over a period of time—millions—have

been killed. Tens of thousands are being killed now; and we have

well-equipped, ready-to-go forces in many countries capable of deployment.

What would be more helpful in dealing with the issue

and dealing with our global public relations dilemma than the

United States taking the lead in calling for a NATO emergency session

to deal with this crisis?

Secretary?

Thank you.