Good afternoon. The hearing of the Senate

Foreign Relations Committee will come to order. I want to welcome

all of you here, especially to welcome our witnesses. We have two

panels of witnesses today, plus we have three Presidential nominees

who have been nominated for Ambassador. We want at least

to get through the hearing on our main subject today by 4 o’clock

or shortly before because we have a series of votes that begin at

4 o’clock which will interrupt the proceeding.

So what I will ask our witnesses to do is to summarize their testimony,

if they will, for their opening statement to no more than

7 minutes and that will give committee members a chance to ask

questions and to have a fuller discussion of the very important

issues.

We are here to examine the complex and difficult choices that

are facing the United States in Sudan. We see a struggle there to

solidify a fragile peace in the south of Sudan and we want to mitigate

the impact of what is the worst humanitarian crisis in the

world today in the western part of that country. Civil war has consumed

the southern part of Sudan for more than two decades. The

heart of the conflict is a clash between the Muslim government in

Khartoum, which identifies more with the Arab world, and the

Christian rebels in the south, which identify more with sub-Saharan

Africa.

President Bush and Congress have responded to this ongoing

conflict. Prior to my joining the U.S. Senate, in 2002 our majority

leader, Senator Bill Frist, led the charge to pass the Sudan Peace

Act. He was then the ranking member of the Subcommittee on African

Affairs and was joined in the effort by Senator Feingold, who

then was chairman of the subcommittee, as well as a former chairman,

Senator Helms, Senators Lugar, Biden, Brownback, and others

expressed a great interest in the Sudan Peace Act. That legislation

provided a framework for the peace negotiations in Sudan.

Since that time, progress on the peace talks moderated by the

United States, by Great Britain, Norway, and Kenya has been

slow. But the talks have finally yielded results. Senator John Danforth

has served as President Bush’s special envoy in this effort.

Just a few weeks ago on May 26, the Government of Sudan [GOS]

and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement signed three protocols

to finally end that conflict. The difficulties of implementation

of those protocols are still ahead, but I am hopeful that conflict is

finally at an end.

This is a tremendous success story, but it has been obscured by

a growing tragedy in another part of Sudan. At the same time

peace was being negotiated between the north and the south, a

new campaign of terror erupted in the western region of Darfur.

The prospect of a just peace with the south apparently provoked

rebel bands in the west to try to get their piece of the pie. The Government

of Sudan responded to rebel raids swiftly and brutally, beginning

a campaign designed not just to root out the rebels among

the population, but to systematically uproot and destroy the people

of Darfur.

It is worth noting that this western conflict has nothing to do

with religion. Both sides are Muslim. The conflict is about ethnic

rivalry and control of territory.

The scope and results of this rampage are only now becoming

clear. Somewhere between 25,000 and 50,000 natives to Darfur

have been killed. Some 200,000 refugees have fled across the border

into neighboring Chad. Over 1 million are estimated to be displaced

in Darfur and 1.2 million are at risk of starvation if sufficient

food assistance is not provided.

Many now believe the Government of Sudan, through its

Janjaweed militias in Darfur has been engaged in an active campaign

of ethnic cleansing. Some have called it genocide. I expect

our witnesses will have more to say on that point.

The international community has failed to respond to the crisis.

The United Nations Human Rights Commission, which is supposed

to confront flagrant abuses of human rights, especially when they

occur on such a mass scale, has failed to adopt a United States resolution

condemning the actions of the Government of Sudan. That

body, the U.N. Human Rights Commission, has become a travesty,

condoning the very activity it was intended to prevent, largely because

human rights-abusing member governments outnumber

those who are eager to prevent such abuse and they vote accordingly.

President Bush and his administration have stated clearly and

repeatedly that what has been happening in Darfur is wholly unacceptable

and must be dealt with quickly. At the same time, it is

not clear how ready we are to push that principle with the Sudanese

Government.

Some of our friends are reportedly concerned that confronting

Khartoum too directly about atrocities in Darfur will jeopardize

any prospect for lasting peace in southern Sudan. They may be

right, but if hundreds of thousands of lives are the price of peace

in southern Sudan the price is too high.

Today we are fortunate to have two distinguished panels to testify

before the committee on this topic. The first panel, from the ad-

ministration, will share the actions taken by our government, the

U.S. Government, in Sudan and what we hope to accomplish as we

move forward. The second panel will provide expert advice on U.S.

strategy as well as an in-depth look at the atrocities in Darfur.

Before the first panel begins, let me turn to my colleague Senator

Feingold and ask for his opening statement. Senator Feingold.

We can swap. OK, we will do the best we

can.

You all will have to excuse us. We do not have an executive job.

We have a legislative job.

But this is very important testimony. That is a terrible story you

have told us, and you have told us with precision and with candor

and with specifics. When we get to the second panel, we are going

to hear more about that. So I would like to focus in the next 7 or

8 minutes, and then we will go to Senator Feingold, first on what

we can do.

Now, how much aid are we currently giving, the United States,

to the Khartoum government, financial aid, how many dollars?

These three protocols that were signed on

May 26, I assume that the expectation is as those protocols are implemented

more aid—what is the expectation of aid to the Khartoum

government or, in a separate category, how will other aid,

how is other aid expected to come into the Sudan?

So in any event there is no prospect of normalizing

relations in the next few weeks or few months. There are

a number of steps to be taken. So that is not an immediate threat.

Mr. Winter was talking about 2.2 million people in October, accord-

ing to the United Nations figures possibly, which is a doubling of

the number of displaced people that we hear about today.

Let us move to the humanitarian aid for a minute. What is the

amount of humanitarian aid that is authorized by the United

States in the Sudan now?

What about in Darfur?

What role does the Khartoum government

have in the distribution of this humanitarian aid?

You do not give them the money——

Senator ALEXANDER [continuing]. To then give to——

Mr. WINTER. We have two sets of partners primarily. One are the

U.N. and other international agencies and the others are NGOs,

nongovernmental organizations.

So the issue with the Khartoum government

in terms of the aid that we are attempting to offer today are

the obstacles that you described, whether they will get out of the

way and let you do the job that you would like to do with food and

medicine and other help.

Let me ask this. We are obviously talking

about a crisis here. Many of us remember Rwanda. Senator Feingold

has mentioned that. Senator Biden has mentioned that. I remember

that. In reflection, many of us regret that the United

States could not have done more then. And this is rising—this reminds

us of the dimensions of that genocide.

Now, what can the United States do more of immediately that

would be most likely to change the attitude of the Khartoum government?

What further steps could we take?

And by ‘‘deliver the goods,’’ I gather we

mean, A, stop the killing, and B, get out of the way in terms of food

and humanitarian help?

My last question would be, to the two of

you: Is there anything else specific that the administration would

like for the Congress to do to strengthen your hand in dealing with

the immediate future in Darfur?

Our hearing on Sudan will resume. I thank

the witnesses and others for their patience with the Senate schedule.

Here is what we will do. I saw Senator Feingold. I have one more

vote to cast and he has two, so I will ask my questions of Ms. Flint

and Mr. Prendergast. I will then ask them to step aside if they

have time to do that, because Senator Feingold would like to also

have a chance to ask you questions, and then we will move to the

three nominees. It is my hope we can do that today.

Senator Feingold has a scheduling issue and I am going to let

him go first with the questioning of the three nominees because I

think we have a better chance of actually getting to you today if

we do it that way. So if you will bear with us, we will try to get

all of our work done.

Now, we have heard some very interesting, graphic, specific testimony

about the tragedy in Darfur in the west of Sudan. Just at

a time when we had hoped we would be making peace in Sudan,

we are having atrocities that make us not think very much about

the peace.

Our witnesses on the second panel are witnesses who have seen

what is happening there recently and confirm that humanitarian

aid is being denied, that the Government of Sudan is responsible

for many killings, and is also responsible for, as I mentioned, obstructing

the delivery of aid. What is interesting to me is that both

of you have said that you believe that congressional action could

make a difference. Many Members of Congress, both Democratic

and Republican, would like to make a difference on this topic.

For example, I saw Senator Corzine as I came back, who was not

able to attend the hearing today, but who made it clear that, and

has made clear in speeches on the floor, his feelings about the tragedy

in Sudan and who emphasized to me that whatever Senator

Feingold, Senator Brownback, and I and others were to do in the

Senate, he wants to be part of. I am confident there will be many,

many more.

Now, you have been very helpful witnesses

in this fact, you have been very specific. I have read your full testimony.

Let me ask the first question in this way. You have heard

each other. Do you basically agree on what the Congress should do

or did you hear—did one of you hear the other say something that

you did not or that you disagreed with?

How much agreement is there between the two of you on exactly

which steps the Congress can take to do the most good?

OK, so step one is a Security Council resolution,

which would I guess have to be initiated by the United

States.

And the UK. Which would as its first step

say, stop obstructing the humanitarian aid.

Now, you have mentioned the Security

Council resolution and how that would have a more dramatic effect

on the government than simply a United States effort. What is second

on your priority list? A Security Council resolution might take

a little while. Is there anything that can be done more rapidly that

would speed up the humanitarian aid or remove the obstructions?

Well, that was Mr. Prendergast’s second

major point, was to make sure phase one stops, which is the killing.

But I am looking for tactically, if the Security

Council resolution takes a while what is the second step that

you would recommend from your perspective that our focus should

be on?

When does the rainy season start?

In your judgment, does the threat of more

sanctions on a country already with sanctions matter to the government

of Khartoum?

So immediately putting the spotlight on

personal accountability for these crimes is something else that

might have an immediate effect?

No, I am talking about in general, all aid.

So nothing to the Khartoum government?