This hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations

Committee is called to order.

The Committee on Foreign Relations convenes for the first time

since the conclusion of a long, but busy, recess to consider the tragic

events in Sudan. We’re especially pleased to welcome Secretary

of State Colin Powell, who has recently visited Darfur and Khartoum,

and who has taken a direct interest in this humanitarian catastrophe.

The immediacy of the Darfur emergency is paramount, and the

lives of hundreds of thousands of people will be at risk during the

coming months. Time and again, groups of Sudanese have suffered

a similar violent refrain. Government planes bomb villages in advance

of attacks by proxy militia, who destroy homes, burn crops,

and steal livestock before driving innocent villagers into the wilderness

and beyond assistance. This has happened in villages across

Sudan during the long civil war, and is now occurring in Darfur.

Today, the 1.4 million Darfurians on the run or huddling in barren

camps are vulnerable to murder, rape, starvation, and disease.

This is the result of a calculated strategy by the government in

Khartoum and their janjaweed proxies who decimate the civilian

supporters of their political opponents.

The United States is committed to helping resolve the civil war

in Sudan that has already claimed the lives of two million people.

The fruits of that labor appear to be within reach as the North-

South peace talks resulted in framework peace agreements in

June. But a sustainable peace in Sudan requires a reversal of the

continuing policies of the Government of Sudan that constitute war

crimes and crimes against humanity. The janjaweed militias were

trained and armed by the government, and must be demobilized

now.

In addition, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1556 demands

that the Sudanese Government bring to justice those responsible

for the atrocities in the Darfur region. Sudanese must see

justice imposed if the current culture of impunity and intimidation

is to be overcome.

During a Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the intersection

of hunger and AIDS held on May 11 of this year, James T.

Morris, the director of the World Food Program, described the

acute fear and desperation of the people he encountered while traveling

in Darfur. Crowded refugee camps have little access to life sustaining

food, medicine, shelter, and clean water. The inevitable

outbreaks of cholera and other diseases threaten to kill thousands

of people a day. If lives are to be saved and hope is to replace fear,

the international community must coalesce and respond to this humanitarian

catastrophe, and it must do so quickly.

The lessons of past atrocities, remembered this spring in the

10th year observance of the Rwandan genocide, should inform and

empower our actions. The Sudan crisis is complex, but it has not

been sudden. It has gradually unfolded, providing ample opportunity

for humanitarian action by the international community.

Although many nations have responded, the resolve and unity of

the international community has not been commensurate to the

horrors of the crisis. Khartoum’s status as an oil exporter, a major

arms importer, and an Islamic government has diminished the appetite

for decisive action in some foreign capitals. But neither economic

interest’s nor religious identification should trump responsible

international actions in a case where genocidal policies are

being conducted.

Secretary General Kofi Annan issued a warning last spring that

a United Nations intervention might be necessary. Last week, following

the expiration of the deadline set by Security Council Resolution

1556, he stated that attacks against civilians have continued,

militias had not been disarmed, and no concrete steps had

been taken to arrest or even identify militia leaders and perpetrators

of attacks.

The threat of sanctions must now be followed by the act of sanctioning

the Sudanese Government, perhaps by restricting the flow

of oil that fuels that government with an estimated income of $2

billion.

The African Union has responded to this challenge on its continent

by deploying a monitor and protection force to police the ineffective

cease-fire signed in April. The African Union convened

talks between the parties to the Darfur dispute in Abuja last week

and called for an expanded force of 3,000 to 4,000 troops, including

major contingents from Rwanda and Nigeria. The resistance by the

Sudanese Government to this expansion is unacceptable.

The international community should authorize the deployed African

Union force, insist on its expansion to a size adequate to address

the needs of a region the size of France, and give it a mandate

to protect civilians. The Rwandan Government, to its credit,

has stated that its soldiers will not stand by if civilians are attacked.

To be successful, this force needs to receive the resources

and support necessary to operate in some of the harshest conditions

on Earth.

Congress has been active with respect to Sudan. On May 6, the

Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 99, which expressed

congressional concern over the deteriorating human rights and humanitarian

situation in Darfur and condemns the Sudan Government’s

actions. On July 22, Congress passed Senate Concurrent

Resolution 133, which declared the policies of the Government of

Sudan in the Darfur region to be genocide.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has worked hard on bipartisan

legislation that is designed to provide significant funding

to address the humanitarian crisis in Darfur and to advance the

prospects for a comprehensive peace. Together with Senator Biden

and other Senators on this committee, I’ve introduced the Comprehensive

Peace in Sudan Act of 2004. This bill reflects many bipartisan

ideas developed by Senator Biden as well as other co-sponsors.

The State Department has been very helpful in the committee’s

deliberations, advising us on how to approach this complex problem

and on funding needs.

Secretary Powell, we would greatly appreciate your personal assessment

today of the current situation and the prospect for a coordinated

international response to the Darfur crisis, especially in

light of the Secretary General’s report of last week. We understand

you are prepared to discuss the result of the State Department’s

own investigation of the Darfur crisis, which is based on more than

1,000 refugee interviews. Your thoughts on the approaching Presidential

determination on the North-South peace process would also

be welcome, as well as any recommendations on our legislative efforts.

Your presence here provides an excellent opportunity to expand

public understanding of the crisis in Darfur and to strengthen the

foundations for effective action. We appreciate your coming once

again. When Senator Biden arrives, I’ll recognize him for an opening

statement. For the moment, the floor is yours, and we welcome

you.

Thank you very much, Secretary Powell.

We have, as should be anticipated, a very good attendance of the

committee this morning, and so the Chair will ask that we have

a limit of 7 minutes for questions and answers by members.

I’ll begin the questioning by noting that constituents of mine discussing

Darfur raise almost inevitably two lines of questions, one

of which is, is diplomacy without backing of military force sufficient

to convince any government, particularly one as intransigent as the

one in Sudan, that the United States, the world community, the

United Nations, anybody, means business? In other words, many

constituents would say, this is incredible, when the Sudan situation

goes on like the brook forever. No one seems to step in, no one

is decisive with regard to this.

Now, on the other hand, constituents would also say we do not

believe United States forces ought to be in Sudan. European countries

have said about the same thing. Most countries have said essentially,

we’re already in a war against terrorism. Sometimes this

is translated as a war against Islam, a war against Arab nations.

Clearly, whether it is genocide as you are trying to describe it,

there is an attempt being made in Sudan by one part of the country,

those that I think you’ve described as Arabs against non-Arab

settlers, to exterminate a lot of people. Over a million people or

maybe two million, are involved in this process.

So the story goes, in the event that the United States becomes

militarily involved, we inflame Arab states, we inflame everybody

in the Middle East who already is inflamed over Iraq or over Iran

or various other problems that we have in Palestine and Israel. So

as a result, that’s a non-starter. Therefore one editorial after another

advises you to be stronger diplomatically. The thought is, the

military thing just won’t work. The world is not prepared to go in

and straighten out Sudan, and simply say to this government to

stop it and make peace.

So we call upon African Union countries to hopefully volunteer

a few more people, to pay for their stay there. They’re somewhat

reluctant but coming along. Whether they make a difference, the

credibility of that really is at stake. Will Sudan pay much attention

to a few hundred African Union persons, or maybe even a few thousand,

or monitoring, as opposed to putting coercion on the government

itself.

Now, sir, the second line of questioning of my constituents comes

back to the U.N. You, as Secretary of State have gone to the

United Nations and you’re getting success through, a resolution. It

is not easy to do this. Ambassador Danforth is working the problem

every day. He’s on television expressing very strong feelings about

this. He was involved in the North-South negotiations, and has a

tremendous background to talk about this problem.

But constituents would say this once again proves that the U.N.

is not very effective. In essence, you go to the mat, you get resolutions,

but what does it mean? Does anybody, including the Government

of Sudan, pay any attention to the U.N., when it comes down

to it, if gut reactions within the country, as well as the domestic

politics, have brought about something akin to civil war, if not

genocide?

At the end of the day, the hope is that by having these resolutions,

and hearings like this, world attention and somebody in

Sudan will pay attention, and maybe they will. But on the other

hand, there’s skepticism as the months go on. The people die, and

the weather gets bad, as you’re describing. It is not clear that this

is timely or enough. This is the conundrum that you and the President

are placed into in terms of our policy.

How do we resolve this issue of credibility? Why would anybody

in Sudan today pay attention to what we’re doing here, aside from

the fact that we feel strongly about it, and we’re speaking out? A

large attendance in the hearing room testifies to that. Why would

anyone in Sudan change his or her mind with regard to the leadership

situation?

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Let me just note procedurally that we’ve been joined by our distinguished

majority leader. We are delighted that he will participate.

I will, however, continue to go to both sides of the aisle. In

the questioning, I’ll call upon Senator Sarbanes next, and then I’ll

call upon the majority leader, and we’ll proceed in that way.

All right. Well then——

Thank you very much, Senator Hagel.

I just wanted to query that point, Secretary Powell, because it

pertains to our responsibility in the Congress. In the authorization

and appropriation bills now, is there adequate money for both the

humanitarian needs and the training of the African Union forces

that you’ve pointed out are going to be critical?

Well, please come back to us quickly on the

training money.

I appreciate that. We have the majority leader

here, and so he’s heard this conversation, too. He has heard the importance

of these troops being there. You’ve emphasized the need

to pay for it.

Thank you very much, Senator Alexander.

Secretary Powell, as you know, your Department has been very

helpful to this committee in our work, thinking about nation-building.

And in our authorization bill, which may or may not see the

light of day by the end of the Congress, there is, in fact, money,

as well as about 300 people within the State Department as a

starter. Defense Department officials will meet with us soon, but

they’re apparently already onboard.

And you’re working with them.

Tremendously important, and we look forward to

working with you some more.

Thank you very much, Senator Sarbanes.

Secretary Powell, let me just ask this. Some have observed that

when the United States sent some troops to Liberia, despite the

fact that many were offshore, it was nonetheless a presence that

showed the gravity of the situation and our interest. Is there any

parallel application that you can envision in Sudan—perhaps a scenario

in which we are not a part of the African Union force, but,

on the other hand, by the presence of our military we are assisting

the situation and increasing pressure and emphasis on the solution?

But the presence of all these U.S. officials, either

military or civilian, are known to the Sudanese Government presumably.

What would be the effect, in your judgment, if

we had an international oil sanction, if that was the will of the Security

Council? As you pointed out, we’ve sanctioned in many different

directions and we are hard-placed as to how to go further.

But the oil sanction is a different thing. What is the effect of that

upon the Sudanese?

Is one of the reasons why Europeans are reticent

to do this their worry about a possible spike in oil prices or some

effect upon the world oil market in the midst of all the other effects

that are occurring now? Admittedly, you’ve said that perhaps

they’re less inclined now to block that.

Finally, you’ve mentioned soft power, and that

Mr. Natsios, and USAID, are headed in that direction. You specifically

mentioned today the Millennium Challenge Account which

might apply to the Sudan in the long term. From my observances

in travels, I would say that in Georgia, one of the countries selected,

for MCC, this has had a tremendous impact upon their government’s

confidence as a young democracy as they think through

the requests they are going to make. Correspondingly, in Albania,

they hope that they are going to be on the MCC list very soon.

I would just report that the construction of democracy

there, in Albania and Georgia, is proceeding remarkably,

as well as is training in their military, including the requirement

of English language training among their officers, and other subjects

that might not have been anticipated.

The Millennium Challenge is limited because of

the criteria, in a way. Corruption is a big factor, quite apart from

the efficacy of how their systems work. How rapidly can the MCA

be applied in Africa?

Sudan has all these problems. But at some point, Sudan may

come out as a possible candidate. Now, if so, how many other candidates

are there in Africa that could also benefit as we’re shoring

up the entirety of the continent, as we’ve talked about today?

Yes.

Well, it’s a tremendously exciting idea, and I

hope that, as you are able, you’ll report to the committee the candidates

in the threshold category; and, likewise, even anecdotal experience,

such as you’ve suggested, of countries that are tapping on

the door, as you pointed out. Because that will be helpful as members

of our committee and others travel to these countries, to encourage

them to move ahead.

And your reports to us will help boost our resolve;

and, likewise, our testimony to our colleagues.