AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

DARFUR AND THE OLYMPICS: A CALL FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 7, 2007

Serial No. 110–51

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html
http://www.oversight.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

42–325 PDF WASHINGTON : 2008

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON OVERSISGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California, *Chairman*

TOM LANTOS, California
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
DIANE E. WATSON, California
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
JOHN A. YARMUTH, Kentucky
BRUCE L. BRALEY, Iowa
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Maryland
PAUL W. HODES, New Hampshire
CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY, Connecticut
JOHN P. SARBANES, Maryland
PETER WELCH, Vermont

TOM DAVIS, Virginia
DAN BURTON, Indiana
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
CHRIS CANNON, Utah
JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr., Tennessee
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
DARRELL E. ISSA, California
KENNY MARCHANT, Texas
LYNN A. WESTMORELAND, Georgia
PATRICK T. McHENRY, North Carolina
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
BRIAN P. BILBRAY, California
BILL SALI, Idaho
JIM JORDAN, Ohio

PHIL SCHILIRO, *Chief of Staff*
PHIL BARNETT, *Staff Director*
EARLEY GREEN, *Chief Clerk*
DAVID MARIN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York

CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
DAN BURTON, Indiana
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania

DAVE TURK, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on June 7, 2007	1
Statement of:	
Anderson, Nick, co-founder of Dollars for Darfur; and Ana Slavin, co-founder of Dollars for Darfur	14
Anderson, Nick	14
Slavin, Ana	21
Hari, Daoud Ibrahim, Darfuri refugee and interpreter to Nick Kristof and other journalists; Joey Cheek, American Olympic Gold Medalist speedskater; Tegla Loroupe, Kenyan Olympic distance runner, World record holder and United Nations Ambassador of Sport; John Prendergast, senior advisor to the International Crisis Group and co-founder of the Enough Campaign; Ambassador (Ret.) Lawrence G. Rossin, senior international coordinator, Save Darfur Coalition; and Jill Savitt, director of the Olympic Dream for Darfur Campaign	26
Cheek, Joey	33
Hari, Daoud Ibrahim	26
Loroupe, Tegla	39
Prendergast, John	45
Rossin, Lawrence G.	57
Savitt, Jill	66
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Anderson, Nick, co-founder of Dollars for Darfur, prepared statement of	16
Cheek, Joey, American Olympic Gold Medalist speedskater, prepared statement of	36
Hari, Daoud Ibrahim, Darfuri refugee and interpreter to Nick Kristof and other journalists, prepared statement of	28
Loroupe, Tegla, Kenyan Olympic distance runner, World record holder and United Nations Ambassador of Sport, prepared statement of	42
Prendergast, John, senior advisor to the International Crisis Group and co-founder of the Enough Campaign, prepared statement of	49
Rossin, Ambassador (Ret.) Lawrence G., senior international coordinator, Save Darfur Coalition, prepared statement of	61
Savitt, Jill, director of the Olympic Dream for Darfur Campaign, prepared statement of	68
Shays, Hon. Christopher, a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut, prepared statement of	11
Slavin, Ana, co-founder of Dollars for Darfur, prepared statement of	23
Tierney, Hon. John F., a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, prepared statement of	5

DARFUR AND THE OLYMPICS: A CALL FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTION

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 2007

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m. in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Tierney (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Tierney, Lynch, Higgins, Welch, Shays, and Platts.

Staff present: Leneal Scott, information systems manager; Dave Turk, staff director; Andrew Su and Andy Wright, professional staff members; Davis Hake, clerk; Larry Halloran, minority deputy staff director; A. Brooke Bennett and John Callender, minority counsels; Nick Palarino, minority senior investigator and policy advisor; Patrick Lyden, minority parliamentarian and member services coordinator; and Brian McNicoll, minority communications director.

[Videotape Presentation.]

Mr. TIERNEY. The full clip can be found at www.dhsthepromise.com.

I ask unanimous consent that only the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee be allowed to make opening statements. Without objection, that is so ordered.

I ask unanimous consent that the hearing record be kept open for 5 business days so that all members of the subcommittee will be allowed to submit a written statement for the record. Without objection, so ordered.

I ask unanimous consent that the following written statements be placed on the record: Professor Eric Reeves of Smith College—he is the professor and author of the sudanreeves.org Web site and Sudan Advisor to the Olympic Dream for Darfur Campaign; a statement by David Muzurski of the Director of the Horn of Africa Project with the International Crisis Group; and Ann Vatalios with the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom.

I want to thank everybody who is participating in this morning's hearing, and our witnesses, in particular. Some of the quotes that were just on there about the need to step up and do something is certainly encompassed by what our students and the other witnesses here have done today.

The Olympics has always transcended sport. It has always been about more than gold medals and world records and individual athletic achievements.

The Olympics goes beyond the compelling stories of the athletes or their families or their loved ones. It is much more than an accumulation of all the athletes' dedication, countless hours of work, and limitless devotion to perfection.

The Olympics is that rarest of institutions in our modern age in which all the nations of the world put aside their differences and come together in a peaceful pursuit. It is inspirational, a call for what the world could be and not about the individual and inevitable faults.

The Olympics is a call to our better natures, a symbol of what we can achieve if all of us, all the nations and the peoples of the world, come together.

The ancient Greeks had a tradition of the Olympic Truce, or Ekecheieria, during which wars and battles would cease and all athletes, supporters, pilgrims, and artists would travel freely and unharmed to and from the games. The Olympic Truce has carried through to the modern day and has been ratified repeatedly by the United Nations.

But the Olympic spirit should go beyond a mere temporary cessation of hostilities. In 2000, North and South Koreans entered Sydney's Olympic stadium under one flag. Just before the 2002 Olympics, the president of the International Olympic Committee, Dr. Jacques Rogge, publicly hoped that, "this peaceful gathering of all Olympic athletes in Salt Lake City will inspire peace in the world."

For the upcoming 2008 Olympics in Beijing, China, the host country chose the theme: One World, One Dream.

We haven't always lived up to the Olympic ideal, of course, but that just underscores the importance of redoubling our efforts.

The hearing that we are holding today asks the simple, yet fundamentally important, question: shouldn't the upcoming Olympic games in Beijing serve as the catalyst to finally put an end to the horrific and unfortunately ongoing tragedy in Darfur?

The images of the genocide in Sudan are forever burned into our collective consciousness: 400,000 people dead; kids killed and maimed in front of their mothers; mothers raped and beaten in front of their kids; entire villages burned to the ground; atrocities and destruction on both a wide scale and on a very personal scale; 2.5 million people uprooted from their lives, their livelihoods, and their homes. We will hear from one of those individuals today.

The tragedy of violence continues. The Boston Globe recently called it "the unending agony of Darfur."

Also, as we meet here today, scores and scores of refugees are living in camps, still fearing for their lives, and dependent on aid for their very survival—aid and workers threatened today by the Sudanese government.

For Darfuris, who still today fear for their lives and their children's future, the glorious theme of the 2008 Summer Olympics, "One World, One Dream," stands as nothing but an empty promise.

While the way forward in Darfur is complicated and will take a sustained effort, one thing is crystal clear: expert after expert and

report after report all stress the importance of a united world pressuring the Sudanese government, in a coordinated manner, to finally allow full deployment of the hybrid African Union/U.N. forces in Darfur and to ensure that humanitarian workers can go about their business without fear for their lives.

Sustained international pressure is also key in bringing all parties of the Darfur conflict together to craft a comprehensive and sustainable peace agreement.

Far too often, Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir has played one country off another, whether in failing to disarm the janjaweed or in blocking deployment of the 20,000 United Nations peacekeepers.

The international community's lack of coordination and unity have allowed these atrocities to continue for far too long. That is why the International Crisis Group in a recent report stressed that, "international efforts need to be unified," and that it is vital to "build international consensus on a new political strategy, particularly with China and the U.S., in order to acquire the necessary leverage over the parties to the conflict."

And increasing focus has been placed on the host country of the 2008 Beijing Games as the linchpin in ending the atrocities in Darfur. Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Tom Lantos and Majority Leader Steny Hoyer sent a letter signed by 108 Members of the House of Representatives to Chinese President Hu Jintao on just this subject. A remarkable 95 Senators joined a similar letter in that other body. And just this week the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly on a resolution by Congresswoman Barbara Lee asking China to do more.

The China/Sudan connection is made for good reason: China is Sudan's top trading partner and one of its top weapons providers. Over two-thirds of Sudanese oil goes to China, and the Chinese National Petroleum Company has recently built a 900-mile pipeline in Sudan. China has canceled $100 million of Sudanese debt and has even offered a nearly $20 million interest-free loan for the Sudanese government to build a new Presidential Palace. If anyone in the world community has leverage on the Sudanese government, it is China, and what better country to help lead the effort to end the tragedy in Darfur than the host for the 2008 Olympics?

While China has recently made some initial steps to be helpful, I don't know of anyone who thinks that they couldn't do more. And this is not a question of one country infringing upon the sovereignty of another; it is a question of being a responsible stakeholder in the world community and living up to the Olympic ideals as its temporary host.

But it is not just China that needs to step up to the plate. The United States could do more, especially in helping to lead the multilateral effort.

Former Secretary of State Powell courageously brought attention to Darfur by calling what has happened there genocide, and President Bush recently implemented some additional unilateral economic sanctions. But unilateral actions can only go so far; success in Darfur now rests on the hard and sustained work of forging coordinated international pressure on the Sudanese government.

China could and should be doing more. The United States could and should be doing more. Russia could and should be doing more. The Arab League and the European Union could and should be doing more.

The Darfur tragedy has continued for more than 4 years. And the young people of our world are saying that enough is enough. Our young people are stepping up and playing the role of humanity's conscience.

My wife and I recently attended a community presentation by a young constituent, Kimberly Pomerleau. Kim is a 2007 graduate from Reading High School and had the courage and conviction to speak out to people twice or three times her age and to say enough is enough.

On our first panel today we will hear from the two Massachusetts founders of the "Dollars for Darfur" high school challenge; young adults whose initiative and creativity raised more than $306,000, and increasing still, to help the people of Darfur.

When I visit high schools in my District, I hear again and again from students that enough is enough, that the horrible atrocities in Darfur simply cannot and should not happen in this day and age, not on their watch.

I have right here in my hand letters from over a dozen students in just one school in my District, Lynnfield High School, on the issue of Darfur. These students and their terrific teacher, Kacy Soderquist, are inspirations.

The young people of the world are loudly and vigorously pointing the way, and it is past time for the rest of the world to follow.

[The prepared statement of Hon. John F. Tierney follows:]

Opening Statement of
National Security and Foreign Affairs Subcommittee
Chairman John F. Tierney

"Darfur and the Olympics: A Call for International Action"
June 7, 2007

The Olympics has always transcended sport. It has always been about more than gold medals, world records, and individual athletic achievements.

The Olympics goes beyond the compelling stories of the athletes, their families, and loved ones. It is much more than the accumulation of all of the athletes' dedication; countless hours of work; and limitless devotion to perfection.

The Olympics is that rarest of institutions in our modern age in which all the nations of the world put aside their differences and come together in peaceful pursuit. It is an aspirational call for what our world could be; and not about our individual and inevitable faults.

The Olympics is a call to our better natures; a symbol of what we can achieve if all of us – all the nations and peoples of the world – come together.

The ancient Greeks had a tradition of the Olympic Truce, or "Ekecheiria," during which wars and battles would cease and all athletes, supporters, pilgrims, and artists could travel freely and unharmed to and from the games.

The Olympic truce has carried through to the modern day and has been ratified repeatedly by the United Nations.

But the Olympic spirit should go beyond a mere temporary cessation of hostilities.

In 2000, North and South Koreans entered Sydney's Olympic stadium under one flag.

Just before the 2002 Olympics, the President of the International Olympic Committee, Dr. Jacques Rogge, publicly hoped that, and I quote: "this peaceful gathering of all Olympic athletes in Salt Lake City will inspire peace in the world."

And for the upcoming 2008 Summer Olympics in Beijing, China, the host country chose the theme, "One World, One Dream."

We haven't always lived up to the Olympic ideal, of course, but that just underscores the importance of redoubling our efforts. The hearing we are holding today asks the simple, yet fundamentally important, question: shouldn't the upcoming Olympic Games in Beijing serve as the catalyst to finally put to an end to the horrific, and unfortunately ongoing, tragedy in Darfur.

The images of the genocide in Sudan are forever burned into our collective consciousness.

400,000 people dead. Kids killed and maimed in front of their moms; moms raped and beaten in front of their kids.

Entire villages burned to the ground....

Atrocities and destruction on both a wide scale.... And on a very personal scale....

2.5 million people uprooted from their lives, their livelihoods, and their homes. We'll hear from one of those individuals today.

And the tragedy and violence continue. The Boston Globe recently called it, "The Unending Agony of Darfur."

Also, as we meet here today, scores and scores of refugees are living in camps, still fearing for their lives, and dependent on aid for their very survival – aid and workers threatened today by the Sudanese government.

For Darfuris – who still today fear for their lives and their children's future – the glorious theme of the 2008 Summer Olympics, "One World, One Dream" stands as nothing but an empty promise.

And while the way forward in Darfur is complicated and will take a sustained effort, one thing is crystal clear. Expert after expert, and report after report, all stress the importance of a united world pressuring the Sudanese government in a coordinated manner to finally allow a full deployment of the hybrid African Union / UN forces in Darfur and to ensure that humanitarian workers can go about their business without fear for their lives.

Sustained international pressure is also key in bringing all parties of the Darfur conflict together to craft a comprehensive and sustainable peace agreement.

Far too often, Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir has played one country off another, whether in failing to disarm the Janjaweed or in blocking deployment of the 20,000 United Nations peacekeepers.

The international community's lack of coordination and unity have allowed these atrocities to continue for far too long. That is why the International Crisis Group in a recent report stressed that "[i]nternational efforts need to be unified" and that it is vital to "build international consensus on a new political strategy, particularly with China and the U.S., in order to acquire the necessary leverage over the parties to the conflict."

And increasing focus is being placed on the host country of the 2008 Beijing games as the linchpin in ending the atrocities in Darfur. Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman

Tom Lantos and Majority Leader Steny Hoyer sent a letter signed by 108 Members of the House of Representatives to Chinese President Hu Jintao on this subject.

A remarkable 96 Senators joined a similar letter in that other body. And just this week, the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly on a resolution by Congresswoman Barbara Lee asking China to do more.

And the China/Sudan connection is made for good reason. China is Sudan's top trading partner and one of its top weapons suppliers.

Over two-thirds of Sudanese oil goes to China, and the Chinese National Petroleum Company has recently built a 900 mile pipeline in Sudan. China has cancelled $100 million in Sudanese debt and has even offered a nearly $20 million interest-free loan for the Sudanese government to build a new presidential palace.

If anyone in the world community has leverage on the Sudanese government it's China, and what better country to help lead the effort to end the tragedy in Darfur than the host of the 2008 Olympics.

While China has recently made some initial steps to be helpful, I don't know of anyone who thinks they couldn't do more. And this is not a question of one country infringing upon the sovereignty of another; it's a question of being a responsible stakeholder in the world community and of living up to the Olympic ideals as its temporary host.

But it's not just China that needs to step up to the plate. The United States could do more, especially in helping to lead a multilateral effort.

Former Secretary of State Powell courageously brought attention to Darfur by calling what's happening there genocide, and President Bush recently implemented some additional unilateral economic sanctions. But unilateral actions can only go so far; success in Darfur now rests on the hard and sustained work of forging coordinated international pressure on the Sudanese government.

China could and should be doing more. The United States could and should be doing more. Russia could and should be doing more. The Arab League and the European Union could and should be doing more.

The Darfur tragedy has continued for more than four years. And the young people of our world are saying enough is enough. Our young people are stepping up and playing the role of humanity's conscience.

My wife and I recently attended a community presentation by a young constituent, Kimberly Pomerleau. Kim, a 2007 graduate from Reading High School, had the courage and conviction to speak out to people twice or three times her age, and to say enough is enough.

On our first panel today, we will hear from the two Massachusetts founders of the "Dollars for Darfur" high school challenge; young adults whose initiative and creativity raised more than $306,000 and counting to help the people of Darfur.

When I visit high schools in my district, I hear again and again from students, enough is enough; that the horrible atrocities in Darfur simply cannot and should not happen in this day and age; not on their watch.

I have right here in my hand letters from 12 students from just one high school in my district – Lynnfield High School – on Darfur. These students and their terrific teacher, Kacy Soderquist, are inspirations.

The young people of the world are loudly and vigorously pointing the way, and it is past time for the rest of us follow.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this meeting. Thank you for your very important statement.

We are meeting today to learn how we can bring an end to one of the deadliest conflicts and worst humanitarian crises of this century and last, the ongoing genocide in Darfur.

After the Holocaust, and again after the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, the world community collectively agreed never again. Never again would it allow such crimes against humanity to occur. But it is happening again.

The security, human rights, and humanitarian crisis in Darfur has continued to deteriorate, even after the signing of a peace agreement in May 2006. While I believe the genocide is finally getting the attention it deserves, the bottom line is the world community is not doing anywhere enough to help protect innocent lives.

Today's hearing touches on what some would call a sensitive subject, which is the connection between China and its substantial investment and influence in Sudan and the Olympics, which China will host in 2008. We are all concerned China has slowed international efforts to resolve the conflict. As one of the Sudan's largest trading partners, China has hampered efforts to impose U.N. sanctions and deploy United Nations peacekeepers, continues to purchase Sudanese oil, and continues to provide aid to the very government that is complicit in the genocide in Darfur.

I visited Darfur in August 2006, and cannot say enough about the critical work being done there by humanitarian aid organizations, including Save the Children, which is based in Connecticut. Whatever policies we adopt to end the killing in Darfur, it is critical we continue providing these organizations with the resources necessary to serve vulnerable populations, millions of vulnerable people.

I am grateful that Daoud Hari, who was placed in a Sudanese prison, among other things, is joining us today to testify. I have had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Hari and I know his unique perspectives and recommendations come from a brave heart.

I am also grateful that, in addition to Mr. Hari and policy experts, we will be hearing testimony today from athletes and from students. Congratulations to our students.

[Applause.]

Mr. SHAYS. We have heard from Connecticut. We are going to hear from Massachusetts. We could hear from every State from students.

Several of the largest rallies held here in Washington have been organized with the assistance of student groups and faith-based organizations, including, in particular, the Jewish and Armenian communities, who consider this issue from a very personal perspective.

Speaking of students, we just watched a clip of the short documentary, The Promise, produced by students from Danbury High School in Danbury, CT. It is heartfelt and beautifully done. What strikes me about the documentary is that it tells the story of genocide so plainly. And really, how else do you tell such a story?

The Promise includes the quote from Edmond Burke, "All that is needed for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." This

is not a cliche, but a warning and an admonition that we do whatever is required to end the genocide in Darfur.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Christopher Shays follows:]

Statement of Congressman Christopher Shays
Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs
"Darfur and the Olympics:
A Call for International Action"

Mr. Chairman, we're meeting today to learn how we can bring an end to one of the deadliest conflicts and worst humanitarian crises of this century, and last: the ongoing genocide in Darfur.

After the Holocaust, the killing fields of Cambodia, and again after the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, the world community collectively agreed "never again" would it allow such crimes against humanity to occur. But it is happening again.

The security, human rights and humanitarian crisis in Darfur has continued to deteriorate even after the signing of a peace agreement in May 2006. While I believe the genocide is finally getting the attention it deserves, the bottom line is the world community is not doing enough to help protect innocent lives.

Today's hearing touches on what some would call a sensitive subject, which is the connection between China – and its substantial investment and influence in Sudan – and the Olympics, which China will host in 2008.

We are all concerned China has slowed international efforts to resolve the conflict. As one of the Sudan's largest trading partners, China has hampered efforts to impose UN sanctions and deploy United Nations peacekeepers, continues to purchase Sudanese oil, and continues to provide aid to the very government that is complicit in the genocide in Darfur.

I visited Darfur in August 2006 and cannot say enough about the critical work being done there by humanitarian aid organizations, including Save the Children, which is based in Connecticut. Whatever policies we adopt to end the killing in Darfur, it is critical we continue providing these organizations with the resources necessary to serve vulnerable populations.

I am grateful that Daoud Hari, who was placed in a Sudanese prison, among other things, is joining us today to testify. I've had the opportunity to

meet with Mr. Hari and I know his unique perspectives and recommendations come from a brave heart.

I am also grateful that in addition to Mr. Hari and policy experts, we will be hearing testimony today from athletes and from students. Several of the largest rallies held here in Washington have been organized with the assistance of student groups and faith-based organizations, including in particular the Jewish and Armenian communities, who consider this issue from very personal perspective.

Speaking of students, we just watched a clip of the short documentary, "The Promise," produced by students from Danbury High School in Danbury, Connecticut. It is heartfelt and beautifully done. What strikes me about the documentary is that it tells the story of genocide so plainly. And really, how else do you tell such a story?

"The Promise" includes a quote from Edmond Burke "All that is needed for the triumph of evil, is that good men do nothing." This is not a cliché, but a warning, and an admonition that we do whatever is required to end the genocide in Darfur.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Shays.

Mr. Welch, did you want to make a comment?

Mr. WELCH. You have covered it, Mr. Tierney and Mr. Shays, but I want to extend my congratulations to the students. In Vermont, the biggest event we had in the last election campaign was a rally that was organized by students in the Burlington area. We had several hundred people turn out.

What is extraordinarily exciting from my eyes is to see young people getting involved politically, having a sense of their own power and a sense of their own responsibility to stand up and to speak out against injustice and to advocate for human rights for all.

You are an inspiration to us. We are delighted at your work. We know that today is just one stop along the long road to try to end the genocide in Darfur.

Thank you all very much for what you are doing.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Welch.

Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Very briefly, I do want to hear from our witnesses, but I would be remiss if I didn't say thank you to all the witnesses and all of the students involved here today. Echoing what Mr. Tierney and Mr. Welch and Mr. Shays have said earlier, I see a lot of this in my District. There was a very active effort by the students at Milton High School in my District and also Medfield High School to try to support refugees and other victims of the genocide in Darfur, calling upon their Government, ourselves, to take action.

I want to thank you all for the power of your example, because I think you speak for all the students and the younger generation in this country. It is great to see the responsibility assumed by young people. It gives me great hope that the next generation is very near the point of asserting itself on some of the issues, not only in this country but globally.

I thank you for your efforts on behalf of all of the victims of the genocide in Darfur, and I congratulate you and join with you in trying to put more and more pressure, not only on our own Government, but internationally, to take full responsibility and to stop the genocide in Darfur.

Thank you.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

I would like to begin by introducing the witnesses on our first panel here this morning.

We are honored to have the high school student co-founders of the Dollars for Darfur high school challenge. I want to point out that it just so happens that these student activists and leaders come from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. we have Nick Anderson with us and we have Ana Slavin with us, as well. Nick and Ana's national high school fund-raising competition on MySpace and Facebook Web sites generated over $306,000, and it is still working. Both of them are entering their senior year and are going to continue to do work on this issue so long as it is necessary.

I want to welcome you both. I do have to tell you that it is the policy of this subcommittee to swear in all of its witnesses.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. TIERNEY. The record will reflect that both answered in the affirmative.

There is not going to be a question and answer on these particular witnesses, but we are more than grateful for your submitting of written testimony. We want to hear from your orally. You have the choice: you can either read to us your written testimony, or, knowing that is on the record, feel free to speak and tell us whatever you would like in the time.

STATEMENTS OF NICK ANDERSON, CO-FOUNDER OF DOLLARS FOR DARFUR; AND ANA SLAVIN, CO-FOUNDER OF DOLLARS FOR DARFUR

STATEMENT OF NICK ANDERSON

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Nick Anderson, co-founder of Dollars for Darfur, the national high school challenge to stop genocide in Darfur.

In the United States, we are quite comfortable, a blessing in striking contrast to what is happening in the Darfur region of the Sudan. In comparison to my home State of Massachusetts, the number of people in Darfur who have died so far is equivalent to two-thirds the city of Boston, and the number left homeless is approximately one-quarter of the State's population. Facts like these compelled me to act.

I present to you today a bit of the history of our project.

In July 2006, co-founder Ana Slavin and I flew to Washington, DC, to meet with staff of the Save Darfur Coalition to encourage them to adopt Dollars for Darfur as one of their campaigns. We came with three main ideas: First, we intended to set up a national high school challenge that would both promote awareness of the situation in Darfur and raise money to be donated to Save Darfur and key relief organizations.

Second, we proposed using social networking Web sites like Facebook and MySpace as a conduit to the Dollars for Darfur Web page. The Web page provided information to increase awareness of the atrocities occurring in Darfur and had a scoreboard page that managed the national fundraising challenge. It is a unique format for disseminating information, as Facebook and MySpace more frequently appear in the news for negative reasons; however, we knew that this awareness and fundraising strategy had the potential to reach a staggering number of high school students.

Given the 22,000-plus high schools registered with Facebook alone, we determined that if each school raised just $50 the total would be over $1 million. So we set a goal of reaching 1,000 schools and raising $200,000. In the end, we reached over 2,500 high schools and raised over $306,000.

The third idea that we presented to the Save Darfur Coalition was to offer a prize of some sort to the schools that raised the most funds. This suggestion became a reality, and sitting in this room today are representatives from some of the top 10 high school fundraisers nationwide. We also extend our gratitude to the Save Darfur Coalition for creating winner's even beyond our greatest expectations.

Ana and I started Dollars for Darfur because we wanted to bring attention to the horrific crimes against humanity occurring in the Sudan. We sought to harness the good will that we know is ubiquitous in students of our generation and provide them with a format to effect change. We aspired to define our generation as one that acted and made a difference. It was always our goal to motivate fellow high school students, but somewhere along the line I realized that kids all across this country had deeply inspired me and opened my eyes to the power of individuals uniting to assert the indelible right to justice and liberty for all people of our global community.

In towns and cities across the country, students joined Dollars for Darfur and inspired fellow students and community members to help stop the suffering in Darfur. Did you know that just $35 can provide two high-energy meals a day to 200 children in the Sudan? Some students who participated in the challenge could scarcely afford the dollar they gave, while others easily gave hundreds. Yet, in his or her own way, each united around this important issue and sought to define our generation as one of strength and moral fortitude.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Anderson follows:]

Hello… I am Nick Anderson, co-founder of *Dollars for Darfur*, the national high school challenge to stop genocide in Darfur. In the United States we are quite comfortable—a blessing in striking contrast to what is occurring in the Darfur region of the Sudan. In comparison to my home state of Massachusetts, the number of people in Darfur who have died so far is equivalent to two-thirds the city of Boston and the number left homeless is approximately a quarter of the state's population. Facts like these compelled me to act; I present to you today a bit of the history of our project.

In July 2006, co-founder Ana Slavin and I flew to Washington DC to meet with staff of the Save Darfur Coalition to encourage them to adopt *Dollars for Darfur* as one of their campaigns. We came with three main ideas:

1) First, we intended to set up a national high school challenge that would both promote awareness of the situation in Darfur and raise money to be donated to Save Darfur and key relief organizations.
2) Second, we proposed using social networking websites, like Facebook and MySpace, as a conduit to the *Dollars for Darfur* webpage (www.savedarfur.org/dollarsfordarfur). The webpage provided information to increase awareness of the atrocities occurring in Darfur and had a scoreboard page that managed the national fund raising challenge. It was a unique format for disseminating information, as Facebook and MySpace more frequently appear in the news for negative reasons. However, we knew that this awareness and fundraising strategy had the potential to reach a staggering number of high school students. Given the 22,000+ high schools registered with Facebook alone, we determined that if each school raised just $50, the total would be over 1 million dollars. So, we set a goal of reaching 1000 schools and raising $200,000. In the end, we reached over 2,500 high schools and raised $306,000!
3) The third idea that we presented to the Save Darfur Coalition was to offer a prize of some sort to the schools that raised the most funds. This suggestion became a reality, and sitting in this room today are representatives from some of the top 10 high school fundraisers nationwide. We also extend our gratitude to the Save Darfur Coalition for creating a winner's event beyond our greatest expectations.

Ana and I started *Dollars for Darfur* because we wanted to bring attention to the horrific crimes against humanity occurring in the Sudan. We sought to harness the goodwill that we know is ubiquitous in students of our generation and provide them with a format to effect change. We aspired to define our generation as one that acted and made a difference. It was always our goal to motivate fellow high school students, but somewhere along the way, I realized that kids all across this country had deeply inspired me and opened my eyes to the power of individuals uniting to assert the indelible right to justice and liberty for all people of our global community.

In towns and cities across the country, students joined *Dollars for Darfur* and inspired fellow students and community members to help stop the suffering in Darfur. Did you know that just $35 can provide two high-energy meals a day to 200 kids in the Sudan? Some students who participated in the challenge could scarcely afford the dollar they gave, while others easily gave hundreds. Yet, in his or her own way, each united around this important issue and sought to define our generation as one of strength and moral fortitude. Ana will now tell you some of their stories.

Nicholas Anderson, student Northfield Mount Hermon School; Gill, MA
949 Roaring Brook Road Conway, MA 01341 413-475-0314

I am Nick Anderson, co-founder of *Dollars for Darfur*, the national high school challenge to stop genocide in Darfur.

From a young age, I admired Nelson Mandela for his perseverance and unmatched political skills. He was able to revolutionize a country and bring it out of third-world poverty through his peaceful methods and masterful negotiation techniques. Last year, during my sophomore year in high school, I had the special opportunity to be part of a joint history and religion humanities class that traveled to South Africa. There, I went to Robben Island and visited Mandela's prison cell; it was impossible not to appreciate the sacrifice Mandela had made in his personal life for a political cause that would free a whole nation. What was most striking to me were the stories from the old prison guards about Mandela's dignity and honor. Returning home, I realized I wanted to create an organization that would help relieve the suffering that is occurring in so much of the African continent. At first, I thought I might do sometime to help the AIDS orphanage I'd spent time at or perhaps try to help the school kids in Johannesburg, who elected to go to "Saturday School" to educate and pull themselves out of poverty. However, news reports drew me to learn more about the conflict in Darfur.

I read and saw reports about 400,000 Darfurians killed by the Janjaweed, the Sudanese government-backed militia who are dedicated to ethnic cleansing by murder, starvation, and rape. Over two million others have been left homeless—each of their homes burned to the ground and the wells polluted with dead animals or human waste to insure that they cannot be used again. In spite of the fact that the United Nations Security Council authorized a strong peacekeeping force for Darfur, the Janjaweed remain active. I also learned that political situation in Darfur is complicated: Sudan's dictator Omar Al-Bashir hosted Osama bin Laden for 5 years, and Al-Bashir has provided the US with credible information on Al Qaeda, making it hard for President Bush to publicly speak out against him. Furthermore, China's oil interests in the Sudan are making the government and towns like Khartoum very wealthy—luxury high rises can be seen being built. The current US government does not want to upset relations with China. Meanwhile, hundreds of Darfurians continue to die and suffer each day.

So, with my schoolmate Ana Slavin, I started *Dollars for Darfur*—the national high school challenge to stop genocide in Darfur. In July 2006, Ana and I flew to DC to meet with staff of the Save Darfur Coalition to encourage them to adopt *Dollars for Darfur* as one of their campaigns. There are three key features to the structure of *Dollars for Darfur*:

1) First, we set up a national high school challenge that would promote both awareness of the situation in Darfur and raise money to be donated to Save Darfur and key relief organizations.

2) Second, we used the social networking websites Facebook and MySpace as a way for kids to connect with other students at their own school, as well as across the country, to raise much needed money to stop the genocide. We felt that Facebook and MySpace would be the

fastest, most efficient way to spread the word about the *Dollars for Darfur* challenge and would demonstrate the potential of a positive, philanthropic use of social networking websites.

We had done our homework, however, and knew that the fundraising strategy had the potential to reach a staggering number of high school students. Our webpages and project information read:

"Okay, so here's the Challenge: There are 22,000 high schools registered with Facebook. With the help of MySpace networking, if each school raised just $50 the total would be over 1 million dollars! Better yet: There are about 15.5 million public and private high school students. If only an eighth of these students gave just one dollar, we could raise nearly 2 million dollars! Our Goal: is to raise at least $200,000 for Darfur."

We asked students who came to the *Dollars for Darfur* Facebook and MySpace pages to find just one friend to join the challenge, stating that in this way, we would quickly develop a national network—over 7,000 joined the *Dollars for Darfur* Facebook and MySpace pages and over 2000 schools joined the challenge.

Facebook and MySpace also served as a conduit to the *Dollars for Darfur* webpage (www.savedarfur.org/dollarsfordarfur) on the Save Darfur Coalition's website, which managed the national challenge. The webpage provided information to increase awareness of the atrocities occurring in Darfur. It had posters, flyers, and a PowerPoint (PPT) presentation with scripted dialogued that we had prepared (please see http://www.savedarfur.org/page/content/dfd/resources/ for all supporting documents); these documents gave a voice to our vision. Save Darfur Coalition created an organizer's tool kit and press release form that students anywhere in the country could use (see supporting documents). On the "Scoreboard" page, students could register their school to join the challenge and donate on line. The Save Darfur logo of a tree was the image used to visually note what percentage of the pledged amount had been reached. All funds raised went directly to Save Darfur, who in turn, it was made clear, would distribute half of the *Dollars for Darfur* donations to two aid organizations.

Additionally, our Facebook and MySpace pages gave us a forum to let kids know what was happening in the news on *Dollars for Darfur* (see supporting documents).

More importantly, the Facebook and MySpace pages provided a place for poignant debate and discussion on the crisis.

We let students know that on a showing of 60 Minutes, Dr. Ashis Brahma, a refugee camp doctor, describes the situation there saying: "This is bad. They go to the villages, and they burn one village after the other, ...then when the people come out they catch the women and gang bang, they rape them not one guy, no 10, 15; then they carve up the men and throw them in the drinking water to make sure that this place will never ever be used again."

Dr. Ashis Brahma continues: "And you're telling me the people in America don't know this—or don't want to know this? Maybe it's too much to know; but that's what's happening right now, and it's happening all over again." Dr. Brahma adds. "I'm sorry to say, I'm going to sit here with you in two years time, and I'm gonna tell you the same sad story. So, we ask you, do we not know—or do we not want to know?"

Six million Jews were killed during the Holocaust and over four hundred thousand people of Darfur have been murdered so far. We asked high school students all across the country to consider: Are we just going to sit back and let another Holocaust occur? They responded with conviction.

5) The third feature of the *Dollars for Darfur* structure was that there be a prize of some sort. Teenagers are competitive, almost by nature. We toyed with speakers and musical groups; Save Darfur wanted it to be a surprise. A trip to DC for the top 10 high schools became the "prize." Our sincere gratitude to the Save Darfur Coalition for creating an event beyond our wildest expectation.

We asked the Save Darfur Coalition to take us on as a campaign, as the political component is essential if any real change is to happen in the Sudan. However, just as important to us is the commitment to get aid to the people in the refugee camps in Darfur and along the border in Chad. As our PPT explains, just $35 can bring two high-energy meals a day to 200 children and $50 can vaccinate 50 people against meningitis, measles, polio, or other deadly epidemics. Yet, the Janjaweed is so dangerous that organizations like, Oxfam, Doctors without Borders, CARE, or International Rescue Committee cannot always get the food and medical supplies to the people of Darfur who so desperately need them. One aid organization that we had designated as a recipient for a donation declined the donation, citing concerns about the safety of their workers in Darfur. The Executive Director of this organization wrote me the following in an email after I had met him at a fundraising event: "Our independence and perception thereof is one of the key assets that we have in trying to gain access and minimizing security risks for our staff, both of which are tenuous in Darfur."

Currently, I am working with two aid organizations that are actively working to make the necessary arrangements for me to travel to refugee camps in Chad or Darfur this summer. It is very difficult to get anyone into the Darfur region, so this is a tremendous investment on the part of these organizations, for which I am very grateful. My primary goal is to return to the US and spread awareness to high school and college students through public speaking and writing commitments. However, one of these organizations already wrote me the following: "Also [I] heard back from our East African Rep and it sounds like [name of organization] is definitely interested in working with you at some level, but your association with Save Darfur may throw things off a bit. [Name of organization] has to be VERY careful about the position it takes and the way it talks about Darfur with congress/media/anyone because we have people working on the ground there whose lives are at risk if it offends anyone. We can't put [name of organization] lives at risk." While I understand that there is an age-old conflict between political advocacy and aid work, it is a shame that I would have to choose between the two. It is my feeling that a voice directed at young adults is a great tool in effecting change in Darfur, as we are the generation that will be left with resolving the legacy of this disaster.

Ana and I started *Dollars for Darfur* because we wanted to bring attention to the horrific crimes against humanity occurring in the Sudan. We wanted to harness the goodwill that we knew existed in this generation, give fellow students a format in which to express themselves, and begin defining ourselves as the generation that made a difference. It was always our goal to inspire fellow high school students, but somewhere along the way, I realized that kids all across this country had inspired me, had opened my eyes to the power that people can assert in an effort to good.

In villages, towns, and cities across the country, high school students (including those in the room with us here today) joined *Dollars for Darfur*, lit the candle of knowledge, and inspired their fellow students to help stop the genocide and suffering in Darfur. Some students who participated in the challenge could scarcely afford the dollar they gave, while others easily gave hundreds. Yet, in his or her own way, each united around this important issue and sought to define our generation as one of strength and moral fortitude. Ana will now tell you some of their stories.

In the end, we reached over 2,000 high schools and raised $306,000. With more time and sponsored support, I feel that we could triple that amount.

STATEMENT OF ANA SLAVIN

Ms. SLAVIN. It is an honor for us to represent high school students from around the country and to be the voice to represent everyone who contributed to Dollars for Darfur at this important hearing.

As Nick and I were developing Dollars for Darfur, there was one aspect that was of primary importance: the involvement of high school students. While some view high school students to be concerned with merely the trials and tribulations of teenage life, we saw something more. We saw a generation with the desire to make a difference.

Our generation has struggled to find an identity. We are now recognized for our activism. Through this challenge we have proved that, given the right forum, we can have an impact.

Nick and I started Dollars for Darfur by simply inviting our friends to join our Facebook and MySpace groups and encouraging them to spread the word. The numbers grew exponentially. In just 6 months, more than 7,000 high school students had joined our groups. Teens across the country have devised creative and effective ways of raising money and awareness for the cause.

For example, at our school, Northfield Mount Hermon, Evan Abrams helped raise more than $15,000 and amassed a Dollars for Darfur committee consisting of over 50 students. Evan and his committee sold pizza to dorms around campus and organized a series of tournaments held in our student center.

Ryan Saxe from Nevada organized a walk through the Vegas Strip, raising both funds and awareness.

Christine Ocshner from Clearwater Central Catholic High School organized a school-wide dress-down day in which students could pay to dress in the clothing of their choice rather than their uniforms.

Numerous schools like Deerfield Academy and Athens Academy held benefit concerts run and performed by students.

Students from Wyoming High School even went door to door through their communities educating people about the situation and receiving donations.

Through these efforts, Dollars for Darfur raised over $300,000 in just 6 months. The success of Dollars for Darfur demonstrates two things about our generation: we have extremely effective social networks that can be quickly mobilized, and we are passionate about ending the genocide in Darfur.

I would like to read a few excerpts from the hundreds of messages that students posted on the Dollars for Darfur Facebook and MySpace sites, to give you a sense of some of the incredible enthusiasm we encountered throughout the Dollars for Darfur challenge.

Claire Helfrich from the American School of the Hague writes: "This is great, you guys. Here in the Netherlands, my school has done a Save Darfur campaign, as well. With all our efforts and money, we can really make a difference."

Kristin Girouard from Oakton High School wrote: "Forget the imaginary lines that divide us from Africa. A suffering human being in Darfur is just as important as a U.S. citizen, and, furthermore, worthy of our attention, compassion, and aid."

Finally, Alex Mandel from Solebury School posted the following quotation from Nelson Mandela: "Sometimes it falls upon a generation to be great. You can be that generation."

Our generation knows that we will inherit a world with staggering problems. We simply can't wait for others to change the world—we must start now. Taking action to stop the Darfur genocide is of great concern to high school students. According to a recent survey of 18 to 24 year olds conducted by Harvard University's Institute of Politics, the crisis in Darfur was identified as the most important foreign policy issue after stabilizing Iraq. Our generation will vote in 2008, and we will support candidates who work to promote human rights.

We are grateful to the Save Darfur Coalition for supporting us and believing in this idea. We would also like to acknowledge the work that members of this subcommittee have done to help end the genocide in Darfur. We extend our sincere gratitude for convening this hearing and listening to our testimony.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Slavin follows:]

It is an honor for us to represent high school students from around the country and be the voice to represent everyone who contributed to Dollars for Darfur at this important hearing. As Nick and I were developing Dollars for Darfur there was one aspect that was of primary importance; the involvement of high school students. While some view high school students to be consumed with merely the trials and tribulations of teenage life, we saw something more. We saw a generation with a desire to make a difference. Our generation has struggled to find an identity. We are now recognized for our activism. Through this challenge we have proved that given the right forum we *can* have an impact. Nick and I started Dollars for Darfur by simply inviting our friends to join our Facebook and MySpace groups and encouraging them to spread the word. The numbers grew exponentially: in just six months more than 7000 high school students had joined our groups. Teens across the country have devised creative and effective ways of raising money and awareness for the cause. For example:

At our school, Northfield Mount Hermon, Evan Abrams helped raise more than $15,000 and amassed a Dollars for Darfur committee consisting of over 50 students. Evan and his committee sold pizza to dorms around campus and organized a series of tournaments held in our student center

Ryan Saxe from Nevada organized a walk through the Vegas Strip raising both funds and awareness

Christine Ocshner from Clearwater Central Catholic high school organized a school wide dress down day in which students could pay to dress in the clothing of their choice rather than their uniforms

Numerous schools like Deerfield Academy and Athens Academy held benefit concerts run and performed by students.

Students from Wyoming High School even went door to door through their community educating people about the situation and receiving donations

Through these efforts Dollars for Darfur raised over $300,000 in just 6 months. The success of Dollars for Darfur demonstrates two things about our generation: we have extremely effective social networks that can be quickly mobilized and we are passionate about ending the genocide in Darfur.

I would like to read a few excerpts from the hundreds of messages that students posted on the Dollars for Darfur Facebook and MySpace sites to give you a sense of some of the incredible enthusiasm we encountered throughout the Dollars for Darfur Challenge.

Claire Helfrich from the American School of the Hague writes:
This is great, you guys. Here is the Netherlands, my high school has done a Save Darfur campaign as well. … with all our efforts and money we can really make a difference.

Kristin Girouard from Oakton High School wrote:

Forget the imaginary lines that divide us from Africa. A suffering human being in Darfur is just as important as a US citizen, and furthermore, worthy of our attention, compassion and aid.

Finally, Alex Mandel from Solebury School posted the following quotation from Nelson Mandela: "Sometimes it falls upon a generation to be great, you can be that generation."

Our generation knows that we will inherit a world with staggering problems. We simply can't wait for others to change the world – we must start now. Taking action to stop the Darfur genocide is of great concern to high school students. According to a recent survey of 18-24 year olds conducted by Harvard University's Institute of Politics, the crisis in Darfur was identified as the most important foreign policy issue after stabilizing Iraq. Our generation will vote in 2008 and we will support candidates who work to promote human rights.

We are grateful to the Save Darfur Coalition for supporting us and believing in this idea. We would also like to acknowledge the work that members of this subcommittee have done to help end the genocide in Darfur. We extend our sincere gratitude for convening this hearing and listening to our testimony.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Ana, and thank you, Nick.

I think I can speak for all the members of the subcommittee that are here and those that have read your testimony and are not here yet that it is very impressive, and your generation has certainly found its identity. Human rights is about as good as you can do when you are looking for a cause.

I understand that you have some representatives from some of the high schools that were leaders in raising the money. Can we ask all of them to stand so we can acknowledge their work, as well.

[Applause.]

Mr. TIERNEY. While you are up, would you please tell us your name and what school you attend and where.

Mr. ABRAMS. I am Evan Abrams. I am from the Northfield Mount Hermon School.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

Ms. OCSHNER. Christine Ocshner.

Ms. KEARNEY. Pilar Kearney, William S. Hart High School.

Ms. CRESCENTE. Kelli Crescente, William S. Hart High School.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you all very, very much. You are doing spectacular things.

Nick and Ana, thank you very much for your testimony. I think what you are doing is tremendous, and you are just setting such a great example, and others are going to follow. We will look forward to watching you. This will not be the last we hear from either of you, I am sure.

Ms. SLAVIN. Thank you.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you.

Mr. TIERNEY. We will take a moment while we change panels, if we can.

The subcommittee will now receive testimony from the witnesses on the second panel.

We have an outstanding panel here this morning, and we will discuss the Olympic spirit as a moral imperative to end the genocide in Darfur. With us to do that we have Daoud Ibrahim Hari. Daoud is a Darfuri refugee who has served as an interpreter for a number of reporters, including Nicolas Kristof of the New York Times and other journalists in Darfur. Mr. Hari was taken hostage and tortured on a trip into Darfur with the Chicago Tribune correspondent Paul Salopek, who suffered personally in respect to his family's situation.

Daoud, we respect the fact that you are here and what you have gone through and your willingness to come forward and testify.

We have Joey Cheek, American Olympic Gold Medalist speedskater. After Joey won the gold and silver in the 2006 Olympics, he donated his $40,000 medal bonus to a group helping Darfuri refugees. Since then, he has been a tireless activist on this issue.

Tegla Loroupe is a Kenyan Olympic distance runner. I declined her offer to train with her. She is a two-time New York City Marathon champion and a world record holder, United Nations Ambassador of Sport, and Champion of Peace and Justice in Sudan and elsewhere in Africa. Thank you for joining us.

And we have Jill Savitt, the director of the Campaign to Bring Olympic Dream to Darfur.

We have John Prendergast, senior advisor to the International Crisis Group and co-founder of the ENOUGH campaign.

We have retired Ambassador Lawrence Rossin, senior international coordinator with the Save Darfur Coalition.

I want to welcome all of you. I want to thank you. I want to ask you to be kind enough to stand, please, and raise your right hands as we do swear in all witnesses appearing before the committee.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. TIERNEY. Let the record please reflect that all witnesses answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Hari, if it is all right with you, we would like to start with your testimony.

STATEMENTS OF DAOUD IBRAHIM HARI, DARFURI REFUGEE AND INTERPRETER TO NICK KRISTOF AND OTHER JOURNALISTS; JOEY CHEEK, AMERICAN OLYMPIC GOLD MEDALIST SPEEDSKATER; TEGLA LOROUPE, KENYAN OLYMPIC DISTANCE RUNNER, WORLD RECORD HOLDER AND UNITED NATIONS AMBASSADOR OF SPORT; JOHN PRENDERGAST, SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP AND CO-FOUNDER OF THE ENOUGH CAMPAIGN; AMBASSADOR (RET.) LAWRENCE G. ROSSIN, SENIOR INTERNATIONAL COORDINATOR, SAVE DARFUR COALITION; AND JILL SAVITT, DIRECTOR OF THE OLYMPIC DREAM FOR DARFUR CAMPAIGN

STATEMENT OF DAOUD IBRAHIM HARI

Mr. HARI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for inviting me to speak. It is really hard for me to share my experience with you.

It is sad, my written testimony. My name is Daoud Ibrahim Hari. I am a refugee from Darfur. I came to the United States in 2003 because of the genocide against my people.

I was born in Musbat in north Darfur, where I learned my English in my school. I am survivor of the genocide.

At the end of 2003 the government of the Sudan destroyed my village and killed my brother. It caused me to flee with the women and children to find safety in Chad. In Chad from 2004 to 2006 I became interpreter for NGO and international journalists seeking to expose the genocide in Darfur and religious crisis in Central Africa Republic.

I took this risk because I want to show the world the tragedies happening to my people. I even went back to Darfur with the journalists and some NGO six times to talk with the victims and hear the stories.

I remember going with Nick Kristof of New York Times for 2 years to talk to soldiers. He was wounded by the villagers. People asked that the government of Sudan had paid them $200 to come to destroy this village. If they succeed, they were paid $700. We saw and he taught me that the government of Sudan had to pay for genocide.

I also remember seeing how they would clean the villages. In one case they dismembered the family bodies and put them in the village well to poison the water resources for the area.

And also, when I went with the BBC, to Sudan and Chad, we witnessed 81 persons had been killed and dead bodies were destroyed. The village was burned down to the ground.

I, myself, then became victim of the government of Sudan when they arrested, jailed, and tortured me with Paul Salopek of the Chicago Tribune on assignment with the National Geographic, and our drivers. I was sure that I would be killed. This was a miracle for me that the American politician Chris Shays, Barak Obama, and Governor Bill Richardson were able to secure our freedom after 25 days in jail. However, my people need more miracle from American and other world.

Finally, to bring peace to my people and to stop the genocide I recommend that you pressure the government of China to not support the government of Sudan killing my people.

Also, all the Darfuri refugees have need of help and resettlement in the United States. There are refugees in danger, including women and children. Sixty percent of the women are refugees who lost their husband. Thousands of children were held who lost their parents. We need the United States to provide special legislation for my people who are in constant risk.

I thank America for saving my life and I will continue to share my story with the American policy. I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hari follows:]

TESTIMONY OF DAOUD IBRAHIM HARI

Hearing on *Darfur and the Olympics: A Call for International Action, June 7, 2007*
House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs

The Gravity of the Current Situation in Darfur

1. Introduction

My name is Daoud Ibrahim Hari. I am also known to some by another name: Souleyman Abakar Moussa, a name I chose to protect myself and my family from the repercussions of my involvement in getting the story of the genocide and refugee crisis out to the wider world. I am 34 years old and one of only three refugees from Darfur allowed into the United States since the genocide began against my people in 2003. I arrived at John F. Kennedy International Airport the night of March 15, and now live in Asbury Park, New Jersey. I knew that in leaving, I might never see my mother, brother and sisters in Darfur again. I thought about all I wanted to do to help them and all the others in Darfur and in the refugee camps in Chad. I continued to cry in myself, but felt hopeful about the new and very different life I was about to find.

2. My Personal Story: How do I know what I know?

My time is very brief. And my experiences are very long. I will tell you a few things about myself, my past before the war, and then something of my recent experiences – especially as they answer the important question you may have: *How does he know what he knows?*

I was born in the small village of Musbat in Northern Darfur. There were so many other villages like mine that are no more. In my village everybody knew each other – and had for generations. In my case, we were Zaghawa, one of the major tribes of Darfur. Like most Zaghawa, my father was a camel herder. I had 4 brothers and 3 sisters and, as a second child, my job was to take care of our little goats and sheep. It was for us a special way of life and while always hard provided a life for us children

that was free of care and always interesting. I completed high school in El Fasher, the largest town in Darfur, where I learned some English.

In 2003, air strikes by the government of Sudan against us were occurring on villages all around. We knew it was just a matter of time before they struck us. Government helicopters came in late summer. The men of the village helped the women and children run away into the hills and valleys. Many died, including one of my brothers; two of my sisters and their families disappeared during the chaos of running away and are still missing. Since then, another brother has gone missing. I saw all this with my own eyes; my village no longer exists –the village is dead. Just one of the hundreds of thousands people who have met similar fates since 2003. I became a refugee in Chad.

I wanted to do something to help. The government of Chad however wouldn't let me work, and when I saw nongovernmental organizations like the Red Cross working to help people and decided to see if I could help them. I first started working with the Red Cross and Africares as a translator. I happened to meet some German journalists and worked for them. Next, I worked with a Japanese journalist and soon journalists began to ask for me. I continued working with NGOs, too. A lot more work came my way. I met Nicholas Kristof of *The New York Times* in mid 2006.

I have translated for journalists in eastern Chad along the border with Sudan and the Central African Republic, and entered Darfur 6 times with journalists from the BBC, the New York Times and NGOs like Human Rights Watch. There was fighting everywhere we went. I was sometimes very scared, but I felt it was my duty to help get the story of what was happening in Darfur out to the world. I saw many terrible things: bodies burned, unexploded missiles in water points, poisoned water, mass graves, very small children killed—burned to death: I buried them with my own hands. The Darfuris we met would tell us horrible stories that I didn't want to hear. It was sometimes too painful to translate for the journalists. I met many people who had become crazy because of the violence and their grief.

You may have read my story in the May 14, 2007 op-ed piece written by Nick Kristof in the New York Times and in an earlier article in the *Chicago Tribune* by Paul Salopek on October 9, 2006. Paul and I were arrested by one of the rebel militias and held for 35 days before being turned over to the Khartoum army. We faced death several times and I experiences repeated beatings and torture before being miraculously released in Khartoum on September 9, 2006. Intervention by American politicians including Representative Christopher Shays and Governor Bill Richardson with key Sudanese officials was critical in securing our release. I could say so much more here, and perhaps you will want to ask me later about such experiences.

3. The situation in Darfur

The experiences I've described are, sadly, not the exception. Many have met far worse a fate than I have. But my role as translator and guide has provided me an opportunity to see the situation on the ground in Darfur in a way that few have.

During the past 3 years and more, I have seen, and have shown journalists, the real face of genocide. For me the situation is personal. For you it is political. For us there is no relief and no prospect of a solution in sight. For one thing it is complex and perhaps hard to understand. It is a mistake to describe it as simply "good" versus "evil," a contest between seeming innocent black African farmers and nomadic Arabs. First of all, both farmers and nomads, African and Arab, are Darfuris and have lived, sometimes very uneasily, together sharing and trading for centuries. We will have to live together again somehow. Both the rebels and the janjaweed unfortunately have contributed to keeping the fighting going.

1. Khartoum and the rebels may have started the conflict for one reason, but are now caught in a conflict that no one party has any control over any longer. And that means, no one party has the power to secure or impose peace. The rebel groups are divided among themselves since the signing of a cease-fire accord in May a year ago – some "pro-agreement" and others opposed. Loyalties are fluid and

treachery is common. If you think about it, a successful peace requires agreement among those fighting and negotiations, but with the splintering and demoralization of rebel groups and the failure of the government to impose a military solution, the task of getting all the parties to the table will be long and complex.

2. But it must be done and the role of China will be critical. From the ground in Darfur, it is obvious that Chinese support for the government in Khartoum, military, economic and political has made it possible for the army to continue to fight in Darfur. Their political support, in the UN Security Council and elsewhere, has given the government protection, you would say "cover," to avoid sanctions and to overcome them when they are imposed.
3. Peacekeeping troops can't stop the killing alone, but they can help. The current African Union peacekeeping force of 7,000 is inadequate. Remember that Sudan is the largest country in Africa and Darfur itself is larger than France. Think about that. Even the addition of the 20,000 UN peacekeeping force promised by the Security Council are small in comparison to the need. And there is a problem that needs to be considered. Even if such a force could be assembled, it is difficult to imagine that they could be deployed successfully in the field and re-supplied without the assent of the government in Khartoum. The alternative of entering from Chad has political and practical problems that make it unlikely. Still, such a peacekeeping force, if deployed, could make a big difference in reducing the violence and giving everyone time for serious political negotiations. But no one should believe that simply having peacekeepers on the ground, given the chaos, will prevent them from becoming drawn into the dynamics of the conflict as has happened with AU forces. What then?
4. Gaining access for peacekeepers and starting serious negotiations could be aided by smart pressure on the government including targeted economic and political sanctions similar to those proposed by President Bush last week – but more serious and less symbolic than those proposed.

4. Recommendations

I want to leave you with three thoughts, three recommendations:

1. Pressure the government of China to stop their "blind eye" and active support for the government in Khartoum that makes the on-going genocide in Darfur possible.
2. Pressure the government in Khartoum and the rebel groups to accept the deployment of the larger joint AU-UN peacekeeping force authorized in Security Council Resolution 1679 (2006).
3. Undertake a serious multi-lateral process to reach political consensus and give it the resources and time needed to succeed. It is the only way forward.
4. Provide Iraq-style legislation to allow others like myself, in dire danger, to come to this country as refugees, including the women and children, many who are widows or orphans and risk horrible harm in the refugees camps. Specifically, authorize the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in N'Djamena to screen and refer such cases to the United States Government for resettlement.

Thank you for listening to my story.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you for your testimony, Mr. Hari.

Mr. Cheek.

STATEMENT OF JOEY CHEEK

Mr. CHEEK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to all the Members and to all of the staff who have put together this hearing today. I think it is a timely issue and an important one, and I am very honored and humbled to be a part of a panel with as much experience and moral weight as this one does.

It truly is the thrill of a lifetime to compete in Olympic games. I spent more than 17 years preparing and training and competing so that I could compete at the Salt Lake Olympics in 2002 and then in the Turin Olympics in 2006 representing my country. I was a bronze medalist in 2002, and a gold and silver medalist in 2006 in Turin.

Oftentimes, the American media really plays up the competitive aspect of the games. What really matters, we are led to believe, is who are the winners, who are the losers, what are the medal counts, and which nation stands on top. It is certainly the case that the Olympics is a competitive event, but in my opinion, having experienced two of them now, that is not the real majesty of the Olympics.

I have a story that I would like to tell, and it illustrates, in my opinion, really what I think the true power of Olympic sport is, and ultimately what the Olympic ideal which we pay a lot of lip service to and oftentimes do not live up to. I think this story exemplifies.

I am asked oftentimes what my favorite memory is, and it is outstanding to stand on the podium as a gold medalist with the national anthem playing and flag raising, but one of my favorite memories is the very first time I walked into an Olympic village. Within the village, very few people are ever accepted and there is no press, there is no family. It is just the athletes who have qualified. And you walk into this big hall, and the flags of all the nations that are competing are draped from the ceilings. You walk in and your eyes light up because this is the moment you have dreamt of since you were nine or ten or eleven years old. You look down and you see all the athletes from the world, and it is this great tapestry of colors, because every nation wears their colors on their back.

At first your eyes are so wide and you are so struck by this experience of finally making it, it takes a little while for you to realize that, as you look up, you see athletes from Europe and from Asia, from Africa, from North America, from South America, and we all sit at the same tables. We sit together and we break bread and we eat and we laugh. Oftentimes, although when we compete on a field of play with all our hearts and souls out there and we compete with all that we have, the cameras never catch us when we return and we are able to laugh and share experiences and hug and talk about this shared reality that so few people on Earth will ever get to experience.

I said in my written testimony that it is not uncommon to see Japanese and Chinese athletes sitting together and talking, or Europeans from nations that our grandfathers fought to the death and decimated an entire continent being best friends, being lifelong

friends. There are actually quite a few Olympic marriages. You would be surprised.

That story is never told about the Olympics, but to me that one is something that exemplifies what this Olympic ideal is all about.

We talk about, when we speak of the Olympics, we speak about sport transcending mere competition. We talk about being able to use sport to promote the values of peace and common brotherhood and humanity, and oftentimes it is just kind of boilerplate. It is something that sounds nice. The only way it can be a true reality is if we take that flowery language and we choose to live it in our everyday lives.

After the 2006 Olympics when I was gold and silver medalist I had a brief moment of media spotlight, and I thought of all the lessons that I had learned from sport, and I realized the most important one was that myself, an athlete from Europe, and athlete from China, an athlete from Africa, many of us have much more in common than we have different. In fact, I may have something more in common with a speedskater that grew up competing in China than I do with someone I may meet walking down the street.

As we get ready in the next year-and-a-half for the 2008 summer Olympics in Beijing, many people are going to say I don't see the connection between a sporting event and the genocide going on on the other side of the world. In fact, I believe one of the foreign ministers of China was just quoted in the Washington Post saying that there are many activists that are trying to link this and they will fail because politics and the Olympics don't match, they don't mix. I think, with all due respect, that is the exact opposite message. I think he is absolutely incorrect. The sole reason we have an Olympics is so that we can live up to the ideals that we profess.

It has already been said, of course, the financial relationships between China and Sudan, but I think it is also important to point out that, by choosing to host an Olympics, China in particular looks to use this as its coronation on the world's stage. They are an enormously developing nation. They are going to be a world power, if they are not yet, very shortly. You don't get to host the Olympics, you don't get to host this great event with all of the glow and all of the good feelings that come along with it, without accepting the responsibility of what you are proclaiming.

It is my intention, as we go through the next year-and-a-half and prepare for this Olympics, to travel out into the world and begin to recruit athletes, not just from the United States, because I think that the United States has already done a reasonable job and I think we will continue to improve in terms of what we are working on to try and stop the genocide in Darfur, but to recruit athletes from all over the world, because it is not just nations that have to live up to the Olympic ideal; I think the athletes that are competing also have a responsibility.

So I founded an organization entitled Where Will We Be, and over the next year-and-a-half I seek to bring other athletes, because, as the glow from the Turin Olympics fades and the star of the Beijing Olympics ascends, I think it is vital that new young hearts and new energy are brought into the fight.

I hope that by the time the Beijing Olympics begin we don't have to have another testimony, another hearing about this. I hope that

the nations of the world have lived up to this responsibility. I hope that the competing nations in the Olympics will live up to the ideals that they profess. But I believe that if they are not ready to make that decision, that the athletes of the world will have to take a leadership position in that respect.

I appreciate your giving me the time, and I also thank you deeply for making this an issue and keeping this on the national and the world stage.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Cheek follows:]

FINAL Testimony of Joey Cheek

It is my sincere privilege to address this august committee. I would like to thank the Chairman, Congressman Tierney, all of the members and the congressional staff for extending the invitation to speak on my experiences as an Olympic athlete and a concerned citizen who continues to fight for the protection of the millions of innocent civilians residing in Darfur, Sudan.

I would like to thank the committee for calling this hearing and for drawing attention to the crisis in Darfur as well as exploring options that we Olympians have for positively motivating the international community to swiftly and effectively improve the lives of the millions that are suffering.

Throughout my life I have been incredibly blessed. After years of hard work, training, exhaustive preparations, and the sacrifice of my family, friends, and community, I have had the privilege to compete in two Olympic Games representing the United States as Speedskater. From those two competitions I brought home three medals, a bronze medal in the 2002 Olympic Games and gold and silver medals in the 2006 Olympic Games in Turin, Italy.

Winning Olympic medals is a great personal thrill, but I brought home lessons and experiences from those two games that I participated in that are worth much more than mere athletic awards. These lessons are best illustrated by a story that I feel encapsulates the true spirit of Olympic competition and goes strait to the heart of the crisis in Darfur that we are addressing here today.

Within the Olympic Village, an area only a handful of people throughout the world are ever permitted to see, the greatest athletes on Earth live and complete their final preparations for the most important competition of their lives. Success means immortality in the annuls of Olympic history and falling short of the goal of athletic perfection means that although your name may not be mentioned alongside the greats, you are still part of a rarefied club, the holder of a shared experience of excellence. The media loves to tout this aspect of the games: the thrill of victory, that agony of defeat.
However seeing only the competitive part alone shows a tiny fraction of the true beauty of the Olympic Games.

I believe that the true Olympic Spirit can be demonstrated by this example: Inside the Village all of the athletes eat together. I know that may seem trivial, but as you walk inside the dining hall your gaze drifts up to the rafters where all of the flags of the competing nations hang then drifts back down to the long tables where all of the athletes proudly wear the colors of their nations draped on their backs the true glory of this otherwise ordinary act is played out.
Athletes from the Americas sit and break bread next to athletes from Africa. The athletes from the many nations of Europe, whose grandfathers lives were devastated by a war that encompassed the world, now laugh and embrace each other like brothers inside this shared space. It was in this enclave that I realized that I may have more in common with an athlete born in communist China, through our shared love of our sport and experience on the field of play, than I have with some of my own native born countrymen. This is the true magnificence of the

Olympic Games. We can fight like hell on the athletic field and return to live in peace.

It was with this spirit in mind that I made a decision that has altered the course of my life. After winning a gold and silver medal in the 2006 Olympic Games I donated all of the money I received as a medal bonus, $40,000, to an organization to aid refugees from the region of Darfur. I have been asked many times why I choose that conflict at that time and my answer is simple. I believed that no where else on earth was there a crisis affecting so many people that had such an inverse level of international attention and power focused on bringing it to an end. Although the level of attention focused on this conflict has improved over the last sixteen months or so since I made this announcement, there are still thousands of people being killed or raped and millions more who have been driven from their homes.

I have spent the last year as an unofficial ambassador of sorts, traveling the country educating young people on the crisis and what they can do to help end it, and traveling the world speaking with leaders in other countries imploring them to do more. Just a few months ago I traveled to Chad, where I visited refugee camps populated by tens of thousands of Darfuri citizens and heard firsthand of the tales of systemic murder, rape, villages being razed to the ground, and families being forced to flee for their lives. The images from those camps continue to haunt me. I am filled with rage when I think of the level of depravity to which some people can sink. Complacency in the face of such evil is indeed very hard to justify. It is, in fact, the opposite of what the Olympics were created to celebrate, which is why this topic is so relevant here today.

As the glow of games in Turin fade the light of a new games begins to shine. China, the most populated nation on earth will be hosting the grandest sporting event on earth, the 2008 summer Olympics. China, with its economy growing faster than almost any other nation, looks at these games as their coronation on the worlds stage, proving that they are indeed a force that will shape history in this century. By hosting an Olympic Games, a nation becomes the torch bearer for the Olympic ideals, as well as the host of a sporting event. In this crisis China plays an especially important role because it is the top economic partner of Sudan. China purchases two thirds of Sudan's oil exports, China has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in Sudan's economy and China sits on the UN Security council wielding veto power over any international effort to protect innocents in darfur from these murderous elements. By hosting an event that professes peace over conflict, China has laid claim to a higher moral ground. It is now up to them to fulfill that obligation.

China is not alone however, as the sole bearer of the Olympic ideal that all citizens are entitled to the rights of a safe and protected life. Every nation completing in these games has an obligation to fight the injustice of mass atrocities. That is why I have formed a new organization, an international coalition of athletes, titled "Where Will We Be?". I seek over the next year to bring in athletes not just from the United States, but every country in the world competing in the 2008 Olympics in Beijing to stand up and say that we believe that the Olympic games should be more than just a sporting competition. We believe that no matter what nation in which you were born you deserve

the same chance to fulfill their dreams as the great athletes competing at the Olympics. We believe that China, as host nation and a nation with extraordinary leverage, should take a leadership role in ending the atrocities for the people of Darfur.
And we believe, that as athletes, we are leaders and role models in our community, and we will do all that we can to make all people aware of this crisis and that it can be stopped.

Thank you again to all the members of this committee and thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak about what makes my Olympic experience truly meaningful. Thank your for hosting a hearing on this critical issue, which could ultimately mean the difference of life and death for millions of people. I know that the eyes of the world will be on Beijing on 8-8-08, but I implore all of us to wonder where the citizens of Darfur will be at that time. Thank You.

Mr. TIERNEY. We appreciate your testimony. Thank you.
Ms. Loroupe.

STATEMENT OF TEGLA LOROUPE

Ms. LOROUPE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, athletes, and students. It is a great honor for me to be here today to represent South Africa as an Olympic athlete.

My name is Tegla from the Tegla Loroupe Foundation. I am still active in sports. Don't turn down my offer. [Laughter.]

I would like to share with you today about the spirit of Olympics, through sports. It has a powerful role to play in our lives.

For the past 5 years, I asked my friends from Africa, Holland, and South Africa, and Uganda to have a race for peace. And they informed me that I come from a conflict place close to Uganda. I witness when people are dying. I used to run away from school. And when [inaudible] went to school in Sudan, I know what it means.

In 2003 I came and asked [inaudible], said I would like to have a peace race in that [inaudible] and they refused. They say do not go there, because of the AK–47s. And I found a place called Angola, where the place where the Sudanese came and stayed, including the family of the director. I did not know what to do. And I asked again, the peace race will help people. And over the last 13 years I have been the best athlete in Kenya.

There was no race being given in that region. In the night of that [inaudible] from Uganda, he called me, I never saw his eyes. He told me, listen, I am a great admirer of yours. We have been fighting for you, all people. You have been fighting to be one of the greatest athletes in Kenya. [inaudible] the reason I stand you down, [inaudible] but don't stop to have that peace race, because peace is the best thing for us. He did not know what it means to have peace [inaudible]. I was really shocked.

The following day I went [inaudible] and I asked, I would like to have this race for women. All of the sudden I had like [inaudible] ten ministers surrounding me. And they told me, listen, Tegla, it is not only for women; it is for men. Let the race be for all people. I said I could not [inaudible] I don't have money.

Some of the Sudanese who stayed in Nairobi, they came to me saying, listen, together with your government, we are going to help you go and train. Well, I went for training. I came back. I had peace race in [inaudible]. We were able to bring warriors and they returned their weapons and their [inaudible] for education.

Today in Africa we have many conflicts. Some are caused by tension over scarce resources, some are caused by ethnic rivalries. Some are caused because of disputes of fair distribution of oil, diamonds or other sources of wealth. Today, conflict in Darfur, it has all, contains all the elements of these. The food crisis is a very painful issue for the people of the continent of Africa. And [inaudible] are the one.

As we discuss about Darfur today, there are so many children, many boys and girls, many Olympians are losing their lives. Women and all the people are dying day by day. And so I tell you today to start to stand, it is not a time for pointing fingers. It is not a time for fearing one another. It is not a time for politicians

to come in. We have to save our human beings. Women have power. It is time for us to stand up in physical areas. It is not a point whereby, people visit Darfur for half an hour and they fly away. It is only that [inaudible] that attracts the media. People in the countryside, they don't have televisions. I say, because I came from countryside, when people come to Nairobi and talk about the peace in Sudan, when people come to Nairobi I talk about the problem between the provinces of Uganda and Kenya. Those who are playing around there run. Those who are playing for [inaudible], they don't understand. If only somebody can come and sit down there and talk with the people, they will understand.

Why we use sports today, because there is no politics, there is no difference, there is no diplomacy. You can believe. You can be placed and you can be moved. But when people come together to share, they feel, they can understand one another and with respect.

We know that [inaudible] are supporting the government for Sudan, but if only the Africa Union can come in and stand firm. Because they are not [inaudible]. There are other people who will not play a lot. When we see a problem in Darfur, it is not only the Sudanese people who suffer. We all suffer, especially—I am a woman, and many of the women [inaudible] and children are dying. We invest so much, 9 months, and maybe more, another 5 years, and that kid will be a soldier. It breaks the hearts of the women.

So it is time to tell the people in China doing the Olympics that we should not only stop a few days for the Olympics to continue for the Chinese to understand us. People are going to their country for one reason, peace. Peace is our dream. Sports is our dream for everybody that should see that they have peace [inaudible] that they build in Sudan should plant these [inaudible] things in the eyes of the children.

In the eyes of the poor that cannot talk, today I want to ask [inaudible], you have to come forward and help. You are the voice of the voiceless, and these people are suffering. It is your duty. It is my duty. It is the duty of everybody in this House to stand firm and tell the old ones [inaudible]. You have to visit Sudan and tell the leaders of Sudan it is time, it is enough.

The rich people, they don't stay there with their kids. They leave [inaudible]. They [inaudible]. I want to tell you one example. In 1999, I was running a marathon in Holland. All of a sudden, I saw my own community [inaudible] on CNN and I saw some people that I know that there was conflict there. I realized that, and when I go home my brother-in-law was killed because of conflicts. I really went home. When I came to Frankfort, I met with one of the [inaudible], and I know he was one of the people who fired the arms. He asked me where I came. We started quarreling in the airport. I say I am going home. He said that place, it is fire. And I say my father is still there. I know he is there. He is family and he will never leave the place. And he told me that, I'm going to Nairobi to see my family. I told him [inaudible] putting [inaudible] by the cameras. I told him, listen, I know that poor people are dying, but you people have coined the problem as dying, give them money to the poor fight themselves. That is what is happening today in Sudan.

[Inaudible] when I came home, people were not staying there, except my family, and few of them. My father told me, listen, do you know how to use any weapon? I say, listen, my hands are already [inaudible]. And he told me [inaudible] something important, don't stay with us. Go to the training camp. I said, where? In the other side are my [inaudible]. There was 4 days I could not go. And then I said, why? He said in sports place, [inaudible] kill sports people. He is an older man who cannot understand what it means to me to play sports. Today, sports can bring people together.

So, as I say, it is time for us. Let us use our resources. These are [inaudible] people, they are human people.

And I want to ask the countries who have not signed agreements, the small arms treaty, please do so. I know it is our business, but I am telling you it is not only going to stay in Africa, it will come to us. There are some of our women, light the fire in the grass, the fire will blind, their eyes are blind. So it will come to us [inaudible] peace to this day the fire of hatred, so sign the treaty of small arms before it destroys the students, any [inaudible].

It can reach people. You don't have peace because [inaudible] somebody is after you, so make what place you own and let us stand and be strong, all of us.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Loroupe follows:]

Tegla Loroupe
President, the Tegla Loroupe Foundation

Testimony to the House Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs

June 7, 2007

It is an honor to appear here before the United States Congress to discuss Darfur and the Olympic Spirit. Thank you Chairman Tierney, Congressman Shays, and to the other members of the committee for this opportunity.

I am Tegla Loroupe. I am from Kenya. I am an Olympian.

I would like to tell you about the spirit of peace of the Olympics, and about the powerful role of sports in bringing peace to conflicts around the world.

For the past five years, I, together with a group of fellow Olympians from Kenya, Holland, South Africa, and Uganda have organized Peace Marathons in conflict areas in Kenya and Uganda.

We have brought warring tribes together; we have negotiated peace agreements and disarmament agreements for warriors. We have helped warriors to give up their AK-47 weapons and agree to abandon raiding. We struggle against the flood of cheap small arms in our region that has led to escalating violence, and we fight against this by bringing communities together through sports.

A few months ago, our Peace Marathon brought together three thousand warriors from 8 tribes in Somalia, Kenya, Uganda, and Sudan.

We were honored that Michael Ranneberger, the current United States Ambassador to Kenya and a recent former head of the State Department's Sudan Programs Group, joined us, together with many of his staff, to run with the warriors, and to dedicate United States resources to support our school for the orphans of the conflicts.

I was proud to make new friends, to run in friendly competition.

But the tragedy of the flood of small arms ravaging our region struck unexpectedly only a few weeks later, when robbers in another part of Kenya attacked a US Embassy vehicle

with AK-47's. They attacked our friend who ran with us, Craig White, political officer at the US Embassy, and killed his wife and her mother.

Our friendship could not save them. Our peace efforts through sports did not reach these armed criminals.

We are redoubling our efforts to use sports to reach everyone. Our next Peace Marathon, in two weeks, will bring two thousand warriors to Moroto, Uganda; many will choose to disarm. Our school can teach children to compete peacefully.

Our marathons also inspire other positive outcomes. In Uganda, fathers came to me pledging to keep their girls in school. In Masai Mara I joined Ambassador Ranneberger in a run to promote an end to the practice of female genital mutilation. I feel strongly that by promoting education and the rights of girls we are creating a culture of peace.

Sports can create peaceful relations among people. We have shown over the past five years in Africa how sports can replace killing, create peace from violence, and do this in some of the most dangerous conflict areas in the world.

In Africa today we have many conflicts; some are caused by tension over scarce resources. Some are caused by ethnic or tribal rivalries. Some are caused by disputes over fair distribution of oil, or diamonds, or other sources of wealth.

The conflict in Darfur contains elements of all of these.

The Darfur crisis is a very painful issue for the people of the African continent.

I feel the pain, peacemakers feel the pain, and we athletes share the pain.

The government of Sudan, as the custodian of its people's security, must take the largest share of blame for the crisis in Darfur. And the government of Sudan has been able to ignore humanitarian appeals and international pressure to bring peace in Darfur because the government of Sudan has sudden wealth from selling its oil abroad, primarily to China.

The Peoples Republic of China, as a global actor, and as a major source of support for Sudan, must responsibly ensure that its business dealings bring peace, justice and respect to humanity and human rights, particularly in Sudan.

The People's Republic of China has embraced peace in hosting the 2008 Olympics, the world's greatest example of peaceful competition.

We Olympians will gather in Beijing next summer to honor the ancient and traditional Olympic spirit of peace. We will judge our success in bringing that spirit to the world by how the world performs in bringing peace to areas of conflict, such as Darfur.

When we Olympians gather in Beijing, we will gather under the hospitality of our Chinese hosts, who have chosen this theme for the Olympics:

One world, one dream.

Peace is our dream. Olympic peace in Beijing in 2008, Olympic peace in Darfur, and Olympic peace around the world.

As an Olympic athlete from the African continent, I appeal to China, host of our upcoming celebration of sport and peace, to take part in addressing the crisis in Darfur.

As an Olympic athlete from the African continent, I appeal to all my fellow Olympians worldwide to act responsibly to bring peace, particularly in Darfur.

As an Olympian, I call upon all governments to work with all athletes to promote peace in their respective countries, to use the power of sports to unify, bring joy, peace and harmony to people of all economic, social and racial status.

May I also appeal to all countries to ratify the non-proliferation of small arms and light weapons treaty, to eliminate this dangerous threat to peace.

It is my sincere hope that the United States Congress will express its support for the people of Darfur, and act to ensure that Darfur becomes peaceful and safe in the shortest time possible.

With your support I am anxious to use my foundation and academy to promote peace in Darfur, through our organization of peace marathons that include Darfur athletes and by recruiting Darfur children to attend my peace academy which will open in January.

We Olympians can only try to set an example; it remains the task of governments, as custodians of the security of their people, to act, and act now for peace.

THANK YOU

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Ms. Loroupe.

Mr. Prendergast.

STATEMENT OF JOHN PRENDERGAST

Mr. PRENDERGAST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I used to be an athlete, so maybe you can train with me as preparation.

There has been a lot of talk about Darfur. In fact, in my quarter century now of working in Africa and on African issues, I don't think there has ever been a wider gulf between rhetoric and action.

Just this morning I saw come across the airwaves our President talking about Darfur, and he said, "I am frustrated, but the international organizations can't move quickly enough. I don't know how long it is going to take for people to hear the call to save lives. I will be stressing, along with Tony Blair, the need for nations to take action. If the U.N. won't act, we need to take action ourselves, and I laid out a series of sanctions," etc.

A crucial misperception I think has to be corrected if we are going to be effective in Darfur. The U.N. doesn't move by itself; it has to be moved by the brain inside the United Nations, which is the United Nations Security Council. The most powerful nation in the Security Council is the United States. The U.N. moves when the United States moves it.

I worked in the last administration and spent a lot of time doing this stuff. It simply doesn't happen unless we move. So to displace responsibility to other nations or international organizations, which we are the dominant member, does a disservice, I think, to the cause.

The United States needs to lead in the United Nations now if we are going to take action that is going to change the calculations of the regime in Khartoum and get the peace deal and the protection force that everyone agrees are the central objectives in Darfur. So the urgency now is multilateral action, is leading in the United Nations. The unilateral actions we have taken have been tapped out, they have been discounted by the regime many years ago. It is harder work to work multilaterally. We have a lot of other issues on the agenda, so let's understand and respect the fact that Iran and North Korea and Iraq and other issues are taking up our time and energy.

But eggs are going to have to be broken and we are going to have to expend a little bit of our leverage or, as the President says, our moral and our political capital, if we are going to move this issue in the United Nations Security Council. And the fact is, the great news is that when we have done that in the past, including during this administration, when we have worked multilaterally we have actually made a difference in Sudan.

There have been three cases in the 18 years this regime has been in power where the United States had led multilaterally and there has been a major change on the ground in Sudan.

The first time was during the 1990's when Bin Laden lived in Sudan and support for terrorism was the order of the day with the Khartoum regime, U.S. led. Bin Laden was kicked out. The Al Qaeda infrastructure was dismantled, and we saw a real change.

The second time, slavery—all of you have known and heard about the issue of slavery in Sudan. The U.S. led multilaterally

and the regime capitulated, stopped arming the militias that were doing the slavery. It ended.

The third time has been just in the last couple of years when the United States and the Bush administration led internationally, multilaterally, to get a peace deal between the north and the south that everyone said was impossible to reach.

There is a track record here. We have just got to actually act.

So what does it mean to act in this context? Well, of course, what we have now is 4 years in Darfur where there has been no real cost for committing genocide, no cost for obstructing the United Nations. Without a cost, this will continue. It would be irrational, frankly, for the government of Sudan to stop pursuing a military solution if there is no cost, multilateral cost. That isn't plan B, because plan B was largely unilateral.

We have to move multilaterally, and I think there are five things we can do, five things the United States can take the lead on that would actually make a difference in Khartoum and change the calculation of the government of Sudan.

First, we need U.S. leadership to get the kind of sanctions that we have imposed on the businesses in Sudan unilaterally, we need to multilateralize those. We have 160 Sudanese companies now on a list that we freeze their assets, we go after their business. We try to target their businesses. We need to multilateralize those through the United Nations' Security Council. That takes leadership.

Second thing we can do, same approach, through the United Nations' Security Council take the idea of sanctioning the individuals who are most culpable and most responsible for genocide and crimes against humanity and multilateralize those through the Security Council.

There are three people, and I want to name names, because there are three people who have been most responsible for the destruction of 400,000 lives in Sudan during the last 4 years, and there are three people who haven't yet shown up on our lists because we are protecting them because they are the ones that are giving us a lot of information in our counter-terrorism cooperation. We are going to have to make a stand here and decide what matters most to us. The three people are the Assistant to the President, Nafie Ali Nafie; the Director of Intelligence, Salah Abdallah Gosh; and the Minister of Defense, Abdel Rahim Mohamed Hussein. Those are the three guys that we need to act. If we don't target the orchestrators, these sanctions are not going to bite.

The third thing we can do, whether you agree or not with the International Criminal Court, whether or not we support the ICC, whether or not we sign the ICC Charter, we can quietly provide declassified intelligence to the ICC that can accelerate the indictment process. There is nothing that will get their attention quicker than if the United States quietly says to them, OK, we have given you 4 years. We have information that will lead directly to the prosecution of some of the senior members in this regime. We are going to turn it over in 30 days. You decide what you want to do. That is real leverage. We are not using it.

The fourth thing we could do is to plan very transparently, start to plan for specific military operations that might make a dif-

ference on the ground if the situation deteriorates. That requires multilateral planning, and it can't just be a no-fly zone. Let me tell you right now, people keep talking about imposing a no-fly zone. It is the height of irresponsibility if we press forward with implementing a no-fly zone, which is the easiest thing in the world to send an airplane over and shoot an airplane on the tarmac that might or might not have been involved in an offensive operation. Well, if Khartoum believes that is all we have, that is all we are prepared to do, the first thing they are going to do is cutoff humanitarian assistance to 4 million people, and then it is on us. And if we haven't done the appropriate preparation for ground deployment, let's not go down the irresponsible road of inciting further action on the part of Khartoum.

So what I am saying is: accelerated military planning multilaterally through NATO and the United Nations' Security Council that looks both at air and ground involvement in Darfur if the situation deteriorates. Just that credible transparent planning will give leverage to the negotiators for the peace and protection the people need in Darfur.

Fifth and finally and the point of this hearing, we have an unbelievable golden opportunity that is being squandered with each passing 24 hours. There is a confluence of three unique factors internationally that I think could help end the war and bring peace to Darfur in the immediate sense.

First, the U.S. Government has, in fact, turned. The worm has turned. The United States, through Plan B, even though it is inadequate, even though it is too unilateral, the United States has made a decision. We have to start working and imposing a class and doing what we have to do to get this crisis concluded. So the United States is in the right place.

The French have just elected a new president willing to work with the United States and who wants to resolve the crisis in Darfur. The French have a huge oil investment in Sudan and they have the most leverage of any outside power with the rebels, because they are the main backer of Chad, where most of the rebels are located.

Third—and everybody has talked about it—China. You have the first time this regime has opened itself up, because it has a vested interest in presenting a new face to the world in the context of the Olympics. It is vulnerable to pressure and it wants to end this crisis, simply because it wants it off its back. We don't care, frankly, what their motivations are, but they have that motivation now.

We now have the three countries—France, the United States, and China—with the most leverage in Sudan, both governments and rebels, all three now—as of yesterday, the French just named their own special envoy. There are three envoys. The Chinese, French, and the United States have special envoys to work this issue. Why are we not working together? Why are we not hearing that these guys are getting together and they are going to start a major diplomatic initiative to get a peace deal and to get a protection force into Darfur immediately?

Historians are going to look back at this perfect diplomatic storm and say either one of two things: boy, they missed a huge opportunity; or, see, that was the turning point and they seized it. All

three of these countries have a vested interest now. China, France, and the United States have a vested interest in peace and stability in Sudan, for whatever reason. That is both the south, where most of the oil is, and in the west in Darfur, because we still have an unfinished agenda in implementing the north/south peace deal.

So there is a solution, basically is the message. There is a solution to the crisis, to the Darfur crisis. For the sake of the 2.5 million survivors in Darfur, we must seize this opportunity now.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Prendergast follows:]

"Darfur and the Olympics: A Call for International Action"

John Prendergast, Co-Chair, ENOUGH Project

Statement Before the House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs

Washington, DC
June 7, 2007

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Shays, and other Members of the Subcommittee, for this opportunity to discuss the grave human rights and humanitarian crisis in Darfur and the steps the international community must take to immediately alter the calculations of Sudan's ruling party, protect civilians from crimes against humanity, and negotiate a peace deal that will allow the 2.5 million displaced Darfurians to return to their homes and rebuild their lives.

The subtitle of this hearing is important – "a call for *international* action" – because after four years of genocide the international community has yet to agree on a common, multilateral approach to ending the state-sponsored campaign of mass killing, gang rape, forced displacement, and systematic destruction of centuries' old livelihoods in Darfur. Despite all of the high-minded rhetoric, the international community's response has consisted largely of hand-wringing, finger pointing, and excuse peddling while Sudan's ruling National Congress Party (NCP) continues to pursue a divide and destroy military solution.

Our collective failure to agree on a common strategy is all the more conspicuous because most nations of the world (and the multilateral organizations to which they belong) have the same general policy objectives: a peaceful and prosperous Sudan that helps to advance regional stability, counter the threat of international terrorism, and improve international energy security.

Moreover, there is widespread agreement on the necessary ingredients for the stabilization of Darfur, namely:

- a **peace** agreement that addresses the remaining issues of the rebel groups that refused to sign the moribund Darfur Peace Agreement and all other stakeholders in Darfur ; and

- an effective civilian **protection** force, the starting point for which is the "hybrid" AU-UN force mandated by the international community but rejected by Khartoum.

The international debate thus centers around how to secure those two critical peace and protection objectives, the first two "P's" of what we at the ENOUGH Project call the "3 P's" of crisis response.

The third P is **punishment**: imposing a cost for the commission of mass atrocities and building leverage through these measures for securing the first two P's, the peace and protection objectives. Building this leverage is a prerequisite for progress towards a peace agreement and a strong civilian protection force, but the appalling situation on the ground is a stark reminder of the world's inability to take collective punitive action to alter the calculations of the Sudanese regime.

Each time during the past three years that the Bush administration or the UN Security Council has threatened the Government of Sudan but failed to take action, the Khartoum regime has been emboldened to escalate its destruction and obstruction in Darfur. After all, what government would change its behavior simply because other countries politely ask it to do so?

Indeed, the empirical evidence demonstrates that during the 18 years Sudan's ruling party has been in power, the regime has changed its behavior only when faced with concerted international and regional pressure. Three times the regime has reversed its position on a major policy issue, and each of those three times the change resulted from intensive diplomacy backed by serious pressure.

The three cases are the regime's support for international terrorist organizations during the early to mid 1990s; its support for slave-raiding militias in southwestern Sudan throughout the 1990s; and its prosecution of a war in southern Sudan that took two million Sudanese lives.

President' Bush's announcement last month of his administration's so-called "Plan B" sanctions is a tacit recognition that punitive action is needed, but the current Plan B is too unilateral and too weak to have a major impact on the calculations of either regime officials in Khartoum. The international community ***can*** forge a consensus policy solution to Darfur, but only if the U.S. stops acting alone and provides the requisite leadership.

Recent events give me a renewed sense of hope that the U.S. can lead a multilateral effort to end the 21st Century's first genocide. The April elections in France, Beijing's increasing anxiety and resultant decision to appoint a special envoy to Sudan, stronger rhetoric from Germany and Great Britain, and President Bush's own decision to move forward unilaterally with "Plan B" have created an extraordinary opportunity for the U.S. to build a strong alliance for peace in Darfur.

Plan B or "Plan Bust"?

On May 26 President Bush announced three measures intended to change the calculations of the regime in Khartoum and intransigent rebel leaders. First, the U.S. will add 31 Sudanese companies to a list of 130 that are already denied access to the U.S. financial system. Second, the U.S. will freeze the assets of three of the scores individuals responsible for the violence in Darfur. And finally, it will "seek" a resolution at the United Nations Security Council to impose targeted sanctions on individuals and expand

an ineffective arms embargo that has been violated with impunity for more than two years.

It must be highlighted that these small steps are largely due to tireless activism from concerned citizens, persistent efforts by members of Congress from both sides of the aisle pressuring the White House, and the President's own demands for tougher policy options. However, the current Plan B is too unilateral in nature and much too weak to have an impact on the calculations of either Sudanese officials or intransigent rebel leaders.

The U.S. has been blocking many Sudanese transactions since President Clinton imposed sanctions in 1997, and the Sudanese regime has had ten years to prepare for the next round. The Sudanese oil industry has grown up around these sanctions by cutting lucrative deals with China and other Asian consumers, and the oil business is conducted without interference because this new sector is beyond the scope of existing U.S. sanctions.

Though oil has grown to dominate Sudan's economy, the U.S. has little understanding of its operations, and has not committed the resources to collect such information. Perhaps most damning, because the administration has for five months leaked information to the press about Plan B, the regime has had ample time to develop a plan for working around new, additional sanctions.

The United States cannot realistically impose robust sanctions on Khartoum and encourage other nations to follow suit unless and until it has enough information about how Sudanese business is conducted. The U.S. should therefore undertake an "intelligence surge" by the CIA to gather detailed and comprehensive information on Sudanese companies with financial ties to the NCP and on individuals responsible for atrocities that have been or are being committed in Darfur.

The U.S. should also undertake an "enforcement surge" and ensure that the Treasury Department devotes additional staff and resources to aggressively act on this new information. Intelligence and enforcement surges could bring the U.S. up to speed on the critical facts and capacities that are needed to effectively implement any punitive measures. And without a clear strategy of rapidly escalating pressure through a variety of economic and legal measures, then the deadly status quo will no doubt prevail.

Both of these steps require political leadership and long-term vision. Since the fall of 2001, the U.S. has counted on the cooperation of Khartoum in global counter-terrorism efforts and the administration continues to welcome and work closely with many of the same Sudanese intelligence officials who are responsible for Khartoum's policies and actions in Darfur. Some members of Congress have begun to question seriously the extent of Sudan's cooperation with the U.S. on counterterrorism matters, but stepping up the practical pressure on Khartoum may well generate opposition in the intelligence community. Similarly, the expansion of economic sanctions – particularly those that affect Sudan's oil sector – may complicate an already complex relationship between the United States and China.

However, the point is not simply to punish for punishment's sake (even though America's signature on Genocide Convention does oblige us to punish the perpetrators of what the U.S. government has repeatedly labeled genocide). Punitive measures are ***necessary*** to gain Khartoum's acceptance of a durable peace deal for Darfur and the deployment of an effective international force to protect civilians. Similar measures should be imposed against leading rebel commanders and political leaders if they are deemed to have committed atrocities or are obstructing real and balanced peace efforts, which so far do not exist.

The need for multilateralism

As important as it is that the U.S. act to implement a Plan B with teeth, our ability to leverage action by Khartoum will be exponentially increased if we act multilaterally. If the United States really wants to take the lead on Darfur, the Bush Administration should immediately work with the new president in France and outgoing prime minister in Great Britain to pass a significant resolution in the U.N. Security Council that would impose targeted sanctions on the most culpable officials at the top of the regime, freeze the assets of the 161 Sudanese companies that the United States has already sanctioned unilaterally, encourage member states (such as the United States) to increase the amount of intelligence sharing with the International Criminal Court (ICC) focused on accelerating indictments for war crimes, and undertake accelerated planning for military measures to protect civilian populations.

The U.S. government already has unilateral sanctions in place against Sudan that bar U.S. companies from doing business in Sudan (though allowing U.S. businesses to work with the Government of South Sudan), and freeze assets in the U.S. or in the control of U.S. citizens of the Sudanese government and certain government-owned Sudanese companies. Enacted in 1997, these sanctions did affect the calculations of the regime in the past, but they have since run their course as the Sudanese regime circumvents U.S. institutions in its commercial dealings.

Even more important, however, the fact that existing sanctions are unilateral means that Khartoum has the practical advantage of accessing non-American financial systems and investors, and the political advantage of knowing that the international community is not acting in concert. Punitive measures applied by the international community acting as one will have a much greater impact on the pocketbooks of those responsible for crimes against humanity. Moreover, the Government of Sudan will have a much more difficult time scoring propaganda points when the U.S. is not acting alone. It is therefore critical that the U.S. works with its partners in the UN Security Council and other forums and shares both intelligence and responsibility for enforcement.

The following multilateral initiatives could be implemented immediately at little cost, but would require a strong diplomatic effort to rally multilateral support and increases in staffing and resources to ensure aggressive implementation.

1. **Targeted sanctions against Sudanese companies:** Impose UN Security Council sanctions against the Sudanese companies already targeted unilaterally by the U.S., and establish a UN Panel of Experts to further investigate which companies are conducting the business necessary to underwrite Sudan's war machine.

   The regime's commercial interests operate across the entire economic spectrum in Sudan, and are dominant in the construction, oil and communication sectors. Despite efforts by regime leaders to conceal them, their existence is well known within Sudan, as the companies have managed to acquire a sizable portion of the country's assets and have in the process produced a new breed of Islamist nouveaux- riches whose wealth is on display. It is the cash flows from these off-budget entities that enable the regime to buy the loyalty of tribal leaders, and through them the janjaweed militias, and pay the salaries and equipment of its foot soldiers.

   The UN Security Council's panel of experts for Sudan, and national and multilateral agencies looking into the financial networks that sustain international terrorism, need to focus squarely on this parallel economic network run by Sudan's regime.

   Targeting the ruling party's assets and those of its security agencies and fraudulent charities could inflict real damage on the regime's ability to sustain its ethnic cleansing campaign. But much more investigative work has to be done to clearly identify these commercial interests and the nature of their activities.

2. **Targeted individual sanctions** -- Such sanctions have been authorized in previous UNSC resolutions, and called for in multiple reports from the UNSC Sanctions Committee Panel of Experts, but they have not actually been ***imposed*** on any official of import. The U.S. effort now underway would target only three individuals, one of whom is a rebel leader, in addition to four individuals designated in 2006, only one of whom is a regime official. The number must be much higher and be widened with each atrocity perpetrated, and reflect the reality of Khartoum's complicity in genocide.

   At a minimum, targeted individual sanctions should () focus on the three of the people most responsible devising and ordering a policy of scorched earth ethnic cleansing in Darfur: Assistant to the President Nafie Ali Nafie; Director of National Intelligence Salah Abdallah Abu Digin (AKA Salah Gosh); and Minster of Defense Major General Abdel Rahim Mohamed Hussein.

   Salah Gosh and Abdel Rahim Mohamed Hussein have already been named by the UN Panel of Experts charged with investigating crimes against humanity in Darfur. The Panel found that both men had "command responsibility" for the atrocities committed by the multiple Sudanese security services. Hussein was found responsible for "coordination operations between entities within the Sudanese Armed Forces and militia groups" – code language for orchestrating Janjaweed militia attacks on civilians.

The principal policymaker for Sudan's national security and intelligence affairs, Nafie Ali Nafie continues to advocate a military solution in Darfur. His latest policy is to reward the Janjaweed for their crimes in Darfur by forcibly installing his Arab allies into positions of traditional power and resettling Arabs on non-Arab land, fundamentally altering the demography of Darfur.

3. **Support the ICC indictment process:** Provide information and declassified intelligence to the International Criminal Court to help accelerate the process of building indictments against senior officials in the regime for their role in orchestrating mass atrocities in Darfur. The U.S. has the most such intelligence and should come to agreement with the ICC about what information to share and encourage other nations to do the same.

Accelerated military planning

While the financial and legal tools to increase international pressure on the regime in Khartoum can be implemented quickly, preparation is also required for multilateral military action to protect civilians. If prompt financial and legal measures succeed in altering the calculations of the regime in Khartoum, then there will be no need for these military measures.

Humanitarian organizations providing life-saving assistance to nearly 4 million people in Darfur have justifiable concerns about the potential negative repercussions that military action would have on their operations. But as history makes clear, the credible threat of military action will alter the calculations of Khartoum officials. As well, and in the event the regime continues to defy its obligations to its own citizens and the will of the international community, these military actions could help to protect the people of Darfur.

Two coercive military measures require accelerated planning processes, which should commence within the NATO framework, but also seek UN Security Council approval. The aim of these multilateral military planning efforts would be to maximize the protection of Darfurian civilians and humanitarian operations if the situation continues to deteriorate.

1. **No Fly Zone**: Absent an enhanced ground component this option is questionable and fraught with potential negative side effects. However, it is important to press ahead with planning an enforcement mechanism for a no-fly zone (NFZ) as the Sudanese regime continues to use aerial bombing as a central component of its military strategy and its civilian displacement objectives. If the mandate of the existing AU force or the planned UN/AU hybrid force would be strengthened and more troops deployed to protect civilians, neutralizing the Sudanese regime's one tactical advantage will be essential.

   The risk to humanitarian operations posed by an NFZ must be acknowledged and mitigated. It would be irresponsible to move forward with an NFZ in the absence of

preparations to deploy ground forces to protect internally displaced persons (IDP) camps and humanitarian operations. Khartoum will perceive an NFZ as an act of war, so planning for a NFZ must also include contingency planning based on possible responses from the Sudanese regime. The consequences could be dire. Posturing without planning could blow up in the faces of the IDPs, refugees, and humanitarian workers bravely assisting them.

2. **Non-Consensual Force Deployment**: Although few nations are likely to support this and volunteer forces in the present context, if the situation dramatically deteriorates in Darfur (large-scale pullout of humanitarian agencies, increasing attacks on camps or AU forces, etc.), the debate could shift quickly and credible plans need to be in place to move troops into the theater of war quickly with a primary focus on protecting vulnerable civilian populations.

This planning is both a practical necessity, and a means to build and utilize leverage against the regime.

China, the Olympics, and international diplomacy

China is opening itself up economically and socially in the run up to 2008 Olympics in Beijing, and China's policies are becoming more vulnerable to international public opinion. China is Sudan's largest bilateral trading partner and gets 7 percent of its total oil imports there. The atrocities in Darfur, partly paid for with Chinese investment, perpetrated with Chinese weapons, and protected by Chinese diplomatic cover, would be a dark cloud over the Olympic Games.

The growing activist movement to label China's international coming out party as the "Genocide Olympics" and the increasing momentum in a grassroots campaign to encourage divestment from companies doing business in Sudan are causing serious anxiety in Beijing. Beijing wants this problem to go away before 2008, as evidenced by its recent appointment of a special envoy to spearhead Chinese diplomacy with Sudan.

It is activism and public outcry rather than diplomatic pressure from the U.S. and others that is pushing China to increase its engagement, and the U.S. should seize this opportunity to work more closely with China on a coordinated diplomatic approach on Darfur. Helping China become part of the solution to Darfur is the essence of diplomacy, and there are a number of actions the U.S. should take.

- Convene and invite China to participate in a high-level contact group for negotiations, ideally consisting of the U.S., China, the UK, France, Norway, the EU, the Arab League, Eritrea and Chad, and a framework to incorporate the multiple, competing peacebuiding initiatives. With China on the outside of peacebuilding efforts, Beijing is much more likely to be cast in, and to play, the role of spoiler. Bringing China into the group of nations and organizations working for a negotiated settlement would help ease the tension between China and nations such as the U.S. and UK calling for punitive action.

- Work bilaterally with China on a "good cop – bad cop" strategy to apply diplomatic pressure on the government of Sudan and establish clear benchmarks for the lifting of punitive measures. To achieve a peaceful solution in Darfur, the U.S. and other should seek to take advantage of China's good relations with Khartoum rather than condemn and isolate Beijing. As a first step, the U.S. and China could make a joint, high-level visit to Khartoum to underscore both governments' commitment to a peaceful resolution to the crisis.

- Encourage China to contribute funding, military assets, and personnel to the planned hybrid UN/AU peacekeeping force in Darfur. China has troops participating in the UN mission in Southern Sudan, and greater Chinese involvement in peacekeeping operations in Darfur could substantially enhance the AU's (and eventually the hybrid force's) ability to protect civilians.

If, after a renewed diplomatic effort with China, Beijing still refuses to work constructively with the U.S. and others on Darfur, then we know exactly where they stand and should work with allies devise a strategy that will pressure China to act more responsibly.

As the two outside actors with the most leverage on the government of Sudan (though in the case of the U.S., that leverage is still only potential), a diplomatic initiative led jointly by the United States and China would send a powerful message that peace and stability in Sudan (Darfur and the South) is a priority and an international responsibility from which no country should back away.

Thank you

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Prendergast.
Ambassador.

STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE G. ROSSIN

Mr. ROSSIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Shays, members of the committee, for inviting me to testify today on Darfur, China, the Olympics, and what more U.S. diplomacy is needed to end this genocide.

With your permission, I will submit the full text of the statement for the record.

Let me just say it is a special privilege for me to testify today, just after the House passed Resolution 422 calling on China to leverage its influence to end the genocide.

My name is Larry Rossin and I am the senior international coordinator for the Save Darfur Coalition. We have over 180 organizations which together have worked for 3 years now to end the genocide. Our Coalition has joined with other organizations and concerned citizens in building awareness and determination that action should be taken to end the genocide, and the presence here today of the founders of Dollars for Darfur, who we supported, demonstrates how the tragedy has moved Americans of all ages all over our country. Attention given to Darfur in the Presidential debates recently indicates how much our efforts and those of colleagues like Joey and John and Jill Savitt, who will speak after me, has made the genocide a political priority in our country.

The President's decision to tighten sanctions on Sudan's regime show that Darfur is accepted as a human rights challenge demanding an American response. And we also welcome action proposals by the new French leadership, with whom I met last week in Paris, demonstrating growing global engagement that we worked with foreign partners to foster.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, all that work has really made very little difference for the people of Darfur. President al-Bashir continues his scorched earth campaign against those people with complete impunity. That the campaign continues is inarguable. Just a week ago 1,500 women and children finished a 125-mile trek to the Central African Republic, reporting that they had to flee continued bombing of their villages.

Civil society can educate and agitate, but it is governments that have to act. We have seen too many tough words but too few tough actions against that regime. There have been too many envoys to Khartoum with too little coordination, too many threats, too little done to make those threats real.

The recent Plan B announcement by the administration of sanctions against the regime is somewhat encouraging, but it is not likely to end the genocide. President al-Bashir and his regime long since have figured out how to bleed off these kind of modest pressures. They manipulate advocates for more time for diplomacy, people like, most recently, the Secretary General of the United Nations, so they can continue their murder and mayhem.

Khartoum is only going to end this genocide under serious pressure. It clearly wants to keep doing what it is doing, and calculates that murder, as John said, costs nothing. Changing that calculation requires much tougher measures by every member of the inter-

national community with influence to wield—the United States, that means Europe, it means the Arab League, it means Africa, and it also means an awful lot more from China. China is an emerging world power, and it has massive economic, military, and political relationship with Sudan and with all of Africa.

As you noted, Mr. Chairman, China is Sudan's major investor, especially in the oil industry, and its biggest export market, and Sudan is one of China's biggest trading partners in Africa. Of Sudan's oil revenues, 70 percent, according to a former Minister of Finance there, fund its military as it wages war against Darfur's people, working closely with the janjaweed militia.

China also provides major aid to Sudan, and when President Hu Jintao visited Khartoum in February, China wrote off $80 million of Sudanese debt and provided an interest-free $13 million for infrastructure, including a new Presidential Palace.

Military ties are closer than ever, and in April, when China's Defense Minister received Sudan's Armed Forces Chief in Beijing, he expressed China's willingness "to further develop cooperation between the two militaries in every sphere." China maintains this military relationship, despite a U.N. arms embargo in place since 2005, and the U.N.'s own panel of experts have reported that Chinese weapons, aircraft, trucks were being used by Sudan's armed forces and the janjaweed to keep people in Darfur.

Beijing defends these sales as legal, but Amnesty International has documented convincingly that they violate the U.N. embargo.

Finally, as you have noted, Mr. Chairman, China has been a big diplomatic defender of Sudan, watering down one resolution after another in the United Nations, most recently the resolution that set up the U.N. peacekeeping force.

This support for the al-Bashir Regime has not gone unnoticed among civil society internationally. Under this growing scrutiny, the Chinese have tried to portray themselves as engaged, quiet diplomacy, public statements, to get Khartoum to accept U.N. peacekeepers and to end the genocide in Darfur. This began in November 2006, at Addis Ababa negotiations where the hybrid peacekeeping force deal was supposedly reached, and in February President Hu raised Darfur briefly with President al-Bashir in Khartoum. More recently, Chinese diplomatic envoys claim to have reinforced that message. China has committed 275 troops. It has named a special envoy. All these things are supposed to be indicating increased engagement, although the envoy, when he was in Darfur 2 weeks ago, echoed official Sudanese word that all is well and everything is fine in Darfur for the displaced.

On balance, it is our assessment that China's performance falls unacceptably short. Whatever quiet influence China may be bringing to bear is, at best, ambiguous, undermined by simultaneous debt write-offs, new Presidential palaces, growing military cooperation, and assertions that everything is hunky-dory out there in Darfur.

No wonder al-Bashir told a Middle Eastern wire service, after President Hu left Sudan, that he hadn't felt like he was under any pressure.

But we are convinced that China has real influence to wield. China claims that it was their Assistant Foreign Minister Zhai Jun

who, when he visited Khartoum a couple of months ago, persuaded Sudan to accept the U.N. heavy support package, the phase two of the hybrid force, and we believe that. And we would ask, if one mid-ranking Chinese official can get Khartoum to reverse 6 months of rejection of that force, what more could China achieve if they really leveraged its relationships to end the genocide?

Recently, China has been expressing loud concern at agitation by civil society about the Olympics and about its negative role. As you noted, the slogan of the Olympics is One World and One Dream. Well, I can promise this: there is more of that coming. China is extremely well placed to extract agreement from Sudan for the peacekeepers and for an inclusive peace process and basically to stop killing its own people. That has not yet happened, and until it does international outrage will mount at China's complicity.

We, ourselves, have met with the Chinese and told them directly that, whether the Olympics-related campaign swells or not is entirely in their hands. Civil society pressure will sharpen unless China visibly helps to end the genocide. How can it be that the Darfur nightmare would not intrude into this Beijing dream?

We have suggested to the Chinese several measures that would show real seriousness, including: Acknowledging publicly and condemning—which they have never done—the mass killings, torture, rape, and displacement in Darfur; affirming, as everybody else but them has done, that Sudan's government bears overwhelming responsibility for this devastation; warning that it won't accept President al-Bashir's continued obstruction of U.N. peackeepers and visibly acting to end it; warning also that it won't accept Sudanese government obstruction of a renewed and inclusive peace process, and visibly acting to end that obstruction; signaling that it will support, not abstain on, but support a Security Council resolution enacting targeted sanctions absent immediate demonstrable Sudanese government compliance with international obligations; redirecting that money for the new Presidential palace to help the people of Darfur; and, suspending military cooperation with Sudan until that conflict has ended.

Mr. Chairman, this list is surely not exhaustive. It is not up to us. China will know what more it can do to end this genocide. Real Chinese engagement is an extremely valuable goal. It is worth great exertion to obtain it, and lives depend on that.

With that said, active Chinese engagement will not prove decisive unless integrated in a coherent, muscular, international diplomacy that backs united messages to Khartoum with pressure measures.

We share your frustration about poor United States and international diplomacy during the last 4 years. Just in the last year we have seen four different U.S. Government officials be the lead on Darfur. Is it Deputy Secretary Zoellick? Is it Deputy Secretary Negroponte? Is it Assistant Secretary Frazer? Maybe it is Special Envoy Natsios. We don't know. We can't tell. And that U.S. lack of coherence has been reflected internationally. Part-time diplomacy of this sort will not change Khartoum's cold calculations. The parade of uncoordinated envoys to Khartoum really has to end now. The last 4 years are a graveyard of the old persuasive diplomacy as much as they are of 400,000 Darfurians.

We, therefore, recommend that this subcommittee exercise its oversight responsibility generally to get more U.S. action on Darfur—John mentioned many of the ways that can be done—specifically, by urging the administration to support the recent French initiative to convene in a large contact group of all the countries with specific influence in Khartoum, including China. Only such concerted, structured, global diplomacy accompanied by real pressure will change Khartoum's calculations.

Without promoting such structured international collaboration, how can our Government really expect to obtain mandatory Security Council sanctions? It is a big uphill climb. Without structured international collaboration, the President's Plan B sanctions will just inscribe themselves on a 4-year-long list of showy gestures toward Khartoum taken while villages burned, women were raped, people were murdered—that is, while Darfur's genocide has proceeded unchecked.

China can and must do more to end Darfur's agony. So must the entire international community, acting together. That is another job this administration has to take in hand, and we urge your subcommittee to press the administration to do so.

I look forward to your questions and thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Rossin follows:]

Save Darfur Coalition
2120 L Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20037
www.savedarfur.org

"Darfur, China and the Urgent Need for Effective Global Diplomacy to End the Genocide"

Ambassador (Ret.) Lawrence G. Rossin
Senior International Coordinator of the Save Darfur Coalition

Testimony
before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee's
Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs
June 7, 2007

Thank you, Chairman Tierney, Congressman Shays, and Members of the Committee, for inviting me to testify today on Darfur, China, the Olympics and what more U.S. diplomacy is needed to end the genocide. With your permission, I will also submit the text of this statement for the record. It is a special privilege to testify today, just after the House passed Resolution 422, calling on China to leverage its unique influence to end the genocide.

My name is Larry Rossin. I am the Senior International Coordinator for the Save Darfur Coalition, comprising over 180 faith-based, human rights and community organizations which, together, have worked for nearly three years to end the genocide. Their commitment inspires my engagement. I also speak from professional experience as an American Ambassador with a career in conflict resolution in Grenada, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq and Afghanistan, and as former Deputy Head of UN peacekeeping missions in Kosovo and Haiti.

The Save Darfur Coalition has joined other organizations and concerned citizens in building awareness of the genocide in Darfur and determination that action be taken to end it. The presence here of "Dollars for Darfur" achievers demonstrates how the tragedy has moved Americans of all ages, all over America. Attention given to Darfur in the Presidential debates indicated how much our efforts, and those of colleagues like Joey Cheek, Jill Savitt and John Prendergast, have made the genocide a political priority. The President's decision to tighten sanctions on Sudan's regime showed that Darfur is accepted as a human rights challenge demanding a response from our government. We welcome action proposals by the new French leadership, with whom I met last week in Paris, demonstrating growing global engagement that we work with foreign partners to foster.

Sadly, all that work has made little difference for Darfur's people. After four years, 2,000 destroyed villages, as many as 400,000 dead, 2 million internally displaced, 1.4 million beyond the reach of humanitarian aid, and another 200,000-plus driven into Chad and the Central African Republic as refugees, al-Bashir continues his scorched earth campaign with near-total impunity. That the campaign continues is unarguable –a week ago, 1,500 women and children trekked 125 miles to the Central African Republic after fleeing aerial attacks on their villages.

Civil society can educate and agitate, but governments must act. There is a lot to criticize in their weak and incoherent response to the genocide in Darfur. There have been too many tough words, but too few tough actions against the regime. There have been too many envoys to Khartoum, with too little coordination, too many threats but too little done to make them real. The recent announcement by the Administration of modestly-enhanced targeted economic sanctions against the regime is somewhat encouraging, but very unlikely to end the genocide.

President al-Bashir and his regime long since figured out how to bleed off such modest pressures, manipulating advocates for "more time for diplomacy" -- most recently the UN Secretary General – so they can continue unimpeded their murder and mayhem.

Khartoum will only end its genocide under serious pressure – it clearly wants to keep doing what it is doing and calculates that murder costs it nothing. Changing that calculation requires much tougher measures by every member of the international community with influence to wield.

That means more from the United States, more from Europe, from the Arab League and from Africa.

And it means much more from China, an emerging world power with a massive economic, military and political relationship with Sudan and all of Africa.

I want to focus today on what China does wrong, what it needs to do right, and why the 2008 Beijing Olympics are properly linked to that. I will finish with a few remarks on why our own government needs to promote more coherent global diplomacy, urgently, through a "contact group" or some comparable structure.

China is Sudan's major investor, especially in the oil industry, and its biggest export market, and Sudan is one of China's biggest trading partners in Africa. 70% of Sudan's oil revenues, according to a former Sudanese Minister of Finance, fund its military, and it is that military that is waging war against Darfur's people, in close coordination with and control of the *janjaweed* militia.

China also provides major aid to Sudan. During President Hu Jintao's visit to Khartoum last February, China wrote off $80 million in Sudanese debt and provided an interest-free $13 million loan for infrastructure, including a new presidential palace.

Military ties are closer than ever. China has sold arms and weapons to Sudan consistently since the 1990s, including an estimated $100 million in fighter aircraft and troop transport helicopters, and helped Sudan set up its own weapons factories. This April, China's Defense Minister received Sudan's armed forces Chief of Staff in Beijing. He expressed China's willingness "to further develop cooperation between the two militaries in every sphere."

China maintains this military relationship despite a UN arms embargo against Sudan in place for Darfur since 2005. The UN's Panel of Experts reported last March that Chinese-made aircraft, small arms, trucks, and other materiel were being used by Sudanese armed forces and the *janjaweed* in Darfur. Beijing defends its military sales as legal, but Amnesty International has documented convincingly that they violate the UN embargo.

China has been a big diplomatic defender of Sudan. It has used its veto leverage to water down several UN resolutions on Darfur, whether on sanctions or war crimes, or most recently Resolution 1706 which authorized a robust UN peacekeeping force to protect civilians.

China's support for the al-Bashir regime regarding Darfur has not gone unnoticed among international civil society. Under growing scrutiny, Beijing has sought to portray itself as engaged – with quiet diplomacy and even some public statements – to get Khartoum to accept deployment of the UN peacekeepers authorized in Resolution 1706.

Beginning with the November 2006 Addis Ababa negotiation at which Sudan "agreed" to a UN-African Union hybrid peacekeeping force, China has in fact engaged, sporadically. President Hu raised Darfur briefly with President al-Bashir in Khartoum in February, and more recently Chinese diplomatic envoys claim to have reinforce that message. The commitment of 275 troops for the Darfur mission and naming of a Special Envoy are said to be further elements of increased Chinese engagement, although the Envoy's statements in Darfur two weeks ago largely echoed unbelievable official Sudanese depictions of good conditions for the displaced.

On balance, China's performance falls unacceptably short. At the very best, whatever "quiet influence" China may be bringing to bear is ambiguous, undermined by simultaneous debt write-offs, new presidential palaces, growing military cooperation and assertions that "all's well in Darfur." No wonder al-Bashir told a Middle Eastern wire service, after President Hu left Sudan, that he had not felt under pressure.

China argues that its "quiet diplomacy" will work best with Sudan, and indeed is working already. Recently we heard our Administration's Special Envoy claim that China is playing a key positive role. We can understand why China would make these claims; why our Administration amplifies them is puzzling to us. We really cannot see any improvement on the ground, in the welfare of women and children in Darfur refugee camps, in improved humanitarian access, or a stop to Sudanese

bombing of villages, or in acceptance of the full AU/UN peacekeeping force al-Bashir just rejected again.

Still, we are convinced that China has real influence to wield. China claims that it was Assistant Foreign Minister Zhai Jun's visit to Khartoum that achieved Sudan's acceptance of the UN "heavy support package" for the AU force in Darfur. We believe that. And if one mid-ranking Chinese official can get Khartoum to reverse six months of rejection, what more could China achieve if it really leveraged its relationships to end the genocide?

China expresses loud concern at civil society agitation about its negative role in Sudan in the context of the Beijing Olympics, the slogan of which is "One World, One Dream." I can promise this: more is coming. China is extremely well-placed to extract Sudan's consent to UN peacekeepers and an inclusive peace process – and to stop killing its people. That has not yet happened. Until it does, international outrage will mount at China's complicity.

We have told the Chinese directly that whether the Olympics-related campaign swells or not is entirely in their hands; that civil society pressure will sharpen unless China visibly helps end the genocide. How can the Darfur nightmare not intrude into the Beijing "Dream?"

We suggested to the Chinese several measures that would show real seriousness – including:

- acknowledging publicly, and condemning, the mass killings, torture, rape, and displacement in Darfur;
- affirming, in line with preponderant international assessment, that Sudan's government bears overwhelming responsibility for the devastation in Darfur;
- warning it will not accept President al-Bashir's continued obstruction of UN peacekeepers, and visibly acting to end it;
- warning it will not accept Government obstruction of a renewed and inclusive peace process, and visibly acting to end it;
- signaling that it will support a Security Council resolution enacting targeted sanctions absent immediate and demonstrable Sudanese government compliance with international obligations;
- redirecting the money for the new presidential palace to humanitarian aid for Darfur's people; and
- suspending military cooperation with Sudan until the Darfur conflict is ended.

This list is surely not exhaustive. China will know what more it can do to end the genocide.

Real Chinese engagement is an extremely valuable goal, worth great exertion to obtain. Lives depend on it. But that said, active Chinese engagement is unlikely to prove decisive unless integrated in a coherent, muscular international diplomacy that backs united messages to Khartoum with pressure measures.

Indeed, the frustration we all feel at the persistence of the genocide is due partly to poor U.S. and international diplomacy during the last four years. In just the last year, we've seen our Government's Darfur lead pass back and forth between Deputy Secretary Zoellick, Assistant Secretary Frazer, Special Envoy Natsios and Deputy Secretary Negroponte. It's hard to tell who is in charge. That US lack of coherence has been reflected internationally. Part-time diplomacy will not change Khartoum's cold calculations. The parade of uncoordinated envoys to Khartoum must end now. The last four years are a graveyard of failed persuasive diplomacy as much as of 400,000 Darfurians.

We therefore recommend that this Subcommittee exercise its oversight responsibility by urging the Administration to support the recent French initiative to convene an enlarged "contact group" of all countries with specific influence in Khartoum, including China. Only concerted diplomacy accompanied by real pressure will change Khartoum's calculations. That requires structure and persistence, both of which a "contact group" or comparable model are needed to provide.

Without promoting such structured international collaboration, how can our government expect to obtain mandatory Security Council sanctions? Without such structured international collaboration, the President's "Plan B" sanctions will just inscribe themselves on the four-year long list of showy gestures toward Khartoum taken while villages burned, women were raped and people were murdered – that is, while Darfur's genocide proceeded unchecked.

China can and must do more to end Darfur's agony. So must the entire international community, acting together. That's another job this Administration must take in hand. We urge your Subcommittee to press the Administration to do so.

I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Ambassador.

Ms. Savitt, you have been incredibly patient. Being at the end is not easy. We respect that.

STATEMENT OF JILL SAVITT

Ms. SAVITT. Thank you so much for holding this hearing, Chairman Tierney, and for inviting me to participate.

I want to associate myself with the comments of all of my colleagues here on the panel, and I won't go over some of the same ground that they have covered.

We have articulated that Darfur is a huge crisis. Your holding this hearing shows that you understand the strategic importance that China can play right now in this fortuitous moment of having a close strategic and economic partner of the Sudanese government being the host of the Olympics.

So the question today is: what might be done to pressure China? What are all the tools at our disposal?

I want to tell you about a new campaign that is called the Olympic Dream for Darfur that has just launched. It is part of the broader Darfur advocacy community, and it is one very concrete way that we want to use the Olympics as a point of leverage to convince China to cause Khartoum to consent to a real U.N. protection force and to engage in a peace process.

What we are doing is launching a symbolic Olympic torch relay that will go from Darfur to Beijing. We are starting this in August, August 8, which is a year from the opening ceremonies of the Olympics, and we are going to go through countries historically associated with genocide and mass slaughter.

We are starting in Chad. We have the great Darfur advocate, Mia Farrow, and others have been invited, and we welcome anyone who would like to join us on this trip. Members of this subcommittee, if there is any leg of this relay, it is something to train for.

Mr. TIERNEY. Maybe I will train with Ms. Loroupe.

Ms. SAVITT. If there is any leg of this trip that you would like to join us on, you would be most welcome if it fits your schedule.

We are starting as close to Darfur as we can get, so likely in Chad. We are going then to Rwanda, Armenia, Sarajevo. We are going to Germany. We are going to Cambodia. And we will likely end in Hong Kong. I am not sure the Chinese will welcome us in, but we are going to try. And when we are in Hong Kong, we are going to talk about the Rape of Nanjing to highlight China's own history with the killing of civilians.

We are also going to hold, with our colleagues here, many of whom are in this room, a symbolic torch relay here in the United States to show solidarity with that global relay.

One point I want to mention: it turns out that at the Genocide Memorials in a lot of those countries they have an eternal flame. So we have now just gotten our torch, and it looks very much like the torch that the janjaweed uses to torch these villages, as symbolic, and we are going to light that torch from those eternal flames, just as a way to show you how we want to put pressure on China.

Our message is: China, please bring the Olympic dream to Darfur.

I want to especially underline the comments of the athletes who have spoken and say we do not support a boycott of the Olympics. We do believe in this Olympic ideal and the idea that we want to live in a world where countries do battle in sporting arenas, and where the Olympic games are where countries send young men and women to show their patriotism and their physical prowess. So that is a very important point.

So the question then is what can be done. I am hoping that if people feel energized and moved by the things they have heard today they will join us in our relay. If I may, dreamfordarfur.org is how you can get involved. Sorry.

Mr. TIERNEY. What was that?

Ms. SAVITT. It is dreamfordarfur.org, thank you. And it is F-O-R, not the numeral: dreamfordarfur.org. Thank you.

There are a couple of things that I do want to make clear about what we can all do together. The people we are mobilizing on this relay, they are right now writing emails, getting ready for rallies, writing letters to the International Olympic Committee, to the Olympic corporate sponsors, to the some 200 national Olympic committees, to the United Nations, which has a role to play in international sporting. They are asking all of those bodies to intercede with the Olympic host.

I want to be clear. As Ambassador Rossin said, China has taken many steps since we started this effort, since our community has been doing divestment and placing ads and making ourselves heard. It is, of course, welcome, but not nearly sufficient.

We want to say that there is only one outcome that China must secure from Khartoum, and that is adequate and verifiable security for civilians in Darfur, not an envoy, not just 275 engineers, not statements, but adequate and verifiable security for those civilians in Darfur. And we would like you to urge, if you are able, that if Khartoum doesn't comply with China on that, that China then takes action, that it doesn't provide the interest-free loan for a new Presidential palace, that it doesn't forgive up to $80 million in Sudan's debt, that it really has consequences if Sudan does not consent to allowing a troop protection force into Darfur.

We are hoping that we can create some space for policymakers to act. If there are ways Members of Congress and members of this subcommittee can approach the Olympic sponsors, can approach the International Olympic Committee and say that they do not want the Olympics tarnished by genocide, that the Olympic host cannot be complicit in an ongoing genocide, because we are really racing with the clock, as we all well know. The survivalist regime in Khartoum is prepared to do all that is necessary to ensure the success of its genocidal counter-insurgency. And if we don't act now, this robust civilian protection force is going to be moot because there will be just far, far fewer people in Darfur to protect.

So, as a body—and thank you for holding this hearing—please insist that China exert its leadership immediately to bring the Olympic dream to Darfur.

Thank you so much for holding this hearing.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Savitt follows:]

Testimony by Jill Savitt, Director, "Olympic Dream for Darfur" Campaign

Presented to the Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC

"Darfur and the Olympics: A Call for International Action"
June 7, 2007

Jill Savitt, Director
Dream for Darfur
c/o Public Interest Projects
80 Broad Street, Suite 1600
New York, NY 10004
Tel: 646-823-2419
Jill.savitt@dreamfordarfur.org
www.dreamfordarfur.org

Testimony by Jill Savitt, Director, "Olympic Dream for Darfur" Campaign

Presented to the Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC

"Darfur and the Olympics: A Call for International Action"
June 7, 2007

Chairman Tierney and other distinguished Members of this Subcommittee: Thank you for holding this hearing and for inviting me to participate.

My name is Jill Savitt. I direct Dream for Darfur and the "Bring the Olympic Dream to Darfur" Campaign.

You hold this hearing because you know well the depth of the brutality in Darfur -- the death, the dying, the rapes, the displacement, the cruelty and humiliation. While the United States and others have taken steps, and the United Nations has said Darfur is a priority, we have just entered the fifth year of atrocities with no end in sight.

The question you ask today is the right one: what effective steps might be taken to end the carnage. There is consensus within our community that the government of China holds a – if not the – key to security in Darfur. China has significant economic and political relationships with Sudan. It sells arms to the government of Sudan. China underwrites the genocidal regime in Khartoum by buying massive amounts of its oil – and investing in the Khartoum-dominated economy. China has also protected Sudan diplomatically, most significantly by conferring veto power upon the Khartoum regime over UN efforts to deploy the robust force outlined in Security Council Resolution 1706.

I would like to associate myself with the written testimony of Professor Eric Reeves of Smith College, a leading Sudan expert and advisor to my organization. Professor Reeves ' testimony makes a compelling case for the depth of China's investment in Darfur's genocide, how thoroughly China has protected Sudan diplomatically, and why China has unrivaled leverage to address the crisis. I urge you to read his report.

With this in mind, one answer to your question of today is China – pressuring China with every means possible to do the right thing in the Sudan. It is fortuitous that China is the host nation of the upcoming Olympics, and China's role as host provides a meaningful opportunity for the international community to exert pressure.

The "One World/One Dream" theme of the Beijing Olympics will seem perversely ironic next summer if images of the dead and dying in Darfur are juxtaposed with the Games, hosted by a country facilitating the suffering.

Our organization, working with the broader Darfur advocacy community, seeks to use the Olympics as leverage to persuade China to act, suasion that will take a number of different forms, most prominently a symbolic Olympic Torch Relay beginning in August, one year from the opening ceremonies of the Games. We will travel through countries historically associated with genocide and mass slaughter. We will light our first torch as close to Darfur as we can get, and then we will go – at least -- to Rwanda, Armenia, Bosnia, Germany and Cambodia. We want to remind China what happens when the world looks away. We will end in China, if we are allowed, and there we will focus in part on commemorating the Rape of Nanjing – and China's own history as a victim of mass slaughter.

We will be joined in our Relay by high-profile people around the world – athletes, celebrities, writers, refugees, policy makers, global citizens who care about Darfur.

In each city we will hold major events, and allow citizens to express to China their deep wish for peace in Darfur. We will also hold a torch relay in the United States this fall – in solidarity with the global relay. Finally, the people we are mobilizing, are already reaching out with emails, letters, and rallies to Chinese Embassies, the International Olympic Committee, the National Olympics Committees, and Olympic Corporate Sponsors – urging them all to intercede with China. Our message is simple. "China, Please: Bring the Olympic Dream to Darfur."

I want to be clear that we do not and will not under any circumstances countenance a boycott of the Olympics. We believe in the Olympic ideal – the global aspiration for a world where countries do battle in the sporting arena, where the Games are the only place we send young men and women to show us their physical prowess and patriotism.

If you pursue this course, you will hear China ask for patience. China will say it is already doing its part for Darfur. Since we started our effort, China appointed a Darfur envoy who toured refugee camps, sent 275 engineers to the region, and urged Khartoum to be flexible. These are all welcome gestures, certainly. But they are nowhere near sufficient. China will also say that the Games should not be politicized. We agree. Genocide is not political. It violates every principle of humanity and should be addressed without political considerations.

Members of this distinguished Committee, you ask what is to be done. I urge you to do whatever is in your power to compel our government, other governments, Olympic sponsors, the IOC, and the UN to convince China to cause Khartoum to consent to troops.

Use carrots. Use sticks, use both. Use every tool at your disposal until one outcome is reached: adequate and verifiable security for civilians in Darfur.

I urge you to be resolute in demanding that China take proactive steps to show its genuine commitment to Darfur if Sudan refuses to budge. China can revoke its offer to forgive roughly $80 million of Sudan's debt. China can rescind the offer of an interest-free loan of $12 million or so for a new Presidential Palace for Omar al Bashir. China can alter its trade with Sudan.

This House of Representatives has already taken several constructive steps in reaching out to China. 108 of your members signed a strongly-worded letter to President Hu of China. This week, the House passed a stinging resolution on China, Darfur and the Olympics. Today you hold this important hearing.

Please do not stop. Because we are racing the clock. The ruthless and survivalist regime in Khartoum is prepared to do all that is necessary to ensure the success of its genocidal counter-insurgency. If we do not act now, a robust civilian protection force for Darfur will very soon be moot. Because there will be far far fewer people left in Darfur to protect.

Please help insist that China exert its global leadership – immediately – and bring the Olympic Dream to Darfur.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today, and thank you again for holding this hearing.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you very much. We thank all of the witnesses.

Those noises that you heard that so rudely interrupted you mean that we have votes. Members up here are very interested in asking questions. I don't know what your schedules are, but if you can stay, we would like to go vote and come back and maybe let you have an early lunch or at least a little respite here until about 12:15 or 12:20. Is that good with everybody, or will it ruin your day?

John, it looks like it ruins your day.

We have two votes. We might be back sooner than that. We could be back even before noon. If you want to try that, we can do that.

Is there any Member here that will not be able to return? We want to ask a couple quick questions.

Mr. SHAYS. I will hold my questions, Mr. Chairman, but I will try to meet that schedule.

Mr. TIERNEY. Great. All right. Then why don't we come back at noon time? We will try to be back here at noon and then we will have the questioning and hopefully let you go before very long after that.

Thank you all very, very much.

[Recess.]

Mr. TIERNEY. Well, thank you all for your patience. We reconvene the meeting now. I hope you all got a little sustenance in the break.

What we are going to do is probably, instead of taking 5 minutes each for questioning, maybe open it up to 10 and have a round of questioning and then see where we are at that point. I don't think there is any need to start slamming the gavel down on people if we are really getting some good information.

I want to take the liberty of starting here, and then we will move on from there.

I want to ask a general question. I suppose that Mr. Prendergast and the Ambassador might certainly have a view on this, but if anybody else does I would like to hear it, as well.

What are we doing with regard to sponsors of the Olympics? We have talked about China and the need to engage and focus around their idea of sponsoring this. What about the Coca-Cola's and the General Electric's and NBC and others who are going to profit considerably out of this? Is there a way to get them engaged in trying to work the international community, trying to pressure the international community to heighten its awareness or to start working, say, in a contact group like the Ambassador recommended?

Mr. ROSSIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am only going to talk about this very briefly. I think actually Jill is the person who can best respond to the question that you have raised.

We believe that in the Olympics area, like in the more general area of those with influence bringing pressure in order to end the genocide, that sponsoring companies for the Olympics have a role to play.

You will recall that a lot of the buzz about the Olympic linkage about the genocide Olympics began when Mia Farrow wrote her column in the Wall Street Journal that didn't flag China, per se. It actually was a column that was directed at Steven Spielberg be-

cause Steven Spielberg is, in a way, one of the corporate sponsors, or he is a communications advisor to the Olympics.

Not only Mia Farrow's column and all the consciousness that raised was valuable in and of itself, but it also was valuable in two other ways. One is it smoked out the Chinese, in a sense. They reacted very, very strongly to the Inspector General. I think they drew more attention to the opportunity that the Olympics present for bringing pressure on China to use its influence with Khartoum to end the genocide.

I think the second thing was the reaction of Mr. Spielberg, himself, who then wrote a letter to President Hu Jintao. I am not sure he was that aware of what was going on in Darfur. He was quickly educated. He wrote a letter to President Hu Jintao and now is engaging very actively and I think will become part of this campaign in a way that will make a huge difference. The kind of attention celebrity can bring is always very valuable in these campaigns.

I will let Jill talk a little bit, I think, about corporate sponsors, because that is part of her effort.

Ms. SAVITT. Yes. Our Olympic Dream for Darfur campaign is working with the entire community, and we have colleagues who have shown a great deal of success in the divestment community helping to craft this strategy aimed at corporate sponsors of the Olympics.

I think our first order of business is to give the corporate sponsors the opportunity to do the right thing and to educate them about the linkage between China, Darfur, and the Olympics, and approach them. So we are approaching them in a couple of ways. One is through the socially responsible investor community—pension funds and the like—who will go to the corporate sponsors and say we are very concerned. The corporate social responsibility business community, we are very concerned about your association with this. We want to educate you, and approach them.

We are going to approach them directly and ask them to take one of two first initiative steps, which is to write a letter to the International Olympic Committee and to the president of China, and also to make a public statement of concern. Those are the first two things that we would like. We think they are very modest, and our goal is to get at least one corporate sponsor to become a leader, and hopefully then have a domino effect with some other corporate sponsors.

As part of that strategy, I think there is a huge role to play for others who can intercede with these corporations and sit down with them and educate them about the fact that what they are endorsing by sponsoring the Olympics, what they are underwriting and whose image they are burnishing as the games near.

Again, if we are not going to boycott, ourselves, we are not going to urge other people to boycott or withdraw. In fact, once you boycott as a strategic matter you lose your leverage, and so as long as the sponsors are donating money and being able to intercede with the Chinese government, we want them to use that, and even as the Olympics near, ask them for more and more things like ceding some of the advertising time to educate more people about Darfur and dividing up or giving equal funds to the cause of Darfur that they are giving to the Olympics, and even underwriting corporate

sponsorship will take of our Olympic torch relay if they were so inclined.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

Mr. Hari, there were three names that Mr. Prendergast mentioned in his testimony, and I was wondering about your opinion of the effectiveness of listing those three individuals as people that are targeted for sanctions and possibly targeted for information about their activities to be shared with the International Court. Would you comment on that?

Mr. HARI. Yes. I hear this name from Mr. Prendergast, like it is not three but there is a lot of people that have activities in Khartoum against the Darfurian people. We know even Musa Hilar, who for years were leaders. He was civilian. Now he is, like, general from the government. They call him General Musa Hilar. So there is a lot of people, yes, you know, associated with the genocide and terror.

Mr. TIERNEY. Is there, to your knowledge, any group of people in the political class in Sudan who are likely to be sympathetic to doing something positive on this issue that just we are not hearing about because they don't have a forum or they are afraid to speak out, or do you think it is a pretty monolithic group that is intent on just following the lead of Mr. al-Bashir?

Mr. HARI. I didn't hear any one politician of Sudan is talking about stop of the genocide in Darfur because the regime, they were all following the regime, even the parliament, and, you know, how the government control the members of someone from the politician of Sudan.

There is nothing like the leaders that were associated with government is very recently, but they have a lot of concern about they will not talk. Suppose we need to hear from, like, the southern leader to push government, except, you know, the U.N. troops in Darfur, but he don't ask the government, he don't push government to accept just to keep silent.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. May I comment?

Mr. TIERNEY. Yes, Mr. Prendergast.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. Thank you for the opportunity, Congressman.

You know, this regime took power in a military coup in 1989. They have a very small, small base of support. They maintain power by any means necessary. If it takes genocide to put down a rebellion in Darfur, they do that. They waged one of the most brutal counter-insurgency campaigns the world has ever seen in southern Sudan for many years, which we talked about earlier, especially the slave raiding and things that went on there. And they brutally suppress all rights of political opposition.

So the question is really an interesting one. Would there be elements and citizens in Sudan who, if we sided with the Sudanese people in a very clear way, what would be the reaction. I think it would be very, very positive. I think if we were smarter in our public diplomacy and smarter in what we do on a day-to-day basis, trying to invest for the long run in a relationship with Sudan and the Sudanese people, it would make all the difference in the world.

So picking out and being very clear that it is just a few of these individuals who have held on to power using military means and

using all the kinds of counter-insurgency tactics that they have learned from centuries, literally, of history, that is the reason they have stayed in power. But there are all these aspirations. Sudan had a huge and vibrant political culture and civil society culture before these guys came to power in 1989 and just crushed it, but it is there. It is still there under the radar screen, and the more that we can invest in building long-term relationships with the people, I think—and our humanitarian aid does that, in part. I mean, that is an important element to say that we care about the suffering of the people, but we could do a lot more with respect to building the political and supporting the political and social aspirations of the people as much as just their basic human needs.

Mr. TIERNEY. Having worked in that area with the past administration, do you think that we have, on a diplomatic side, identified these people and are reaching out through back channels or any other method, or do you think we are just ignoring that avenue right now?

Mr. PRENDERGAST. It is funny, because no, not at all. You know, in these kinds of situations people like me who are hard-liners who say, you know, we have to use the tools, the punitive measures, people think that then you have cutoff communication. I think the opposite. When you ramp up a policy of multilateral pressure, you should also ramp up your political engagement. We should be engaging not just with the government, with all kinds of the political parties that are above and underground and all these civil society organizations. We should increase our diplomatic presence in Khartoum rather substantially, because it is an important country, both in the world and in our foreign policy, and we have a lot of interest there. We don't have an ambassador. We don't have just but a few political officers.

There is just not enough to do the kind of real engagement to demonstrate to people a real public diplomacy strategy, to demonstrate to the Sudanese people that it matters to us what happens to them and that we want the best for the country, we want to support their democratic aspirations, not our vision of it, it is their own, and we want to support peace and stability in the country in the long term.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

I will just wrap up my questions with Mr. Cheek and Ms. Loroupe. We talked a little bit before the hearing. Can we just share on the record what efforts you are making to engage athletes in this prospect that you have been talking about here this morning?

Mr. CHEEK. Well, again, with the founding of this organization that I sort of put forth, this campaign, the goal ultimately—and we are sort of in the initial stages. We are getting incorporated and nonprofit status, and we have office space donated to us. What we hope is that we can organize an international campaign.

Maybe because I am one of the driving forces, obviously it is going to be seen a bit as a U.S.-centric thing, but ultimately my goal is that it is not primarily U.S. athletes but majority athletes representing other nations, because, to a certain extent, in some areas anything led by the United States will be met with certain suspect, and so I think that having a truly multilateral inter-

national voice, especially of athletes competing in this, it is very easy to say, Joey, you are done, you are not competing in these games, you can say whatever you want because there is no real consequence to you. It is much harder if athletes—and these are friends and new friends that I am reaching out to from all over Asia, Europe, and Africa, South America—if they are competing and they are saying the same thing. It is very difficult to accuse them of taking a course that is politically easy, I suppose.

Mr. TIERNEY. Ms. Loroupe.

Ms. LOROUPE. I have the same idea also. In Kenya we have some peace races that we organize, and we talk about the problem in Darfur. That is the only thing that they understand. It is difficult to ask someone for spots, television. Next week in 2 weeks we will be having our peace race in Uganda whereby we also have in Kenya, and we have 6 minutes at the front. I am really proud that this is policy, and the representative from government in Sudan, the Ambassador talked to me that he's there also, Ambassador to Uganda, and that will be in Uganda.

There are sports in Uganda and education. They will be training us. We feel that we are going to start somewhere.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding these hearings.

To our witnesses, each one of you has provided a wonderful insight into this issue, and each of you have different perspectives, so every one of you was necessary, I think, for us to have this kind of meaningful dialog and to learn from you.

I just want to be clear with you, Mr. Cheek, in terms of you are not recommending we boycott the Olympics; what you are recommending is that we use the Olympics in an effective way with American athletes and other athletes around the world making sure that we speak out now and during the Olympics about this issue. Is that what I am hearing?

Mr. CHEEK. Correct. I am strongly against any kind of boycott of the Olympic games.

Mr. SHAYS. And, Ms. Savitt, you have taken that same position?

Ms. SAVITT. Exactly.

Mr. SHAYS. I am just reminded one time when I was really angry what happened in the State House of Representatives about a process. The entire Republican delegation members walked out, and we just watched our other colleagues stay on the house floor and continue to debate the bill minus our input. I have to tell you it was the stupidest thing we ever did. Well, we have done a lot of stupid things, but that ranks as one that I haven't forgotten. So I am really grateful that you are saying go there, but do not be silent about the issue.

Wouldn't it be nice if you could go and thank this Chinese government for responding before? In other words, let's not assume that it is going to, you know, be like this by the time of the Olympics. Let's assume that we can all have some impact.

I want to say to you, Mr. Hari, you are a brave heart. I am stunned by the fact that you were willing to go into northern Darfur, given all the threats that may have come your way and ul-

timately did by your arrest with Mr. Salopek. I want you to know when we met with Mr. Salopek in the prison, he was concerned about himself but he was more concerned about you. He was more concerned about you. He insisted that you be treated better. He insisted that we Americans focus on your plight. He was grateful that we were focused on his. I think you know it, but I just want to say it for the public record. You have a wonderful friend in Mr. Salopek, and you have a lot of friends here, and you have a lot of admirers. You are not a difficult person to help, because you are a brave heart and you represent a lot of other brave hearts.

I am going to tell all of you that I think that this administration gets a bit of a bad rap. I think that we have spent a ton of money. We have called this a genocide, where no other country is willing to do it. We are constantly being criticized by other countries for calling it that. We have a special envoy. We had an ambassador, frankly, who dedicates 99 percent of his time to this effort. And we have American NGO's that are getting significant resources to feed individuals who now are in these camps.

I am a former Peace Corps Volunteer. When I went to visit one of the camps in northern Darfur, I was struck by the fact that there was food and there was education, and I looked at some of the villages around these camps and I thought, you know, I don't know if I would rather be in the villages around the camps or I would rather be in the camps. Now, obviously I wasn't in the villages so I can't form a firm opinion.

What I was struck with was how there has been some real effort on the NGO side of the equation, and a lot of people are risking their lives because they know if the United States just does something that this government doesn't like, their lives can be threatened. I did not have one NGO that thought we should send military there. They said, you send military there, we are dead men walking. Really what they said is we will have to leave and we are not sure we will be able to get out safely. That was one point that was made, and we traveled together in this, so your observations may be slightly different.

I use this word as infrequently as I can, because I do not like to think that I have this mentality, but I am somewhat frustrated by people who suggest that we have to get other countries to do what we want through negotiations, and when they don't do what we think they should it is our fault, because it isn't our fault.

There are a lot of countries here who are doing far less and could be doing far more, and they are getting a pass. So I know we can't send military troops. I will make this point to you and I am just saying this so I can then ask each of you for your reaction. When we were talking to the Governor of northern Darfur and we were talking about how outrageous it was that you had cattlemen killing farmers with weapons and on large animals with farmers who had no weapons who were in a very vulnerable position. And it was almost like, you know, yes, this is happening and it is wrong and so on. And then I said, you know, what I think we should do is we should at least begin by having a no-fly zone. At that moment the Governor of northern Darfur became outraged, incensed, and said, How dare you impugn our country? How dare you impose on our sovereignty? Then he was outraged. He was outraged about the

sovereignty, not outraged by the death of his own countrymen, women, and children.

I thought this is one tough group of people. I say this. Now I would like reaction. I would like you to start off, Mr. Hari, and we will go right up the line. Actually, I would like to go to you and Ms. Loroupe, and then to you, Mr. Prendergast and Mr. Rossin, because I have already engaged. React to what I have said. Tell me what you would specifically like our country to do that we are not doing, and tell me why, if we did it, it would make a difference. And if you would like someone else to go first, I can do that. Mr. Prendergast, you are the most aggressive on this. Let's start out with you.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. You can count on me for aggressiveness.

United States is, indeed, doing more than any other country in the world, and, indeed, the humanitarian relief effort has been nothing short of herculean. What you may not have been briefed on fully, because it is the way you do the numbers, is we have now over 1 million people in Darfur, according to the United Nations, not according to us aggressive activists, that are outside of the reach of humanitarian assistance.

Mr. SHAYS. You mean they are not in the camps?

Mr. PRENDERGAST. Many of them are in camps, but because of targeted violence and because of bureaucratic restrictions imposed by the government of Sudan, both of these two factors, people largely in camps—98 percent of those are in camps—are not being reached by our humanitarian aid infrastructure. One million people.

So whereas the people that are being served now in very, very difficult circumstances, you know, people braving risking their lives often to provide that assistance, 90 percent of the assistance being provided, of course, by Sudanese, themselves, we don't have any idea what is going on in those areas where a million people are not being reached. We don't know what their mortality rates are. You get the picture.

So yes, there has been a lot expended, but, wow, we have a long way to go.

Mr. SHAYS. Fair enough.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. No. 2, U.S. action has been, by far and away, larger than any other country, but, as I said—and I think it is a really important point—it has been unilateral. We have to work assiduously multilaterally, which is a lot harder. I mean, it is just a lot more work right now. We need to save our leverage, understandably, for Iraq and Afghanistan and North Korea and Iran, and we only have so much.

So, again, I worked in the last one where we had to do this horse trading every day in New York and you make your calculations where do we want to expend our energy and where are we just going to basically do things for public relations purposes, and I fear that Darfur gets, although first-tier rhetoric, it kind of falls down into second-tier expenditures.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me ask you this question: if we don't have success multilaterally, isn't our only other choice to act unilaterally?

Mr. PRENDERGAST. Well, we haven't tried multilaterally. That is my point. The point of going from zero to 60 with military meas-

ures and with unilateral measures when there are things that have been proven over time, as we said, the three cases, three times we have actually changed government of Sudan policy during the last 18 years, when we worked very assiduously through the United Nations, both administrations, Clinton and——

Mr. SHAYS. You say the last 18 years. Some of those things you mentioned happened in the last year or two, didn't they?

Mr. PRENDERGAST. The most important example, indeed, was the peace process brokered by the Bush administration, the peace agreement between the north and the south.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, that was acting multilaterally.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. Acting multilaterally.

Mr. SHAYS. So we have tried. I mean, I am not trying to debate you other than to just——

Mr. PRENDERGAST. No.

Mr. SHAYS [continuing]. Make sure the record is clear.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. But I definitely referred to that in the testimony, wrote about it. I think it is the most important case study. In other words, we have a model. We just need to reintroduce the model.

Mr. SHAYS. But I would suggest to you that we are doing things that don't show up on people's radar screens multilaterally. We are putting incredible pressure on our allies in Europe, at the same time we are putting pressure on them with Iran, and it is not—in my judgment, I think there are things that are happening that nobody is going to give this administration credit for.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. And true of all administrations. We never get the credit we need. But there are two things I think that need to be visible, and the first one is that we need, through the United Nations Security Council, to get a resolution that does impose a cost. Let's look at the Genocide Convention. Read it upside down, inside out. The only operative phrase in the entire convention is that signatory states must do all they can to prevent—way too late for that—or to punish the crime of genocide. We haven't punished it, and we have to punish it multilaterally because the Sudanese discount unilateral action.

And the second thing we need to do with our special envoy, as of yesterday the new French special envoy, and the Chinese special envoy, we need to make a visible diplomatic push, the three countries that have leverage. That hasn't happened yet. It can be in the context of a contact, as the Ambassador said, or whatever. We have to be visibly working with them, because I believe, as every one of us have said, the Chinese are a big question mark. They can be engaged. It is in their national security interest to have stability in Sudan, so we actually share a common goal. It is not like we are trying to fight them to do something they don't want to do; it is just how they do it is going to be completely different than how we do it. They will never criticize this government in Khartoum. They will never say anything that broaches sovereignty. But behind the scenes I believe they can be engaged to do a lot more than they are doing now.

Mr. SHAYS. With the chairman's indulgence, could I go to the Ambassador and our two African friends?

Ambassador.

Mr. ROSSIN. Thank you, Congressman Shays.

Our organization has certainly put a lot of pressure on the administration and on President Bush through our advertising and through other work that we have done——

Mr. SHAYS. And I think that has impact.

Mr. ROSSIN. It does have impact in our assessment, as well, and thank you very much for affirming that. But I want to underscore something: we don't question the President's genuine, sincere concern about the situation in Darfur, nor the efforts of the will of our Government and our administration to try and make a difference and to end the genocide that it, itself, as you pointed out, had named in Darfur. But we do have a concern, and when we have talked to officials of the administration the concern is reinforced. There is a dynamic, particularly with there are things like Iraq and Afghanistan, North Korea, that are always at the very top level of diplomatic attention. They don't need to be pushed. They are always out there in the system.

Things like Darfur, like Kosovo and other Balkans issues in the 1990's, like Haiti, tend to have to be pushed, tend to have to be pulled by interested officials in the administration to a place where they get all of the attention and, in a sense, the whole toolbox of——

Mr. SHAYS. And what that argues for is that you state the case in as extreme a way as you can state it. In other words, you shouldn't be the moderating force in the middle; you need to be pushing from one end.

Mr. ROSSIN. You need to be pushing it. You need to be pushing.

Mr. SHAYS. I am monopolizing time here. I would love to speak to our two witnesses from Africa.

Mr. TIERNEY. Ms. Loroupe.

Mr. SHAYS. Ms. Loroupe.

Mr. TIERNEY. Do you have a comment on that?

Mr. SHAYS. I would like to just know what would you like. Give me one or two things specifically you would like our Government to do. And I am going to qualify it by saying I find there is a real concern in Africa that we not act like a colonial power and that Europe doesn't act like a colonial unit. Been there, done that. So I find that is somewhat of a restraint on our even doing some good things. But whichever of you would like to jump in first, and if you don't want to answer, you don't have to.

Ms. LOROUPE. I think to send the forces over there, Africa, and one mention about the fear, people mention about sending troops to Darfur. I think the only thing that your government can do is to work together with the African Union, not go alone.

Mr. SHAYS. But, see, I think aren't we willing to almost fund all of the African costs, the United States? My understanding is if they sent, instead of 7,000, 14,000, the United States would help fund most of that cost.

Mr. TIERNEY. Are you asking the witness?

Mr. SHAYS. I am asking you or the Ambassador.

Mr. ROSSIN. Well, we fund currently, sir, the cost for infrastructure for the African Union. Of course, the European Union funds the salaries and operating costs. I don't know, if that force was enlarged if, in fact, we would be willing to do it, because the adminis-

tration has consistently sent inadequate funding requests to the Hill. In fact, it has been Members of Congress that——

Mr. SHAYS. We will leave that on the record.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you. Mr. Hari, if you have 1 minute, we do want to go to other members of the committee. Do you have any comment that you want to make on Mr. Shays' remarks?

Mr. HARI. OK.

Mr. TIERNEY. You do?

Mr. HARI. Yes. You know, I am a Darfurian. Like the other Darfurian, I need from United States to push, working with his allies to push U.N. Security Council to send more troops to Darfur.

Mr. SHAYS. Can I just say but the U.N. includes China. That is the problem. The Security Council includes China. They are part of it.

Mr. HARI. When the people are working together, they have to pressure China to start to make the resolution, because what I saw in Darfur now is going now in Chad, like eastern Chad and eastern Central Africa right now is going the genocide the same Darfur. This is why the genocide started in Africa because the community would not care about, they didn't take action in Darfur. That is why the government is used as sometimes, you know, pressure for the NGO's sometimes.

But first of all in Darfur they need the secure from United States and U.N. Security Council.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Hari.

Mr. Higgins, thank you for your patience.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Chairman John Tierney, for holding this hearing. I am struck by the conviction and the commitment of the panel, because, you know, such an atrocity should justify a major response from the world, particularly the western world that values the very things that are being violated in Darfur in a very fundamental level. But it is the non-governmental community, formally or not, that has sustained attention and focus on this issue, which is a great tribute to all of you.

I think the good thing for you is that the governments are catching up. I think that even Congress in the past 6 months has come a long way. Unfortunately, there has been this preoccupation with Iraq and Afghanistan and other world conflicts. Although different in nature, this is a world conflict that obviously requires a response, and a stronger response, and at the very lease from the United States.

I traveled to the Sudan with then chairman, now Ranking Member Chris Shays, and we visited Paul Salopek in custody in the Sudan, and he, as Chris has said, was most concerned about your welfare than his, despite the fact that there was this filthy individual being held, but very lucid, and was subsequently released, which was a very good thing.

The other thing that struck me was, going into some of the refugee camps and the schools that were being conducted by Save the Children, despite all this misery that surrounded them and this lack of optimism for a future, there was a presence in these kids that conveyed a tremendous sense of optimism and appreciation for what they were going through. Despite our long trip and seeing

some of the horrible things that were going on in Darfur, you leave with a sense of optimism because you believe that in them is the potential for the triumph of the human spirit against extraordinary atrocities.

A couple of things. You know, when you look at world conflict, wherever it exists, there are fundamentals, and this one has an economic fundamental. This one has a racial fundamental, despite being indistinguishable from color. There is an African population and there is an Arab population. The misery that has been exacted on the African population is beyond human comprehension.

I think when the new regime, the current regime, took control, there was pervasive drought in the Sudan which reduced the arable land and thus intensified the competition for the land, which I think created a situation which was horrible. But the other thing that you realize, since the current regime has taken over, the world has changed. I think in many cases the discussion here, the theme has been will or lack of will on the part of the United States and on the part of the western world to do something about this conflict.

One question I have, John Prendergast, for you and others, please, is: is it a lack of will or is it a loss of leverage because of the demand for oil and the precious resources that the Sudan has an abundance of? Has the United States, which previously the Sudan would have a much greater dependence on, have we lost leverage because of that?

Then I have a followup question.

John, I would like to start with you, and then the other panelists, please.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. Thank you, Congressman.

I also want to just say one very quick parenthetical to your very good explanation of a lot of what has happened, and that is that, with respect to Arab and non-Arab peoples in Darfur, you know, the government that took power is a very small minority regime, and they have used a very small percentage of the Arab militia in Darfur, this sort of Darfur's version of the KKK, the janjaweed, to undertake most of its destruction. The vast majority of Arab people in Sudan are horrified by the actions of this small minority of people, so I just wanted—you weren't implying otherwise, but I just wanted to keep that in there so that we understand this isn't an ethnic or tribal or racial issue; it is a power grab, and people maintain power.

On your question about lack of will versus lack of leverage, indeed, I think the United States has less leverage. No one could argue we have more than we did pre-2003, pre-Iraq, and we are constrained dramatically, in fact, multilaterally on a number of fronts by what has happened over the last 3 years. Nevertheless, when we have demonstrated leadership, particularly in the United Nations Security Council globally on issues like North Korea, when our policy finally shifted, on Iraq, still we still can get countries to go along with us. People will go along.

And I wanted to make a point to Mr. Shays' question or point to answer yours. In the last whatever number of years it has been since the cold war ended, China, Russia, none of these countries have ever vetoed a Security Council resolution related to Africa. In

other words, if it matters enough to us and, in fact, it is in their interests to have a resolution to the crisis, they are going to stand publicly and threaten veto, they are going to stand publicly and oppose anything that violates the sovereignty of another state, because they don't want their sovereignty because of what they are doing. So however, I think we still have the leverage when we decide to press forward with enough political will to move the international community sufficiently to do the work.

The most exciting thing about this issue has been that it has been bipartisan. The thing hasn't been attacked by the Democrats against the administration or whatever. It has been joint. We can do more. Yes, we have lost a little bit, but still empirical evidence demonstrates on other issues that when we do take that leading role we can actually move a situation on the ground fairly substantially.

Mr. ROSSIN. Thank you, Congressman.

I would like to make two comments, as well. One of them was your observation, which obviously I would share and our entire organization would share, about the heroism of the humanitarian workers in Darfur who work under really incomparable threats and harassment from the Sudanese government. The things they describe, they have never encountered in other situations.

I think that underscores something about that heroism, about that bright light of the human spirit which you described which can give rise to optimism, and that is that all of that exists at the sufferance of the Sudanese government. They could be deciding even now while we are sitting here, they could be deciding to kick all of those aid workers out, to do anything they want, because there is absolutely no international leverage on the ground in Darfur to control in any way what they do. The U.N. has been warning that could happen. The private NGO's have been warning that could happen. That is why we think we need to move beyond this kind of a situation to where we can actually get some grip on the situation in Darfur so that the people that are living there in these camps and the humanitarian workers, themselves, are not at the mercy of this government which has no good intentions in its heart.

With regard to the leverage issue that you mentioned, I would certainly agree with John and I think with the implication of your question, as well, which is that our leverage is diminished compared perhaps to some other times, and there is a lack of competition for administration attention.

I think the concern that we have is the leverage and the tools that we do have are not adequately mobilized, in fact. I worked on the Balkans for a number of years as a State Department officer before I retired at the end of the last decade beginning of this, and the kind of international, consistent, concentrated, going across the Atlantic every week going to these places that we used to do on Kosovo and on Bosnia, I travel a lot in Europe for our organization and meet with government officials and I see no evidence of that taking place with regard to Darfur. Oftentimes I am the first person that has come into their office to talk about Darfur. I don't know if it is maybe embassy officers delivering xeroxed demarges,

as we used to do when I worked for the State Department, but there is not that kind of intensive engagement.

The Darfur Peace and Accountability Act last year mandated the President do certain things and authorized him to do a number of other things such as barring the entry into U.S. ports of ships that have carried Sudanese oil. We don't understand why, in a sense, the book isn't being thrown at President Bashir, why dribble out a few sanctions now with Plan B and maybe who knows when down the road you dribble out more. There is just nothing in the behavior of the government of Sudan or the diplomatic process that has been going on to justify really not throwing the book, not imposing all the sanctions that are available now.

I think the other thing that I would say is that even the things that have been done maybe have not been adequately implemented, and I think, with regard to the new sanctions that were announced by the President, it is important for this committee and for the Congress, as a whole, to monitor and to exercise oversight to make sure those things are actually done. They need more enforcement mechanisms. They need more resources in Treasury, at the agency, and in April, when Andrew Natsios testified before a Senate committee, he said part of Plan B would be setting up the enforcement mechanisms not only for the new sanctions but actually for the existing sanctions, i.e., what have we been doing with those existing sanctions over the last period?

So I think this is the area where our concern is great and where there doesn't seem to be a positive evolution nearly fast enough to match the scale even of the deterioration in Darfur.

Thank you.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

Mr. HIGGINS. Just one more question. Again, we talked about the United Nations, you know, does not move itself; it has to be moved by the influence. I think the irony is that after World War II the United States had the world at its feet, and established international organizations, including the United Nations and the United Nations Security Council, and as a demonstration not only of military might and economic superiority, the United States demonstrated generous spirit by including China in the United Nations Security Council, and perhaps China should be reminded of that.

But just on the issue of who is in control there, al-Bashir, is he a figurehead? John, you had mentioned in your earlier comments that, you know, there are three individuals that you want to apply pressure to in Darfur, and I think it was the assistant president, the director of intelligence, and the minister of defense. Why? Is al-Bashir more a figurehead, or is it a loose coalition that requires all of these individuals? I am not quite sure. Just elaborate, if you will.

Mr. PRENDERGAST. The government of Sudan, like many dictatorships, are a collective decisionmaking body, but there are people in that collective who wield disproportionate influence. In my view, particularly the first two, Nafie Ali Nafie, the Assistant to the President, and the Chief of Security, overall security, Salah Abdallah Gosh, these are the two people who consistently have been the leading, sort of the pointy end of the spear on military strategy that the government of Sudan has pursued since it came

to power, first against southern Sudanese and now against Darfurians that have caused, by far and away, more destruction than anywhere else on the planet during the last 15 years besides the Congo.

I mean, I just believe we ought to go right at the source of those and place the scarlet letter. We are not arresting them and sentencing them. We are not sending a military force to annihilate these guys, but just put the scarlet letter on the shirt, because in the past when we have done these kinds of things, when we have spotlighted particular elements of the regime or done that, it actually has affected their calculations.

This isn't the Taliban. Bashir and company aren't Saddam Hussein ready to go down with the ship. They want to play ball internationally. They want to get involved in the world. They wanted to be in the Security Council. They made a very big pitch in 2000 to try and become a member of the Security Council, and the United States blocked their ascension to it and put Mauritius, just as a nice footnote, as the aspiring Security Council country.

So I think there is a lot we can do by using the tools that we have, as Ambassador Rossin said, before we have to escalate to other, more dramatic measures.

Conventional diplomatic, economic, and political measures working multilaterally, aggressive diplomatic engagement, and multilateral punitive measures have gained traction in the past and I think we just need to do it. We just need to decide we are going to have to break a little China, literally and figuratively, to move this process forward and to get consensus around a particular plan that would bring a peace process that could bring peace to Sudan and to get the U.N./A.U. hybrid force that the world has basically agreed upon to be actually be deployed over the objections of the Sudanese government in Darfur to protect civilian populations.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

I want to thank every single one of our panelists here today. Thank you very much for your contributions. They are valuable to us. We will be following up on this and we will be working in concert to take some action on that. We wish you all good luck and good fortune with what you have done, and we are particularly grateful also for the testimony of the first panel today. I think we were all impressed by that.

So thank you very, very much.

With that, there being no other questions, this hearing is adjourned. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:57 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]