

Center for American Progress



A DISCUSSION ON:

**“GENOCIDE IN THE 21ST CENTURY:
REMEMBERING RWANDA,
CONFRONTING DARFUR”**

MODERATOR:

**JOHN D. PODESTA,
PRESIDENT AND CEO,
CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

FEATURING:

**SENATOR JON CORZINE,
(D-NJ)**

**AMBASSADOR DR. ZAC NSENGA,
AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF RWANDA
TO THE UNITED STATES**

**GAYLE SMITH,
SENIOR FELLOW,
CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

**9:00 A.M. – 10:00 A.M.
TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2005**

**Transcript provided by
DC Transcription & Media Repurposing**

MR. JOHN D. PODESTA: Good morning. I'm John Podesta, the president of the Center for American Progress, and I want to thank you all for joining us this morning.

Eleven years ago tomorrow, a plane carrying the presidents of Rwanda and Burundi crashed killing both of them. Within hours, roadblocks were set up throughout Rwanda; arms caches were unearthed; and Radio Mille Collines escalated its propaganda, calling on people to move swiftly to kill Rwanda's Tutsi cockroaches. Over the next 100 days, close to a million people were murdered in Rwanda's genocide. Once it was over, the world looked back in horror and solemnly pledged, "Never again." Yet, over the past two years as many as 300,000 people have died in Darfur. Almost two million people have been forced to flee their homes. It is happening again.

Human life is the first casualty of genocide, whether it be in Rwanda, in Sudan, or in Europe some 60 years ago. But also at stake is our humanity, for a fundamental tenant of human decency is that we care for those around us, that we confront suffering and abuse, that we protect the vulnerable. Eleven years ago the world failed to protect Rwanda's people; today, we are failing to protect the people of Sudan.

Everywhere we look, our political discourse is dominated by a discussion of values. Yet, what becomes of our values if the United States does not act to protect the people of Darfur from the very real and growing threat of genocide? I believe that we can and should act, and with us here today are three people who know what needs to be done and who are fighting to ensure that America and the world does the right thing.

Media accounts of the situation in Darfur surprised Senator Jon Corzine who, like many of us, couldn't comprehend why the world was standing by as genocide unfolded, so he went to Sudan and returned with a plan of action and a commitment to implementing it. With cosponsor Mike DeWine of Ohio, Senator Corzine added \$75 million to the budget of the African Union Observer Force in Sudan. Then, teaming up with Senator Sam Brownback of Kansas, the senator introduced the Darfur Accountability Act, a bill that holds not only the Sudanese government but all of us to account.

Ambassador Zac Nsenga is Rwanda's representative to the United States government here in Washington. The ambassador knows firsthand what genocide is, having served in the field with the Rwandan Patriotic Front as a medical doctor. He has served as ambassador to Israel and to the United Kingdom, and is here with us today to remind us of what happened in Rwanda and to talk about what this means for Sudan.

Finally, Gayle Smith is a senior fellow here at the Center. She comes to us with direct field experience in Rwanda and Sudan over many years, as well as with policymaking experience during the Clinton Administration. Gayle heads the Center's international rights and responsibilities program, which promotes an America that leads

global efforts to ensure a safer and more equitable world for all. The three pillars of the program are the responsibility to protect, global economic opportunity, and the rule of law and accountability. Please visit our web site at americanprogress.org for more information on this new program.

Before we get started, I also want to make one important introduction. We have as guests here today, Mark Hannis (sp), Andrew Snyderman (sp), and Sam Bell (sp), who are Swarthmore College students and co-founders of the Genocide Intervention Fund. Mark, Andrew, and Sam, like so many students around the country, wanted to do something constructive to stop the genocide in Sudan, but the idea they came up with was entirely unique. It was to raise money for the under-resourced African Union peacekeeping force, both through collecting private donations and through urging Congress to provide additional funds.

With the help and support of the Center for American Progress, hundreds of people have already donated to the Genocide Intervention Fund, and hundreds of events have already been organized on its behalf. And tomorrow, they'll be announcing at an event with Senator Corzine, Senator Brownback and Gayle, amongst others, a major 100 days of action initiative during which they hope to raise \$1 dollars and spur 100,000 letters to Congress.

But now let me turn to Senator Corzine, who will share with us his insights into the crisis in Darfur.

Senator?

SENATOR JON CORZINE: Thank you, John, and thank Center for American Progress for hosting this event, but most importantly for being a consistent voice in raising this issue for the public's awareness, for the international community's awareness, for humanity's awareness. It's great to be here with Gayle Smith, who – we traveled to Darfur last August and early September, and very few things in my life captured my attention more than to see this mass of humanity that has been displaced, knowing that it was the remainder of those who had lost their lives in this process of genocide. Nothing actually moves me more in my public life and public service than to join with all of you who are part of a grassroots effort to raise the attention and to motivate those of us who have the ability to move political processes, to recognize and to bring change. And unfortunately, too little is being done.

I want to also both recognize and thank Ambassador Nsenga for his tireless work on this issue. It is absolutely essential that we remember. We talk continually in our public life about remembering and “never again” with respect to elements of genocide, the Holocaust, the Rwanda situation, which has been so publicly presented to the American population with the movie *Hotel Rwanda*, which raises the issue and awareness in people's minds.

On April 17th of this month, it'll be the 30th anniversary of the Khmer Rouge taking over in Cambodia; another genocide. How much of this do we need to experience in this generation to not be moved? It's only through the efforts of people like Ambassador Nsenga and a number of other voices who raised this issue. If you haven't seen the pictures of Captain Stiegle (ph) who provided some of the photos that Kristoff has put in the *New York Times*, I encourage you to see and to visit the websites that can singe in your mind the need for all of us to speak up and speak out. And that's certainly what I've been trying to do and others on a bipartisan basis in the Congress. This is not a Republican or Democratic issue. This is a moral issue. This is a human issue and is one that demands action now.

We are getting rather weak – rather – we're getting weak actions from the American government, from the United Nations, unfortunately without resources from the African Union. One has to ask the question, where's NATO? Where is the will, as John talked about, at a time when the culture of life is being celebrated with the passing of Pope John Paul, who did celebrate life and worked and recognized the needs of sub-Saharan Africa, and reached out across the world. But we in the political environment are giving lip service to that culture of life and not acting where there is real and present loss of life and turning away from humanity. And it is time for us to stand up as a community at large and turn back and accept our humanity's responsibilities to one another.

And I hope that the Congress, which first recognized genocide then put in \$75 million – I'm embarrassed by the small size of the \$75 million that Senator DeWine and I were able to get, and it was only – we asked for much more – it was only in a compromise of Congress that we were able to get anything targeted for the purposes of helping sponsor the African Union troops. And think about it: 2,000 troops, maybe, on the ground in a country the size of France trying to separate populations in the millions. Two million displaced, maybe more, is not an acceptable investment of one man for another man to try to bring together efforts.

Senator Brownback and I have introduced a Darfur Accountability Act. I won't go through the details of it. There are 22 cosponsors, bipartisanship actually extended to this effort. It includes a requirement of no-fly zones, an extension of arms embargo to the government of Sudan, targeted sanctions against those responsible for crimes, detailed efforts about trying to hold individuals accountable for crimes against humanity for those that execute genocide. We have a chance this week, and I hope people will speak up as we go through the State Department authorization effort to add the Darfur Accountability Act to that authorization.

It is not acceptable for us to fail to act. It just isn't. We have to recognize that it's time to move. And, you know, we need to take it up in our diplomatic activities as well. I will just say that I and, I think, a lot of folks are disappointed that this hasn't been at the top of the agenda. We've had the trips of Secretary Rice, the president to Europe meeting with all senior leaders from Putin to Chirac to Tony Blair, and not one mention – not one mention in the whole discussion of what are the important issues on the agenda of the

globe with respect to Darfur. We need action on it, and we need more than just loose language that comes out of the Security Council which says the north/south conflict in the Sudan is more important and needs more focus than what is now taking place in Darfur. If you read the Resolutions 1590, '91 and '93, you will find that they are – they give lip service, but not detail or do they give calls to action with regard to what needs to be done to try to separate the two powers and to hold the Sudanese government accountable for actions, the Janjaweed and all of the elements that I think most of you are so familiar with, which I will not (go for?).

We need to help the ambassador. We need to help those that speak up. We don't need another movie 10 years down the road to remind us that we were failing to act when the time to act is now. This is one of those great moral issues in front of mankind, and I hope that with the efforts of the Center, a lot of really great people, we will continue to encourage the press to keep this issue in front of the American people and the world public, and we will use our nongovernmental organizations, students, religious groups, and others to raise this issue in our communities and our newspapers, and to speak out. This is one where we have to join hands and work together. And I hope all of you have the passion that pushing back against genocide is something that we have a moral responsibility to do, and I congratulate you for being here today. I hope you will take the actions that are necessary. I promise you we will do everything we can to raise this issue and the Congress to push for response. We need a response from the administration. We need a response from the global community.

Thank you.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you, Senator.

And we'll next hear from Ambassador Nsenga.

AMBASSADOR DR. ZAC NSENGA: Thank you very much, John. First and foremost, let me thank the Center for American Progress. Let me also thank Swarthmore students for what they have been doing. They have been getting in touch with me and briefing me on what they are doing, and I think this is very great. (Unintelligible.) Keep up.

Thirdly, this discussion comes at the right time for us in Rwanda because it coincides with the week when we are commemorating what happened in 1994. And actually, what you are focusing on now, although we look at survivors, their (prides?), we try to help them, but we're also looking at the global picture of how we can fight the genocide ideology and the issue of revisionism, because once you don't do this, then down the road you are wasting your time.

So I don't have to go back into the past, because John and Senator Corzine have really made the same remarks I would have made, but suffice it to say that 11 years ago in 1994 the genocide in Rwanda happened during the day. Everybody saw it. This came after half a century of the Jewish Holocaust. And since 1994, there have been other

serious crimes and other genocides committed in Kosovo, East Timor, Liberia, Ivory Coast, and now the same is happening in Darfur and we are still watching 10 years after the Rwandan genocide, and we are not doing anything. And we are not hidden from anything that is coming from there. It seems to me, then, that the international community does not and is incapable of learning lessons, so history repeats itself.

And this is why we all say “never again,” and over and over again, and we never develop mechanisms that can prevent this genocide – this real problem that we are living with in this world. And when you observe all the conflicts I have mentioned above, and you compare them with the experience we had in Rwanda, you see very interesting parallels. In all those cases, there are always ability or clear warning signs of an impending threat or active commission of a crime against humanity, and all these are never heeded in time. This is what we are seeing.

Secondly, it is only the lack of unanimity from the international community on the course of action to prevent, stop, or manage the crisis. Of course, this sends wrong messages to those who are perpetrating or were planning those crimes. It sends a message that nothing is going to happen to them. This is exactly what we saw in Rwanda.

Three, well, an action is finally agreed upon. It is always uncoordinated, it is confused and inadequate, delayed, and more often than not (rotted?) with competing political interests. In Rwanda, the set objectives of that (unintelligible) is never attained. Everybody comes up, we are going to do something, but at the end of the day there is genocide, there is crimes committed despite the public who are coming and putting billions and billions of money in this process.

And lastly, there is always the problem of sustainability. It is a belief in quick fixes. You do something and you think you have solved it. End of problem. Then you withdraw. You (come?) and then problems go back. So this sort of quick fixes and lack of sustainability in resolving the problem is part of the whole problem as well.

Now, in all this scenario, who should be responsible for protecting and preventing this genocide? Here it's important to note that when a genocide or crimes against humanity are being committed in any country, usually the state has failed to protect its people or in most cases it is accomplished in the commission of that genocide or those crimes. This was exactly what happened in Rwanda. The government, which should have protected the people with its machinery, instead used the machinery to kill people. So you can't have – you couldn't have asked that government to stop those crimes.

So in other words, it is not easy to say that you actually – you cannot rely on that same government to protect the victims in danger. It is therefore the responsibility of the international community to protect such victims who are in danger of genocide and other crimes against humanity. Having talked to the international community, in my own opinion there is not such (a passion?) according to the international community. It is always – there is nobody – you can't (rely on?) anybody, so that's where the problem is.

We talk about it in the international community, but who is this international community? And this is where the problem is. But someone, according to the international community, must exist because the state has failed and it is an accomplice.

The priority in such cases of such an intervention should be to provide safety for the people in danger. That's really the primary objective: protect the people and then other things can come after, because if you go in talking about other things, people have died and you protect nothing. So protect the people, provide humanitarian support, and then embark on the real causes of the conflict, but just first and foremost people must be safe.

However, in the real world and as witnessed in Rwanda, such intuition and common sense is never invoked. This is because there is no such mechanism in the place that can give such an imagined task. In my own view, and as I say, the United Nations should be the right place to offer such a mechanism. It must have three important elements to achieve the above task. Number one, they must have the capability for (unintelligible) warning signs and welcome them to react on them.

Number two, it must be able to mobilize necessary resources – human, financial, logistics, and otherwise – to intervene. And there must be – and the most important of all – ability to mobilize political will to act in time, and that's what Senator Corzine said: political will is a problem. And I concur with him: that is the culprit.

Experience in Rwanda shows that it has never been a problem of early warning signals. Signals are all there. They are (unintelligible) everywhere. Everybody sees them. Because they're always in the fringe anyway, (unintelligible) has been a problem of mobilizing resources. Resources are (unintelligible), but the problem is that they're only misallocated either through giving wrong mandate, prioritizing inappropriate course of actions. It is, for example, you identify that the problem in Congo is the presence of former army that committed genocide and its militia. You know that that is a problem, and when you give a mandate you spend a lot of resources, a lot of talk with that same problem, but to deal with other things. How do you expect the problem to end? So that is the problem of misallocating the available resources in terms of human. You have got over almost 17,000 troops in the Congo, but their mandate is not to deal with the problem, so deal with other issues. That is the wrong – you've wasted your resources. You're not solving the problem.

And I still believe that national and regional interests in all these problems, they override the wider global interests. That is the biggest challenge. When it comes to the problems, everybody looks at themselves. Every country looks at their own interests and there's no way you can combine this interest into action, so this is the problem. You comprise the whole system.

So what needs to be done? We need to rethink the concept of national interests vis-à-vis global interests in order to arrange what we talk literally and the reality of what

has happened, so this is a problem. And I hope Senator Corzine can help us, probably, being a decision-maker here to see how this can be arranged. We talk about the global work, but at the end of the day we give local solutions, local interests. It will never work.

Number two, we need to reform the UN to be more representative. I think the debate is on. I don't know whether it will be successful. It must be more delegative. That might be another reason why UN Security Council should be doing all these things. Delegate the power to African Union. Delegate the power to NATO. Delegate the power down – down there. That's the best way. And it must be more effective. It must be. So we have to empower regional and subregional (initiated?) groups.

In Africa, as far as Africa is concerned, there is no shortcut. We must empower African Union. That's not to (unintelligible) African Union is incapable, cannot do anything. Let us empower it because it's near the problem and understands the regional dynamics. It's not everything. And to give it more resources and you will see.

African Union – we have (unintelligible). Everybody knows what (unintelligible) has done. It has done some good things. You know, even the (Lusaka?) forces and (Pretoria?) government in the Congo – you know, they did a good thing. But it needs to be supported, but not undermined. I can talk about this issue for a long time, but I know instead of being supported, it is always undermined. (unintelligible) with Sudan north/south – you know, everybody knows, you (unintelligible) in the course of – (there of course?) was a regional force there to do something that is – they are well acquainted with.

Thirdly, we need to look at our domestic actions in – what we are doing in our each individual countries (unintelligible), not in our own country, but first elsewhere. What do I mean here? I mean here, when they commit crimes in those countries, they come to defend the country. They come to America. They go to Europe and they stay there, and they don't touch them, as if they are not criminals.

We need to look at the whole structure of injustice and to restore harmony, we need to fight poverty in those – in our countries and ignorance, too. And the most important thing, which I think Senator Corzine mentioned, we need to investigate, even in our own countries in the West to investigate why do we always fail to intervene. Why do we fail? We need to investigate this and find out the reason why we have failed and prevent them in the future. But if you don't do any investigation, it will (unintelligible). I know after the case of Rwanda, I know the regional government has investigated and found loopholes, and I think are taking appropriate measures. We would like this kind of thing being done elsewhere in different countries, even in the powerful countries.

We need to investigate and find out what is going wrong, because at the end of the day, it's all about us, or about humanity. And then once we know the loopholes, we'll stop them. Of course, the international community and the UN should be able to help these initiatives by giving them more support. Materiel, moral, and anything. So Africa's African Union and Darfur, we have got some examples. You know, the

African Union has really come in full swing to help resolve the problem in Darfur. I'm glad to say that my government has (unintelligible) was the first government to take – to send troops to Darfur with the hope that we could be able to protect the civilians who are in danger. Not only to protect the monitors, but to protect the civilians. As I say, that's the most important thing. We know it. We pass through it. We lived through it. We know it's the most important thing is to protect the civilians. And I hope that whatever is being done is to help has a mandate of protecting the civilians.

So we are told by our troops, for example, that where they are, although they are not very many, whenever the Janjaweed would come, our troops there – even if we don't have the mandate, but we are not going to wait – looking for (killing?) these guys (unintelligible). And they have not – they have the Janjaweed (unintelligible), so imagine if you have so many troops in there and they are also doing the same thing. Suppose that was the idea of giving a mandate – a new mandate; to protect the civilians. That would make life easier, but that is not only the responsibility of African Union to do – to look at this mandate. Everybody - the UN and the Security Council - we should be discussing about the mandate to protect the civilians.

And then with all the other mechanisms in place we are talking about the court, we are talking about the humanitarian - all those things can come when people are safe. And indeed, those issues and situations will be dealt with. So we need to move – at the moment, we need more unanimity from the international community to ask for accountability and to give humanitarian assistance and also not to do this and come out very quickly, but remain engaged in Sudan and help, because the immediate post-conflict period is always the most, most challenging thing.

So I end here. If there's any questions, I could answer, but I thought that was my own contribution to this based on our experience.

Thank you very much.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you, Ambassador.

Gayle Smith?

MS. GAYLE SMITH: Thanks, John. I could make this very easy and just say if we implemented everything the senator and the ambassador had recommended, this would be taken care of.

I'd like to very briefly just underscore what the stakes are here in Darfur, and I think obviously we know that the stakes manifest themselves in human lives, but I think we've also got to consider the fact that our strategic interests are also at stake. The horn of Africa region where Sudan hits at the heart has been of strategic importance to the United States for over 50 years. In the 1950s, it was one of the few regions in Africa that warranted our attention and our resources. It was a key battleground during the Cold War, and it was one of the first places we saw the signs of transnational terrorism,

including emanating from Sudan. So we have strategic interests as well as the moral interests that both the ambassador and the senator have pointed to.

We've also got at stake the risk of a failed state straddling the African and Arab worlds. Sudan is the largest country in Africa. Our failure in Darfur will mean that the north/south agreement, hard fought and hard won and of critical importance to literally millions of Sudanese, will unravel. We are already seeing in eastern Sudan the eruption of increased violence coupled with demands for greater representation and accountability. The longer Darfur goes on, the greater the chance that the east will some months from now look like Darfur and we will have in essence a collapsed state in the heart of Africa. And as we know from Afghanistan from the president's national security strategy, in many cases weak states can pose as great a threat as strong states.

And I think the third thing we have at stake, and this is something both of our other panelists have referred to, is that the values that supposedly drive our global war on terrorism will be discounted. I think we're already seeing that pledges to fight for freedom are being questioned because it's selective. Certainly in the case of Darfur, I think we're at risk of suggesting that our willingness to fight oppression counts if you have oil, if you have resources, and if you're in the right place, but not, quite frankly, if you're in Africa. And I don't think that is a value or a message that we can afford to send to the rest of the world.

In terms of what we need to do, I'd like to point to something in the short, medium, and long-term. In the short term, and I think the ambassador has referred to this, there needs to be much more united pressure from the international community on Khartoum. If you look at the most significant breakthrough leading ultimately to the signing of the north/south peace agreement, it came in the mid-1990s when there was united pressure from outside and united pressure from the subregions. Khartoum knew it was between a rock and a hard place, and it finally made some concessions.

Now, the recent UN Security Council resolution and the modified but still significant victory in terms of the International Criminal Court help, but those sanctions aren't enough unless and until we're willing to put the resources necessary into monitoring and enforcing those sanctions. We've seen in Liberia, we've seen in Sierra Leone, we've seen in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and as President Bush said himself, we saw in Iraq that sanctions aren't enough unless there's the willingness to monitor and enforce them. So we need to as the United States commit resources, for example, to monitoring the arms embargo because arms embargo on paper will not stop Khartoum from moving. An arms embargo enforced is much more critical.

Also in the short term, we need, as many people have pointed out, to see a stronger mandate for the AU and an increased size of that mission. And I agree wholeheartedly that the mandate needs to be to protect civilians, but I would argue that the AU's mission is a permissive observer mission. Khartoum agreed to it. For Khartoum to concede in any expansion or any elevation of the mandate, they need to

know they're between a rock and a hard place, and right now there are still too many loopholes, I think, allowing them to get out.

In the medium term, I concur with both of our other speakers that we need to be prepared to make a long-term, serious investment in the African Union. The African Union is new. It still needs to build certain capacities, but it didn't exist in 1994. I believe if it had existed in 1994, Africa would have intervened in Rwanda, and I think Africa has shown that it is the one region in the world that took a lesson to heart by acting on its willingness to go into Sudan.

Now, the African Union has made clear that they're prepared to go into regions where we have proven in the United States that we're not prepared to put boots on the ground. They're talking about going into eastern Congo, and as the ambassador points out, we've got an enormous U.S. mission there and still the underlying problem hasn't been resolved. We all know that U.S. troops are not going to go into eastern Congo. If the African Union is willing to go, I think it's in Africa's interests clearly, but also in our own both from a values and humanitarian perspective, but from a strategic prospective to make those investments.

What do those investments mean? In part, it's resources for the Sudan mission, but there are at least three other things we need to be prepared to do. One is to have high-level diplomatic representation to the African Union. The second is to develop and support a robust capacity-building program targeted at helping the AU develop the stand-by force they've pledged to create. Their plan is to have stand-by forces that can respond rapidly. They need capacity-building assistance to get that up and running.

The third is to help grapple with some of the huge and very costly logistical demands. Lift, inoperability, getting units from different African countries to work in synch and to move quickly costs money, but I would argue it is money worth it. We have spent far more on the United Nations mission in the Congo over the last several years, on relief in Rwanda, on the international tribunal than we would have had to spend had we been prepared to do something in 1994.

Finally, I think for the long term, we've got to be prepared to act on what is called the responsibility to protect where the international community's willingness to step up to the plate when states can't or won't protect their own citizens. That means merging our values with our interests and, in fact, taking on board the notion which is out there in rhetorical terms, but not in practice but are strategic interests, indeed, do derive at least in part from our values.

It means that we need to abandon the notion that humanitarian intervention is somehow neutral and risk free. It is always risky. It means we need to stop complaining about peacekeeping and fix it. And if I may as a last point, it means that all of us – and I know there are many people in the audience today who spend a lot of time working on these issues – need to demand that our government in September at the time of the UN

General Assembly engage in the debate about the responsibility to protect, but also lead in terms of demanding that the international community take it on.

John, I'll end there. Thank you.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you, Gayle, and I want to thank the whole panel for an excellent presentation. (Applause.)

The duties of the Senate are going to call Senator Corzine soon, but we have time for some questions. And I'm going to take the prerogative and ask the first couple maybe. But I'm a part-time law professor, so I just want to put the students on notice that I'm going to let them have the first question, since they've done so much to help organize this, after I do one to the senator and one to the ambassador.

Senator, the ambassador said that you are – we're counting on you, I think, a little bit to align talk and reality, I think, to use his phrase. And I think if you look at what's happened in the past year or so, I think that the Congress has really led and you personally have led in trying to align talk and reality first in declaring a genocide, then providing support – financial support to the African Union.

Now you've introduced the Darfur Accountability Act, and I just wonder whether you – what you think the prospects of that being included in the State Authorization Bill are, what are the impediments, what the administration's attitude is towards the bill and what we can do to help.

SEN. CORZINE: I think there is the will in the Senate to deal with this issue. We have, as I said, 22 co-sponsors. It's evenly divided, Republican and Democrat. Senator Frist has shown interest in this issue. The reality is, this will pass if the administration is willing to embrace it as policy. We were only able to get the \$75 million for support of the African Union with the intervention of Secretary Powell behind the scenes with the leadership to allow for the amendment to move forward.

I believe left to our own devices we will move in the Congress to have the precision and the practical responses that I think the ambassador and Ms. Smith both talked about. We need – it's not enough to, say, label it and use language. You need actual steps like stopping helicopter ships from attacking villages. You need a no-fly zone. It needs to have the ability to be enforced. The international court – a compromise came up about people in the Sudanese government and in the community that are attacking the people need to know that they will be held accountable; that names are on the lists, that people will someday be subject to international prosecution, and so I think that the Darfur Accountability Act – the will of the Congress if we are able to convince the administration – and we hear lots of good words. Now it's time for real specific actions on this. And again, I think a lot of this comes to fruition from the kinds of pressure that religious groups in particular have been able to express, and this ties together with the cultural themes that the administration wants to put forward.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you.

Ambassador, you talked about empowering regional groups, and particularly the African Union, and Gayle mentioned that the African Union wasn't in existence in 1994, but we've kind of blended resource needs, financial lift, the other things that Gayle talked about, and the political will. And I just wonder whether you might offer your observations about at this moment what's lacking. Maybe it's a chicken-and-egg question, but what do we – what's lacking now? Is it the political will to give support to the mission or is it the resource needs or – I guess it's probably a little of both, but I wonder if you could reflect on that.

AMB. NSENGA: Both of those are lacking. The will from African Union's point of view is there, but I think, as I said, that's not enough. We need more as from the political will right away. And we need more will at the United Nations, and especially the Security Council. At the moment, all of you – you see the division that we hear in the Security Council. That is not a very good message to send either to the Janjaweed or also to the African Union. They say we are trying, but we're not – there's not concerted will.

The question of resources – certainly the resources are available today are just being nice. That is the big problem, and African Union has no secure resources. Even whatever coming, we must deal to pay the debt – a huge debt that Africa owes the multilateral institutions, and if you don't pay the debt, you don't have any more money.

African Union kind of is struggling to find better trade deals with the – in the global system. It's the high – it is ah going against the odds. So I think both the political will and also the resources is a problem. But this time the resources in terms of personnel is not a problem with African Union.

MR. PODESTA: Okay. I promised you the first questions. Does anybody want it? He's writing.

Go ahead.

Q: This question is for the senator. I was wondering how much money you think the Genocide Intervention Fund is going to have to raise to shame this administration to act.

SEN. CORZINE: I'm more interested in the money that we need to authorize and appropriate so that the African Union has the resources. We are – the \$75 million in the United States' resources went together with about, what, \$250 from the international community. The reality is it's not just money. We also have to be prepared to allocate specific resources; the kinds of things that Gayle talked about: aircraft. Even with 10,000 troops, in a country the size of France without the ability to move your resources from one spot to the other where the attacks might take place or the needs might demand it, things won't happen.

I think there is no answer to your other question. It is only through consistency in the voice – and I think to some extent we have been inconsistent. I blame myself. This is something that those of us in public life and those that support and from other walks – you need to make sure it's an everyday pounding on recognition of what this problem is about. We have some people who have been heroic in their centerpiecing (ph) of this issue. And, again, we need the will to make sure that it's an everyday event, as opposed to amounts of dollars or a specific country.

MR. PODESTA: Why don't we come to the gentleman with the yellow sweater and –

Q: (Off mike.)

MR. : Sir, please wait for the mike.

MR. PODESTA: Please wait for the mike.

MR. : Please wait for the mike and identify yourself.

Q: I'm Rick Joward (ph). I want to follow up on that question because I think it goes to the political will, and I don't think that we have the political will in this country and I – and that's what I'd like to know is how do we go about it? How many (code Ls?) during this week has went to Dafur? You know, how many special sessions or how many Palm Sunday night sessions of Congress have there been held on Darfur? How many special orders on Darfur? With all due respect, 22 cosponsors is not many. That's less than half of the Senate. How do we get the political will? How many people have to die?

SEN. CORZINE: Well, I wish I could give you an adequate answer. Those of us – and there are some. I don't say I'm the only one to speak out on this day after day. Certainly week after week on the Senate floor when we're in session, we ask – we push Senator Lugar and the Foreign Relations Committee; we join with groups outside; we – as I mentioned in my remarks, we had Captain Stiegle who has this incredible, just devastating film review of what is happening on the ground. We tried to take that out onto the road, sponsoring it.

I get your point about the number of (code Ls?). There is more to do on this. I mean, there's just – it is sometimes our intensity and lack of passion and single-mindedness with regard to this issue that's missing. And I think that what our hope is is that over the next several months now we will actually bring that to bear. And the problems on the ground from at least the understanding I have in some of the committees I serve on is it's actually gotten worse in the last two months, and it's time for us to just recognize and do what you're suggesting.

MS. SMITH: Jon, can I add from you? I think there's another important ingredient in we've got the Genocide Intervention Fund here, we've got the Save Darfur Coalition. Something different than what happened in Rwanda in 1994 is that there is a

tremendous level of activism and there is polling that shows, for example, that most Americans would support some kind of intervention in Darfur. That goes against the conventional wisdom that I'm sure the senator would confirm, and John as well, that in politics the notion is that the public won't support the U.S. taking risks in something like Darfur. I don't think that's true, and I think we're seeing levels of public interest and activism out there that counter that notion.

It's not going to bring change in the immediate short term, but I do think the level of consistent activism – as the senator point out, making it a daily message targeted not only at Congress and the administration, but also at the media. We have had 24/7 coverage over the last ten days of two events, and nothing quite frankly on Darfur, so target your members of Congress, if you're lucky enough to live in the part of the country where you actually have voting representation, and the executive branch, but also your local and the national media, because that's the other way to build up the tension.

MR. PODESTA: I'm going to take just a couple of questions in order. If you could keep it brief. The gentleman right there in the blue shirt right behind you, and then we'll come up here, and then we're – I'm going to let the panel wrap up in deference to Senator Corzine's schedule.

Q: Doug Brots (ph) with the International Peace Operations Association. And I think this has been a very good panel. I think the ambassador's points and Gayle Smith's points are excellent in terms of supporting the UN with training, with equipment – or with AU, the African Union. I think the African Union has shown a real willingness to get involved in these sorts of operation, and I think we can do a lot to support that. ATRI followed by ACODA (ph), the Bush Administration – now GPOI, the Global Peace Operations Initiative, are all great projects, which have done a lot to enhance African capabilities.

But in the meantime, I think there's a lot we can do until we get a stronger mandate in terms of adding force multipliers to the African Union force in Darfur, including aerial surveillance, additional helicopters, maybe some security support, protect IDB (ph) camps better, and we can do that now. We don't have to wait for an additional mandate and troops and things like that. I mean, there's a lot we can do in the meantime, and I just think we need to keep that in mind.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you. And up there.

Q: Thank you. I'm David Rubenstein, the coordinator of the Save Darfur Coalition. I want to thank you for hosting this today and thank you for the wonderful work you and Gayle Smith have done in bringing this to the public attention. And Senator Corzine, thank you for your leadership. Ambassador Nsenga, thank you.

But I want to, since you are a professor, ask you the question at this time. You worked in the White House. You may have a better sense than any of us what it takes to move the White House. We've had wonderful policy prescriptions. I think they're very

important, but I think this is a question of political will, and political will at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. What do you think it's going to take to get President Bush's attention and to put this at the top of his priority list?

MR. PODESTA: Well, I think the elements have already been put forward by the panel, quite frankly. It's going to take, I think, political pressure. Political will comes from political pressure, and I think in circumstances like this, I think the president has focused the country's attention on a number of problems around the world, and I think he could focus the country's attention on this, but I think that in this case, I think it's going to bubble up from the bottom, rather than starting from the top. And that is going to – I'll answer this – the question that was posed to the senator. I think it's going to cause some shame that comes from funds being raised by students around the country, as opposed to the federal government stepping up to the plate more strongly in order to provide the kind of resources that are necessary for the African Union mission.

I think it comes from a bipartisan coalition that the senator's assembling. I would say also that the senator has had to wear the mantle of the kind of failure of his colleagues, I think, to pay more attention to this, but there's no one who has been more out front on this and done more and been to the region and really kept the Congress's attention on this than Senator Corzine. And I think his work with – bipartisan work with Senator Brownback and Senator DeWine is critical.

And then finally, I think – again, this has been alluded to – I think a strong presence, particularly with this administration and this president, from the religious community who focuses attention on this question in coalition with other political partners who care about this and humanitarian partners who care about this question can and I think will bring this administration to act. I think if we keep that pressure on and keep doing the kind of work that we're doing, that the students are doing, that the ambassador is doing – in that regard he reminded me that tomorrow night, April 6th, at 5:45 at All Saints Church at Chevy Chase Circle, there's a church service to remember the 1994 genocide. And those are the kinds of efforts, I think, around the country that can begin to build support, attention, pressure to get the administration to act.

I think that, you know, it's – I was in a different position in the administration. Gayle was in Africa during the Rwanda genocide, but I think no one's proud of the attention that the administration brought to bear on that. I think that President Clinton himself has reflected on that extensively in public. And I think it is only through, I think, the pressure of the public that began to – and with due respect to what Gayle said at the beginning – begin to put this through a prism of what we really need to do as human beings, and not just try to sit in the situation room and in the basement of the White House and decide is or isn't this in the strategic interests of the United States. Our humanity calls us to make this part of the strategic interests of the United States and that's, I think, what the UN meeting in September will focus on.

I'd like to basically let Senator Corzine have the last word but maybe get – ask final comments from our panel, maybe starting with Gayle and working in reverse order.

MS. SMITH: Well, I think there's very little to add. The one thing I would stress to everybody here, because I know we have a lot of activists in the room, is don't give up and multiply, because I think John is absolutely right. It is only when the executive branch sees that this is something that people – voters care about and that we're demanding in part that our rhetoric on values match our reality that I think we're going to see any difference.

I don't think we're going to see it as quickly as we should. There's going to be a lot more suffering in Darfur before it's over, but we absolutely can't give up. I think at the same time, as I said in my remarks, this debate in September is critical. Right now, the administration has given no signal whatsoever that it is interested at all in the question of UN reform. And in this issue of the responsibility to protect we have an opportunity, and I would argue a responsibility, to demand also that the U.S. delegation in New York in September is putting this very high on the agenda, because that's the only way we can stop from a scenario where we're sitting here from – 10 years from now talking about what happened in Darfur and the next genocide that's unfolding.

MR. PODESTA: Ambassador?

AMB. NSENGA: Yes, thank you very much. Not much, but I want to emphasize the issue overriding rhetoric with reality, and the issue of learning from the past. You have to learn from the failures you had in the past in order to improve. If you don't do that, then it is a blind system and it can't work.

Lastly, we need to – really to focus for humanitarian protection. There is no such a thing like mutual humanitarian intervention. It is never there. If it comes that way, you're heading for disaster.

Thank you.

MR. PODESTA: Senator?

SEN. CORZINE: Politicians pay attention to voters. The more of you who register, not as voters, although that's a good idea as well, with each of us in groups, I think the more likely we are to have political action. But this is not one of those things that folks hear about on any consistent basis, and I don't think it becomes a prime issue. And that's true at the White House and it's true in Congress, and it is absolutely essential that we turn up the volume on this issue.

MR. PODESTA: Thank you. Please join me in thanking the panel.

(Applause.)

Thanking our friends from Swarthmore and please get out there and be active.

Thank you.

(END)