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Abstract:

The ongoing civil conflict in Sudan is seen as the biggest roadblock to the successful global eradication of Guinea worm disease. Neighbouring Uganda successfully eradicated the disease while experiencing conflict, which would suggest that the conflict argument is invalid. Instead, I argue that it is not conflict but regime type and the commitment of the government to the eradication programme that determines its success or failure.
Global public health is on the verge of a landmark accomplishment: the eradication of Guinea worm disease (GWD). While most people have never heard of Guinea worm disease, it is one of seventeen neglected tropical diseases that adversely impact the quality of life of over one billion people worldwide. Guinea worm disease is a nematode parasite caused by *Dracunculus medinensis* and is spread through unsafe drinking water. While there is neither a vaccine to prevent the disease nor a drug therapy to treat the disease, it can be controlled by filtering and treating drinking water. The disease has been eradicated in Asia and is now only found in four Sub-Saharan African countries: Sudan, Mali, Ethiopia and Ghana. Of the 1,624 remaining cases of Guinea worm disease, Sudan has 1,549 (WHO Collaborating Center for Research, Training and Eradication of Dracunculiasis, 2010: 2). "The greatest challenges to success of the global campaign are sporadic insecurity or widespread civil conflict in Sudan, the uncertainty associated with future political benchmarks in Sudan (census in 2008, national elections in 2009, and referendum on the status of southern Sudan in 2011)," argues the Carter Center (Hopkins, Ruiz-Tiben, Downs et al., 2008: 478).

Uganda, a nation on the southern border of Sudan, has successfully eradicated Guinea worm disease while experiencing a twenty year civil conflict. The patterns of conflict in Sudan and Uganda are very similar: both were protracted (Sudan's First Civil War lasted from 1955-1972 and the Second Civil War went from 1983-2005, Uganda's Northern conflict lasted from 1987-2006), both centred around North-South or centre-periphery divisions, both represented situations where a lack of state monopoly on violence allowed for well equipped rebel movements to gain momentum (the Southern People's Liberation Army in Sudan and the Lord's Resistance Army in Uganda), and both...
involved extensive civilian casualties (over 2 million civilian deaths in Sudan's Second Civil War and over 2 million displaced people in Northern Uganda) (Petterson, 2003; Resolve, 2011). This comparison raises two main questions: 1) Is conflict really the major roadblock to disease eradication? 2) If Uganda can successfully eradicate Guinea worm disease while experiencing conflict, why can't Sudan?

I argue that it is not simply the presence of conflict but the type of government regime that impacts the success or failure of the Guinea worm eradication programme. The crucial difference between Sudan and Uganda is the power and control of their respective government regimes; Sudan is an authoritarian regime while Uganda is a hybrid regime. In an authoritarian regime the executive dominates without challenge. Comparatively, in a hybrid regime, the executive seeks to expand power and control but there are certain checks and balances that prevent the unchallenged domination of the executive (Tripp, 2010). This crucial distinction leads to different motivations and aims of each state and different degrees of social services and programmes.

Guinea worm disease eradication programmes and other health programmes depend on a certain degree of government support and involvement to be successful. The Sudanese government will be more focused on maintaining power while the Ugandan government, with its pseudo trappings of democracy will go through the motions of addressing the needs of the people. I argue that this will lead Uganda to be more supportive of health and disease programmes.

Classification and categorisation by regime type is tool employed by the international community. Given the importance of classification in international politics, one way to evaluate the difference between governments and the regime types is to see
how the international community, particularly the United States, views both Sudan and Uganda.

Sudan is categorised as a state sponsor of terrorism; Uganda is seen as an ally in the war on terror, a member of the United State's "Coalition of the Willing". I argue that these different roles in the international community motivate the governments of each country to act differently in how they engage with their people, particularly in the delivery of social services like public health. Uganda has motivation and incentive to keep the United States and other Western powers happy by implementing public service programmes to improve the quality of life for Ugandans, like the Guinea worm eradication campaign. Uganda seeks to be seen as an ally in the US led war on terror. Uganda wants to take part in the U.S. led regime. This lends legitimacy to Museveni's rule. Sudan does not have the same aims and incentives. The government of Sudan does not wish to live up to demands of Western governments or gain legitimacy for its regime through U.S. approval. Sudan gets international support and approval from China and the Arab League. Using the relationship between the United States and Uganda and Sudan to explore the different regime types will help show how each country's commitment to it's people and government programmes and services.

The Eradicability of Guinea Worm Disease

The World Health Organization has identified three factors that are important in deciding whether a disease is eradicable: 1) "an effective intervention is available to interrupt transmission of the agent," 2) "practical diagnostic tools with sufficient sensitivity and specificity are available to detect levels of infection that can lead to transmission," 3) "humans are essential for the life-cycle of the agent, which has no other
vertebrate reservoir and does not amplify in the environment" (Dowdle 1999). Guinea worm disease meets these three conditions and is recognised as a prime candidate for global eradication. First, while there is no drug therapy or vaccine, treatment of contaminated water sources using filters or larvicide interrupts transmission of the disease so there is an effective intervention measure. Second, it is very easy to diagnose Guinea worm disease. When a person is infected with the disease a large blister like ulcer develops. No expensive lab tests are required to confirm diagnosis. Monitoring and evaluating infection levels is highly feasible. Third, while there is an intermediate host of the disease, copepods or water fleas, there is no vertebrate vector of the disease that would facilitate transmission (Aylward et al., 2000).

**Conflict and Public Health**

There is strong consensus on the fact that conflict has a negative impact on public health. Conflict negatively affects access to food, water, shelter and medical care and creates an environment that facilitates the spread of infectious disease. The impact of a specific war in the short term is relatively well researched and understood. Studies have looked at specific conflicts and specific diseases such as tuberculosis in Guinea-Bissau (Gustafson et al., 2001) or the number of deaths from conflict related diseases in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Roberts et al., 2001).

There are a handful of studies that look at the cross-national long-term impact of conflict on global health. Ghobarah, Huth and Russett have developed an analytical model of the long-term consequences of conflict on public health across countries. Building off of their earlier model (Ghobarah, Huth and Russet, 2003), they looked at the World Health Organization's Health Adjusted Life Expectancy (HALE). Ghobarah, et al.
identified four main factors that influence public health during and after conflict: 1) the extent to which a population is exposed to conditions that increase risk of disease, disability and death, 2) financial and human resources available for addressing the health needs of a population, 3) the level of resources that are actually allocated to public health, 4) the degree to which allocated resources are used effectively (Ghobarah et al. 2004). The four main factors were developed out of the ongoing academic dialogue on the health effects of conflict. These four factors neatly and concisely incorporate and summarise the leading arguments in the field (Toole, 1997; Murdoch and Sandler, 2002; Adeola, 1996; Ball, 1988; DeRouen, 2000; Mintz, 1989). They controlled for factors such as higher levels of GDP, political freedom, education and urbanisation. Regression analysis showed that there is a statistically significant relationship between conflict and higher rates of disease. Using this model, Ghobarah et al. demonstrate that civil war has a long-term negative effect on public health.

Similar to Ghobarah et al., Iqbal also analyzes the relationship between conflict and public health. Like Ghobarah et al., Iqbal argues that conflict leads to a decline in public health. Approaching the issue through a framework of human security and the idea that public health is a key indicator of human security, Iqbal focuses more on the level of economic development and democracy and how those factors may mitigate the impacts of conflict on public health. Building off of the findings of Ghobarah et al. (2004) that democracies spend more money on health than non-democracies, Iqbal (2006) examines the effect of democracy on health. While there are some autocratic states with successful public health systems, democracies are more likely to spend more money on health as it is part of the norms and values that are part of a democratic society. The
connection between health and wealth is also examined. Wealth and trade openness were looked at to see how these factors impacted public health. Iqbal argues that wealth and trade openness lead to stronger public health systems. Iqbal concludes that while conflict clearly has a negative impact on health, it is necessary to look at other factors like wealth and government to see how this will influence the impact that conflict has on health.

In the paired comparison of Sudan and Uganda, Iqbal's observation on the role of government is important. Expanding on the role of the government and how this impacts eradication efforts further develops the analysis of the connection between conflict and public health. There is no doubt in both the case of Sudan and Uganda conflict has reduced the efficiency and effectiveness of their public health systems and by extension their ability to successfully eradicate disease. What is not clear, and what is not directly addressed in the literature is how different countries react to the public health challenges that conflict presents. Further examination is necessary to see what factors mitigate or exacerbate the impact of conflict. Clearly, as the case of Uganda shows, conflict is not an insurmountable roadblock to the eradication of Guinea worm disease. Therefore it is not conflict per se but other factors, like the role of the government, that prevent the eradication of Guinea worm disease.

**Methodology**

Sudan and Uganda provide an interesting paired comparison to examine the relationship between conflict and public health and what role other factors, namely government regime type, play in this relationship. Sudan and Uganda have experienced similar types of conflict yet have had different outcomes with Guinea worm disease control. One of the key differences between the two countries is regime type. Exploring
this difference in the context of conflict and public health will show how different government regimes respond to conflict. Focusing on each country's role and reputation in the international community, particularly in relation to the United States, I examine the effect this has on Guinea worm disease eradication success and failure. To analyse each country's reputation in the international community I focus specifically on the interaction between each country and the United States. I provide a historical summary of these country's relationships with the United States and analyse official press releases from the United States State Department and resolutions from the United States Congress.

Looking at the tone and attitude of the United States towards both the Sudanese and Ugandan government helps show how each government portrays itself. The government and its attitude towards the international community are important to understanding how they will support disease eradication programmes. A government that is friendly with the United States, like Uganda, will be more open to partnership and collaboration with the Carter Center and other international bodies that run disease programmes. Sudan, which has more complex relationships with the U.S., will be less supportive.

**Sudan**

When Sudan gained independence from Great Britain on January 1, 1956, the country had already been at war for a year. Sudan's First Civil War continued until a ceasefire was reached in 1972. When President Numeiri violated the peace agreement by trying to enforce Sharia law in Southern Sudan fighting resumed. This motivated the formation of the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) to fight against the central government in Khartoum. The SPLM/A, led by John Garang, was
created in response to the ongoing hardships and inequality faced by the people of Southern Sudan (SPLM, 2010).

There are two major schools of thought to explaining this conflict: 1) a dispute between the centre (the North) and the periphery (the South), 2) a racial and religious conflict between Muslim Arabs (the North) and Christian and Animist Africans (the South). At the root of the conflict, it is the exploitative nature of the Northern based government and the mistreatment of the Southern people. This division can be traced back to colonial times when the colonial government ruled the North and South as separate, distinct regions under a policy of indirect rule.

Peace talks between the Sudanese government and the SPLM/A started in 1988 but were derailed in 1989 when General Omar Hassan Amed al-Bashir seized power continuing the ongoing fluctuation between civilian and military rule which Sudan has experienced since Independence. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed in January 2005 brought an end to the Second Sudanese Civil War. The CPA included provisions for the Southern Sudan referendum on independence and set out the equal distribution of oil revenue. Despite the peace agreement, violence continues in Southern Sudan. Continued fighting over Abyei, an oil rich district on the border between North and South, has led to ongoing fighting. The conflict has had a devastating impact on the financial resource of Northern Sudan, retarding economic growth and development and led to an ongoing humanitarian crisis in Southern Sudan and Darfur. Over 2.5 million people have been killed in the Sudanese conflict with another 5 million people internally or externally displaced (de Waal, 2007).
U.S.-Sudanese Relations

Despite the fact that the United States is one of Sudan's major donors of humanitarian aid, the two countries have a complicated, volatile relationship. As a newly independent country, Sudan did not side with the United States in the Cold War. In 1967 Sudan and other Arab nations broke off relations with the U.S. during the Arab-Israeli War. In the early 1970's after a failed coup attempt by the Sudanese Communist party President Numeiri turned to the United States for support. The U.S. saw Sudan as a strategically important country and sought to repair relations. To win over the Sudanese government, the United States flooded the country with official development assistance and military aid.

Good relations between Sudan and the United States were short lived however. On March 1, 1973, the Black September Organization, a Palestinian terrorist group, murdered U.S. Ambassador Cleo A. Noel and Deputy Chief of Mission Curtis G. Moore in Khartoum. The accused assassins were extradited to Egypt were the escaped harsh charges. In protest, the United States removed its Ambassador from Sudan.

As terrorism became a more central issue to the U.S. international agenda, U.S.-Sudanese relations became more complicated. Sudan supported the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in the First Gulf War. A security threat against U.S. embassy personnel in 1993 led to a scaling back of the staff and adding Sudan to the list of state sponsors of terrorism. In 1996 all embassy staff were recalled. In August 1998 following the bombings of the U.S. Embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya, the U.S. launched a missile at a supposed nerve gas factory in Khartoum, Sudan.
Relations improved as Sudan began cooperating more with the United States anti-terrorism agenda in the early 1990s. Bashir and the Sudanese government tried to foster better relations by expelling Osama bin Laden at the behest of the U.S. government. In May 2000 bilateral anti-terrorism talks began. Since the September 11th terrorist attacks Sudan has ostensibly cooperated with the United States yet still remains on the state sponsors of terrorism list. The United States has not had an Ambassador stationed in Sudan since 2002. Sudan is one of only a handful of countries that does not have a U.S. Ambassador. Burma/Myanmar, Cuba, Iran, North Korea and Taiwan are the only other countries that do not have a U.S. Ambassador.

Evaluating official United States State Department statements and Congressional resolutions on Sudan, it is clear that Sudan is still seen as a problematic country (Full text of U.S. State Department Press Statements and Congressional Resolutions addressing Sudan can be found in Appendix A). These official government statements and documents repeatedly portray the Sudanese government as a violator of human rights that abuses and attacks its own people. This would suggest that it is a government that would not support social services and health care programmes.

In June 2004 the U.S. Congress passed House Resolution 467 declaring that the ongoing conflict in Darfur, Sudan was genocide. Within the resolution were calls for President Bush to lead an international effort to end the genocide, to impose sanctions on the Sudanese government, to ban visas to Sudanese officials and to freeze Sudanese government assets. The United States Congress would not issue such a declaration against a friendly state. Declaring that a state is committing genocide against its own
people is not something to be done lightly. As stated within the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, Article 5:

The Contracting Parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective Constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article 3 (United Nations, 1948).

By declaring the conflict genocide, the United States, as a signatory of the Convention, is obliged to act.

Discussing the ongoing unrest in Southern Sudan and the violence in Darfur, Secretary Clinton said: "An unstable Sudan not only jeopardizes the future of the 40 million people there. It can also be an incubator of violence and instability in an already volatile region, it can provide a safe haven for international terrorists, and trigger another humanitarian catastrophe that Sudan, its neighbours, and the world cannot afford" (Clinton, 2009). The United States sees Sudan's instability as a serious threat to international security yet this statement also highlights the fact that Sudan's instability has a detrimental impact on the well being of Sudan's own people.

When the International Criminal Court issued an arrest warrant for Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir the U.S. State Department released the following statement: "The United States is strongly committed to the pursuit of peace in Sudan and believes those who have committed atrocities should be held accountable for their crimes" (Duguid, 2009). The State Department also encouraged continued work towards a peaceful resolution of the Sudanese Civil War.

Recently, with the successful referendum on Southern Sudanese independence, the United States has expressed more friendly and favourable sentiment towards the Sudanese government. On February 7, 2011 President Obama and Secretary of State
Clinton said that Sudan could possibly be removed from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. "For those who meet all of their obligations, there is a path to greater prosperity and normal relations with the United States, including examining Sudan’s designations as a state sponsor of terrorism," said Obama (LaFranchi, 2011). In a US State Department Press Release Secretary Clinton said:

Removal of the state sponsor of terrorism designation will take place if and when Sudan meets all criteria spelled out in US law, including not supporting international terrorism for the preceding six months and providing assurance it will not support such acts in the future, and fully implements the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement, including reaching a political solution on Abyei and key post-referendum arrangements (Clinton, 2011).

While the United States is offering some movement on their position on Sudan, they clearly still maintain strong qualifications on how they see Sudan. Continual improvement of relations between Sudan and the United States is contingent on the smooth transition to independence for Southern Sudan.

**Uganda**

Uganda gained independence on October 9, 1962. After several military coups d'état, the current leader, Yoweri Museveni and the National Resistance Movement gained power in 1986. While Museveni's rule has brought a certain level of political stability, it has also come with a high degree of corruption, lack of political freedom and political violence. Museveni's rule has not been peaceful for Uganda. Uganda has been involved in the ongoing civil and regional conflict in the Great Lakes region.

Uganda, like Sudan, has experienced a long and violent division between North and South. The North-South division in the country goes back to colonial days when the British developed the South more aggressively than the North leading to serious economic and political divisions. Under colonial rule the Baganda, a southern ethnic
group, formed an alliance with the colonial rulers, creating a system of favouritism and preferential treatment of one group or region over another. After Museveni, a Southerner, took control of Kampala many Northerners fled the city fearing retribution. Museveni dismissed all Northerners from civil service positions and military positions. The Lord's Resistance Movement emerged out of the ongoing fear of reprisal and retribution among the Acholi people of Northern Uganda.

Alice Auma, a spirit-medium from Gulu, Northern Uganda, created the Holy Spirit Movement, arguing that Lakwena, the spirit of a dead Italian general, had instructed her to start a movement to overthrown Museveni and start a new government under the law of the Ten Commandments. Alice led her forces to the edge of Kampala, the capital city were Museveni's forces defeated them. Alice fled, claiming that the spirit had left her.

Joseph Kony, a relative of Alice Auma, took over the mantel of power and created the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). The LRA moved away from the loose spiritual trappings of the Holy Spirit Movement and devolved into a more mercenary, opportunistic and violent movement. The people of Northern Uganda did not support the LRA, with many civilians arguing that Kony's violent tactic did not represent the will of the Acholi people. In retribution for the lack of support, Kony began to recruit child soldiers for his cause, fundamentally betraying his manifesto of addressing the grievances of the Acholi people. Over 66,000 children from Northern Uganda have been abducted by Kony and the LRA and forced to serve as child soldiers or camp wives (Resolve, 2011).
The Ugandan army, the Uganda People's Defence Force (UPDF) led aggressive campaigns against the LRA. In 1996 civilians were forced into protected villages, or camps. Eighty-five percent of the population of Northern Uganda was forced from their homes by the LRA and the UPDF (Resolve, 2011). The government argues this was to enable UPDF to better protect people from LRA raids but in reality, the poor conditions in the camps led to the death of over 1,000 people a week (Resolve, 2011). Mistreatment of the Northern people by the Museveni government further outraged and isolated the Northern people creating mistrust of the peace process.

The Juba Peace Process, held in Juba, Southern Sudan, in July 2006 began to encourage hopes of peace. Joseph Kony, the head of the LRA, refused to attend talks for fear of being arrested due to the International Criminal Court warrant for his arrest. Museveni was also unwilling to negotiate terms with the LRA. By 2008, through a series of smaller agreements made a full peace agreement seem possible but Kony failed to sign. Despite the lack of a signed peace agreement, no reported LRA attacks have occurred in Northern Uganda since 2006. The LRA has relocated to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan and the Central African Republic. While there has been no violence in the North, the people of Northern Uganda live in constant fear of Kony and the LRA.

Painfully slow progress has been made in recovery and rebuilding in Northern Uganda. Over 1.5 million people were displaced with many people still living in internally displaced person camps. Houses have been destroyed and landmines are still found across fields prevent farming and livestock. Insufficient funding and support from the Museveni government has made rebuilding of infrastructure nearly impossible.
U.S.-Ugandan Relations

Uganda and the United States have experienced a strong bilateral relationship since President Museveni assumed power. President Museveni has been an active supporter of the United States led War on Terror. Uganda was a member of George W. Bush's "Coalition of the Willing" for the 2003 U.S. led invasion of Iraq. The Lord's Resistance Army has been categorised as a terrorist organisation by the United States State Department (Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)). The U.S. provides military training and assistance for the UPDF to help combat the LRA.

Political rivals have accused Museveni of funnelling money to the Lord's Resistance Army in an effort to perpetuate the conflict. The motivation behind this is two fold: first, the LRA is attacking its own people, the Acholi, a group that Museveni is against, and second, continued conflict means continued U.S. support and funding.

Much of the Congressional and State Department activity involving Uganda addresses the Lord's Resistance Army. In July 1998 the House passed a resolution condemning the LRA's use of child soldiers. Interestingly, the Museveni government is not mentioned in the resolution but the Bashir government of Sudan is. Resolution 309 of the 105th Congress calls on the Bashir government to "cease supporting the LRA in the abductions and kidnapping of children in Northern Uganda" and calls for President Clinton to "appoint a Special Humanitarian Envoy for Sudan" (House 1998, H 309). (Full text of all resolutions discussed in this section can be found in Appendix B).

In 2004 Congress passed the Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act. In the Act, the strong relationship between Uganda and the United States refers to the strong relationship between the two countries yet also criticises the Ugandan government for
failing to protect civilians. The Ugandan government is critiqued for the conduct of its military forces and the Act "urge[s] the Government of Uganda to improve the professionalism of Ugandan military personnel currently stationed in northern and eastern Uganda, with an emphasis on respect for human rights, accountability for abuses, and effective civilian protection" (Senate 2004: S 2264). The Ugandan government is also encouraged to better address security, economic, and humanitarian needs of the people and take a more active role in addressing human rights violations.

Again, the actions of the Sudanese government are addressed. The Northern Uganda Response Act includes a clause addressing the involvement of Sudan in the conflict: "the relationship between the Government of Sudan and the Government of the United States cannot improve unless no credible evidence indicates that authorities of the Government of Sudan are complicit in efforts to provide weapons or other support to the Lord's Resistance Army" (Senate 2004: S 2264). The U.S. sees the involvement of Sudan in the Northern Uganda as a bargaining tool to encourage Sudan to act better internally and regionally.

The United States actively supported the peace process and the reconstruction efforts in Northern Uganda. During the 109th and 110th Congress several resolution were passed to call for action to end the conflict and bring about a peaceful settlement. Senate Resolution 573 called for U.S. and international support of an end to the conflict. While the LRA was condemned for the majority of the violence, including the use of child soldiers, the onus for peace is placed on the Government of Uganda. The resolution calls for "coordinated and comprehensive effort" by the Ugandan government and calls for the government to meet with representative from LRA to engage in peace talks
Senate Resolution 16 and House Resolution 80 of the 110th Congress reiterates that leaders from both sides, the LRA and the Government of Uganda need to be committed to ending the violence.

In 2009, Senate Resolution 1067 and House Resolution 2478 of the 111th Congress supported the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009. This Act called for authorization of funds for humanitarian relief efforts, reconstruction and post-conflict justice efforts. It reaffirms the United State's' commitment to continue to pursue Joseph Kony and the LRA. The good relations between the U.S. and Uganda are also reaffirmed with a call to increase future funding to Uganda to help with reconstruction. But the increased funding comes with certain terms such as a commitment to "transparent and accountable reconstruction" with increased oversight activity and the contribution of its own government funds as well (House 2009: H 2478).

Clearly Sudan and Uganda enjoy different interaction with the United States. Simply comparing the sheer number of U.S. State Department reports, remarks and press releases for each country indicates an important trend in how the United States views each country. Uganda has less than 100 reports and releases from 2004 to present. Sudan has approximately 400 for the same period, many addressing concerns over the government and the ongoing conflicts in Darfur and Southern Sudan. Part of this could be attributed to the type of conflict that each country experienced. The ethnic aspect of the conflict in Sudan led to more of a censure on human rights from the United States. But the larger critical and judgemental tone found throughout U.S.-Sudanese relations may be largely attributed to the fact that as an authoritarian regime Sudan does not pay
lip service to democracy. In the case of Uganda, it is easier to villainies the LRA and make Museveni look good despite his own human right violations, corruption, and other flaws.

**Guinea Worm Disease Programmes**

The global campaign to eradicate Guinea worm disease began in 1980 under the direction of the United States Centers for Disease Control. In 1986 the Carter Center took over the campaign. The Carter Center's Guinea worm eradication programme works with national ministries of health to coordinate national guinea worm eradication programmes and helps oversee community health workers who carry out case monitoring, evaluation and treatment. Both Sudan and Uganda have worked in partnership with the Carter Center to eradicate Guinea worm disease.

Uganda's Ministry of Health established the Uganda Guinea Worm Eradication Program (UGWEP) in 1991 in partnership with the Carter Center. The Carter Center initiated the partnership when former U.S. President Jimmy Carter visited Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni and proposed that the Ugandan government and the Carter Center collaborate to combat Guinea worm disease. At this time, Uganda had the third highest number of cases of any endemic country. Approximately 126,369 cases were discovered in the primary village-by-village survey of the disease at the beginning of the eradication programme (Rwakimari, Hopkins and Ruiz-Tiben, 2006:3). These cases were found in 16 districts all in Northern Uganda.

Uganda managed to successfully implement the Carter Center's Guinea Worm Eradication Programme as well as designing its own programmes to fit the unique needs of the country. Uganda's health ministry appointed a national coordinator to oversee the
project with district coordinators spread throughout the country. Working through Uganda's already extensive bureaucracy, each district was assigned a coordinator to oversee the programme. District coordinators reported back to national coordinators who worked with parallel advisors from the Carter Center.

On the ground, in the villages, training courses were held to engage village health workers. Focus was placed on case containment and treating infected water sources. Uganda developed a unique programme of Pond Care Takers to protect ponds from contamination from people with ulcers with emerging guinea worms. These pond care takers helped educate people about filtering water and reducing the transmission of the disease.

Uganda also piloted a voluntary institutionalisation programme for those infected with guinea worm disease. Anyone with an ulcer or swelling was encouraged to stay at the nearest public health facility until the blister burst and the risk of contamination was over. At the clinics the guinea worms could be manually extracted. Patients were given free food and a cash reward. This was a very unusual system for most Sub-Saharan health care programmes where family members are responsible for feeding and caring or relatives who are undergoing medical treatment. By 2004, Uganda had its first calendar year free of guinea worm disease. In 2009, Uganda was declared free of guinea worm disease.

Sudan's approach to Guinea worm disease control has been much less centrally organised or controlled. There is no one central body overseeing the Sudan Guinea Worm Eradication Programme (SGWEP). Various international agencies, the Khartoum based Sudanese government and a handful of Southern based rebel groups all weigh in on
programme control and operation. Health workers are caught between the North-South division. It is this lack of central control and authority that explains why the Carter Center program has been unsuccessful in Sudan. Unlike Sudan, Uganda still had a central authority that could enforce public health programmes. Sudan's conflict has led to too extensive divisions and weakened government control. Despite the fact that Sudan is an authoritarian regime, the government does not have enough control or authority to implement the programmes successfully in the South (even if they had the political will and motivation to do so).

Within Sudan, the majority of cases are found in Southern Sudan. By 1999 the ten Northern states had ceased transmission of the disease and the only cases of Guinea worm disease in the north were those imported from the south. This imbalance in endemic areas between north and south is just another reflection of the deep-seated tension between the two halves of the country and the extent of economic, social and political deprivation the Northern seated government has inflicted on the southern half of the country.

Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter negotiated a "Guinea Worm Cease-Fire" in 1995. The ceasefire lasted four months and allowed for an escalation of Sudan's eradication efforts. Programmes like "Worm Weeks" and Voice of America radiobroadcasts featuring Former President Jimmy Carter and Former Malian President Toure, and Former Nigerian President Gowon educated people on Guinea worm disease treatment and prevention.

Increased global attention to addressing the various conflicts in Sudan have led to international efforts to reach peace settlements and to address the humanitarian impacts
of the conflicts. Sudan's ongoing conflicts have also impeded the eradication of the disease in neighbouring countries. The large numbers of refugees created by the conflict led to imported cases of Guinea worm disease in bordering countries. Military personnel from other nations who have been sent to assist in peacekeeping have contracted the disease and brought it home with them. Given the long incubation it is nearly impossible to screen returning troops for it. Neighbouring Uganda educates and trains its troops to filter their water supply and prevent infection before they are dispatched to Guinea worm endemic areas in an effort to prevent a new outbreak of the disease in Uganda.

The Southern Sudan Guinea Worm Eradication Programme (SSGWEP) was implemented in 2005 following the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. Under this programme surveillance was scaled up and over 28,000 village health workers were trained and assigned to endemic villages. With support from the Carter Center, the World Health Organization, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, as well as the backing of several national Sudanese organisations, great progress has been made. Now the real issue is maintaining the momentum, especially when Southern Sudan gains independence in June 2011. There is concern that there will be a resurgence of violence surrounding the elections. The 226 villages that have remaining cases of Guinea worm disease experienced conflict between nomadic herders over access to grazing land and water. There is still a great deal of civil unrest and instability that must be addressed before eradication can be achieved. Despite the conflict, Sudan has made considerable progress. In 2001, the country had 49,471 cases of Guinea worm disease; as of December 2010 they have 1,549 cases (Hopkins, Ruiz-Tiben, Diallo, Withers, and Maguire, 2002: 417).
Conclusion

In the preceding comparison, the role of government and regime type in dictating the success or failure in public health programmes has been examined. Both Uganda and Sudan experienced similar conflicts yet Uganda successfully managed to eradicate Guinea worm disease while Sudan has been unable to. How the government reacts to conflict and addresses public health issues like Guinea worm disease is the crucial difference between Sudan and Uganda.

It has been argued that while other diseases like smallpox and polio which have shorter incubation periods can be eradicated during conflict, Sudan will not be able to successfully eradicated Guinea worm disease until the fighting has stopped (Hopkins and Withers, 2002). Uganda defies and invalidates the argument that conflict is an insurmountable roadblock. But the paired comparison does show that government and regime type is crucial and what is really necessary is a strong central government. Obviously, peaceful resolution to the conflict in Sudan would greatly improve any public health programme's chance of success but Uganda has proven that it is not a prerequisite.

Further research into the role of government regime in public health in conflict states is necessary. Broadening the public health programmes that are examined would strengthen and broaden the argument. For example, looking at Uganda's HIV/AIDS programme and how government commitment has contributed to its success would be interesting, especial when comparing it to successful programmes under different government regimes. Uganda's upfront, honest and aggressive HIV campaign seems to have become more restrained as Uganda has prioritised its relationship with the United States. Under the Bush Administration abstinence only HIV programmes were strongly
encouraged. In an effort to please the U.S. Museveni began pushing the abstinence only agenda instead of condom use, arguably resulting in the resent resurgence of HIV prevalence in Uganda. This case could show that hybrid regimes do not always pursue a course of action that is in the best interest of the people. Sometimes international relations and other motivations may win out.

A cross-comparison of Uganda and other hybrid regimes, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa would also be interesting and allow for exploration of a possible trend across hybrid regimes. Kagame's hybrid regime in Rwanda has made impressive accomplishments in public health despite the 1994 genocide and ongoing conflict with the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Uganda and Rwanda would make an interesting comparison.
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In this paper eradication is defined as "Eradication: Permanent reduction to zero of the worldwide incidence of infection caused by a specific agent as a result of deliberate efforts; intervention measures are no longer needed. Example: smallpox" (Dowdle 1999). This is the definition used by the World Health Organisation and US Center for Disease Control.

Smallpox and Rinderpest are the only two diseases that have been eradicated. Polio and Guinea Worm Disease are the next most likely diseases to be successfully eradicated. The Carter Center International Task Force for Disease Eradication has proposed eradication campaigns for measles, mumps, rubella, lymphatic filariasis and pork tapeworm.

Neglected tropical diseases are parasitic and bacterial infections that are the most common chronic and debilitating infections amongst the world's poorest people. Although these diseases are medically diverse, they are grouped together because they are all associated with poverty (Hotez et al., 2007:1018 WHO, 2010:iii). The World Health Organization's First Report on Neglected Tropical Diseases included seventeen diseases: Dengue Fever, Rabies, Trachoma, Buruli ulcer, Endemic Treponematoses (Yaws), Leprosy (Hansen Disease), Chagas Disease (American trypanosomiasis), Human African trypanosomiasis (Sleeping Sickness), Leishmaniasis, cysticercosis, Dracunculiasis (Guinea Worm Disease), echinococcosis, food borne trematode infections, lymphatic filariasis, ochocerciasis (River Blindness), schistosomiasis (bilharziasis) and soil transmitted helminthiases.

The following are the characteristics or common features of a NTD: disease that is a serious obstacle to socioeconomic development, impacts disenfranchised populations, do not travel easily, are disabling and lead to stigma and discrimination, impact morbidity and mortality rates, are neglected by research, can be controlled and prevented by strategic interventions (WHO 2010:5).

Water supplies can be treated by simply filtering water before it is used. Adult cyclopoids are over 1mm long and are easily filtered through ordinary cloth. Water supplies can also safely be treated with larvicide to kill the insect larvae before they mature.

In 1986, when the Carter Center took over leadership of the programme Guinea worm disease affected 3.5 million people in 20 countries. As of September 2010 there were 1,624 cases in only 4 endemic countries; Sudan (1,549 cases), Ghana (8 cases), Mali (49 cases), and Ethiopia (18 cases). Further reduction is expected with projected numbers of cases around 800 (Guinea Worm Wrap Up #201) by December of 2010. Several other African countries have had no cases for the past few years and are undergoing the certification process by the World Health Organization (WHO) to be declared free of the disease. Seven countries that were recently endemic have interrupted transmission: Burkina Faso, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Kenya, Niger, Nigeria, and Togo. Six countries were never or not recently endemic but do not have a certificate: Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Somalia and South Africa.

Guinea worm disease is most prevalent in poor rural populations due to the mode of transmission of the disease. The parasite spreads to humans who drink water from ponds or other stagnant water sources containing copepods or water fleas that host the parasite in its immature infectious stage. There are no known animal vectors for the disease.
After 10 to 14 months the mature female worm breaks through an ulcer in the skin, normally located on the lower leg. The emerging worm creates a burning sensation. To ease the pain people normally submerge their leg in water. If the ulcer comes in contact with water, thousands of tiny larvae will break through the blister like skin. These larvae will then be eaten by small cyclopoid crustaceans or copepods that foster the parasite. Then someone is infected with the parasite by drinking the water and the cycle begins again. The disease is prevalent in rural areas that don’t have adequate water treatment or medical facilities to monitor and evaluate the disease.

People who have been infected once do not become immune to the parasite. The infection lasts approximately one year but those infected with the disease are usually incapacitated for two to three months when the ulcer emerges. The worm has to be pulled out inch-by-inch over a month or longer. Given the cyclical nature of the parasite the periods of incapacitation often occur at the height of harvest time causing great socioeconomic burden. Half or more of an endemic village may be infected at one time. While Guinea worm disease is rarely fatal, it has serious adverse socio-economic implications and negatively impacts a person's overall quality of life.

6 The obvious health impact of conflict is the death and injury caused on the battlefield. But even after the fighting stops, conflict can have lasting consequences on health. War will be one of the top ten causes of disability adjusted life years by the year 2020. For every one armed combatant killed in conflict, one civilian is killed and fifteen civilians lose their lives due to loss of shelter, clean water or food. This does not include the number of people who are wounded, whether physically or psychologically (Yusuf, Anand, MacQueen, 1998: 1669).

Government bureaucracy breaks down during conflict making it difficult to fully or accurately record the full magnitude of war deaths, both military and civilian or the number of people missing or displaced (Murray, King, Lopez, Tomijima and Krug, 2002: 346). These casualties are considered to be the primary impacts that conflict has on public health. Given the complexity of simply measuring the number of deaths that occur in armed conflict, it is even more difficult to measure the long-term impacts that conflict has on health. Measuring the non-violent deaths caused by conflict due to insecurity, deprivation, disease and displacement is even more challenging to measure (Lacina and Gleditsch, 2005). There is no neat index to measure or calculate the long-term health impact of conflict.

While the primary impacts are important to consider, it is really the secondary impacts of conflict that has lasting impact on public health and can facilitate the spread of disease. Conflict causes population displacement, food shortages, damage to infrastructure like roads or sewage and the interruption or collapse of basic health services (Toole and Waldman, 1997). While it is hard to accurately measure the full impact of these secondary effects a new term has been coined to describe the phenomenon: complex emergency. A complex emergency is a situation that impacts a large civilian population and is usually involves a combination of war or civil strife, food shortages, and displacement with an end result of significant excess mortality (Toole and Waldman, 1997: 285). Some of the health infrastructure that may be negatively impacted by a complex emergency include physical healthcare structures like clinics and hospitals, the disruption
of vaccine or other preventative medicine programmes, supply shortages include medicines and staff, lack of surgical facilities. Preventative medical programmes like vaccination campaigns or child nutrition programmes are disrupted. This can be a result of military action or diversion of resources away from social services to fund the war efforts.

Disruption of food production and distribution also negatively impacts the quality of health of a community. Armed faction may seize food supplies or interrupt the delivery. Farmers may be unable to tend to their crops due to violence or they may be actively involved in the fighting. Irrigation systems may be damaged. Water supplies may be contaminated or pumps may be damaged.

One of the major factors impacting health in conflict is population displacement. All available data suggests that refugees and internally displaced persons have extremely high death rates (Toole and Waldman, 1997: 289). Deaths are attributed to diarrhoeal diseases, meningitis, measles and other infectious diseases. In many refugee situations, the majority of deaths are caused by only one or two communicable diseases that spread through the population due to malnutrition, poor sanitary conditions, and lack of preventative medicine like vaccines.

These broad, negative trends in public health in conflict situations make treatment and prevention programmes for disease like Guinea worm disease incredibly challenging. When basic needs are not being met, it is harder to address long-term preventative health programmes.

The first factor, the extent to which a population is exposed to conditions that increase risk of disease, disability and death, comes out of Toole's (1997) analysis of mortality rates amongst newly arrived refugees. Toole discovered that refugees have a five to twelve times greater risk of mortality. Studies by the World Bank also show that militants and civilians in conflict situations are more impacted by the HIV/AIDS epidemic and other infectious diseases (World Bank, 2003).

The second factor, financial and human resources available for addressing the health needs of a population, is developed out of the argument that civil wars reduce or retard economic growth and by extension, negatively affects the amount of financial resources that can be spent on health. Murdoch and Sandler (2002) argue that civil war has a severe impact on the economic growth of country in the first five years after the conflict ends. This restricts both the public and private financial resources that could be dedicated to health needs.

This leads into the third factor, which is that conflict reduces the level of resources that are actually allocated to public health. Reconstruction needs like rebuilding infrastructure and administrative capacity of various services like police and the judiciary service may lead to further neglect of public health. This is discussed extensively by a variety of scholars such as Adeola (1996), Ball (1988) and Mintz (1989).

The fourth and final factor was developed out of the argument that civil wars, in addition to negatively impacting the amount of resources given to public health, also negatively impact the ability to use resources effectively. For a further discussion of the negative impacts of conflict on health infrastructure see Endnote 6.

The referendum on independence of Southern Sudan was held on January 9-15, 2011. The Southern Sudan Referendum Committee released preliminary results of 98% in
favour of independence or "separation" and only 1% in favour of "unity". The formal declaration of independence is scheduled for July 9, 2011.

Since 2003 a separate conflict in Darfur, a region in the west of the country has led to approximately 400,000 deaths and over 2 million displaced people. The civil conflict is seen as a conflict between the Arab government and the non-Arab locals, particularly the Fur, Zaghawa and Masalit people. The United Nations and various human rights organisations have labelled the conflict ethnic cleansing or genocide. The United States Secretary of State public acknowledged that the conflict in Darfur was genocide in 2004. Sudan, Cuba, Iran and Syria are the only countries on the United States state sponsors of terrorism list.

11 Other African nations in the Coalition of the Willing included Rwanda, Angola, Eritrea and Ethiopia.

12 The President of the Uganda People's Congress (UPC), Olara Otunnu, was investigated by police for alleging that Museveni supported the LRA in a speech in Lira, Uganda in June 2010. The Sudanese government does support the LRA, partly in retaliation for Ugandan support of the SPLM/A. It has been proposed that Museveni funnels money to the LRA through the Sudanese government. These rumours where rife among academics, politicians, and civilians when I visited Northern Uganda in 2009.
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108th CONGRESS
2d Session
H. CON. RES. 467

Declaring genocide in Darfur, Sudan.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 24, 2004

Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WYNN, Ms. LEE, Ms. MAJETTE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WATT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Declaring genocide in Darfur, Sudan.

Whereas Article 1 of the 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide states that 'the contracting parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish';

Whereas Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide declares that 'in the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group';

Whereas Article 3 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide affirms that the 'following acts shall be punishable: (a) genocide; (b)
conspiracy to commit genocide; (c) direct and public incitement to commit genocide; (d) attempt to committed genocide; and (e) complicit in genocide';

Whereas in Darfur, Sudan, an estimated 30,000 innocent civilians have been brutally murdered, more than 130,000 people have been forced from their homes and have fled to neighboring Chad, and more than 1,000,000 people have been internally displaced; and

Whereas in March 2004 the United Nations Resident Humanitarian Coordinator stated: `[T]he war in Darfur started off in a small way last year but it has progressively gotten worse. A predominant feature of this is that the brunt is being borne by civilians. This includes vulnerable women and children . . . The violence in Darfur appears to be particularly directed at a specific group based on their ethnic identity and appears to be systemized.' Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress--

(1) declares that the atrocities unfolding in Darfur, Sudan, are genocide;
(2) reminds the international community, including the United States Government, of their international legal obligations, as affirmed in the 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide;
(3) urges the Bush Administration to call the atrocities being committed in Darfur, Sudan by its rightful name: `genocide';
(4) calls on the Bush Administration to lead an international effort to prevent genocide in Darfur, Sudan;
(5) urges the Bush Administration to seriously consider multilateral or even unilateral intervention to prevent genocide should the United Nations Security Council fail to act;
(6) demands that the Bush Administration impose targeted sanctions, including visa bans and the freezing of assets of the National Congress and affiliated business and individuals directly responsible for the atrocities in Darfur, Sudan; and
(7) calls on USAID to establish a Darfur Resettlement, Rehabilitation, and Reconstruction Fund so that those driven off their land may return and begin to rebuild their communities.

END

ICC Arrest Warrant Issued For Sudanese President Bashir

Press Statement
The United States is strongly committed to the pursuit of peace in Sudan and believes those who have committed atrocities should be held accountable for their crimes. We urge the Government of Sudan, armed rebel groups, and all other concerned parties to exercise restraint in responding to this development and to ensure the safety and security of vulnerable Sudanese populations, international civilians, and peacekeepers on the ground.

The United States will continue to support efforts to ease the suffering of the Sudanese people and to promote a just and durable peace. We remain committed to full implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) that brought an end to the conflict between North and South Sudan. We will also continue to support UN/AU Mediator Bassole’s efforts to achieve a permanent cessation of hostilities and a political settlement that will end the humanitarian crisis and bring lasting peace to Darfur.

Remarks on the Sudan Strategy

Remarks
Hillary Rodham Clinton  
   Secretary of State
Susan E. Rice  
Scott Gration  
   Special Envoy to Sudan
Washington, DC

October 19, 2009

SECRETARY CLINTON: Good morning. Good morning. Well, I’m very pleased to be joined today by our Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice and the President’s Special Envoy to Sudan General Scott Gration. And let me begin by saying that the
Sudan policy we are outlining today is the result of an intensive review across the United States Government that included the three of us, but many others as well. It reflects the Administration’s seriousness, sense of urgency, and collective agreement about how best to address the complex challenges that have prevented resolution of the crisis in Darfur and full implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

President Obama and I have discussed this issue over many months and most recently over this past weekend. The fate of the Sudanese people is profoundly important to him, to me, to Ambassador Rice, to General Gration, and to our nation. Sudan is the largest country in Africa, one that has been torn by myriad religious, tribal, ethnic, racial, and political divisions for most of its half century of independence. During the past decade, genocide in Darfur and protracted violence and conflict between the North and South have claimed more than two million lives, subjected civilians to unspeakable atrocities, and led to mass human suffering.

While the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the North and South in 2005 was a historic step forward, Sudan today is at a critical juncture – one that can lead to steady improvements in the lives of the Sudanese people or degenerate into more conflict and violence.

An unstable Sudan not only jeopardizes the future of the 40 million people there. It can also be an incubator of violence and instability in an already volatile region, it can provide a safe haven for international terrorists, and trigger another humanitarian catastrophe that Sudan, its neighbors, and the world cannot afford. All too often, efforts to bring peace and stability to Sudan have been undermined by factionalism, broken peace agreements and cease-fires, and the involvement of regional states affected by the crisis.

For these reasons and others, we are realistic about the hurdles to progress. Achieving peace and stability in Sudan will not be easy, nor is success guaranteed. But one thing is certain: The problems in Sudan cannot be ignored or willed away. Sitting on the sidelines is not an option. It is up to us, and our partners in the international community, to make a concerted and sustained effort to help bring lasting peace and stability to Sudan and avoid more of the conflict that has produced a vast sea of human misery and squandered the potential and security of a vital region of the world.

Now, my views on the genocide in Darfur are well known. I have been speaking out and acting on this issue for a number of years. And the President also has spoken out about the genocide that’s taking place in Darfur. But at this point, the focus must be on how we move forward, and on finding solutions. Even while the intensity of the violence has decreased since 2005, the people of Darfur continue to live in unconscionable and unacceptable conditions.

So our focus is on reversing the ongoing, dire human consequences of genocide by addressing the daily suffering in the refugee camps, protecting civilians from continuing violence, helping displaced persons return to their homes, ensuring that the militias are
disarmed, and improving conditions on the ground so that the people of Darfur can finally live in peace and security.

Our strategy has three principal objectives: First, an end to conflict, gross human rights abuses, war crimes, and genocide in Darfur; second, implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement that results in a united and peaceful Sudan after 2011, or an orderly path toward two separate and viable states at peace with each other; and third, a Sudan that does not provide a safe haven for terrorists.

In the past, the United States’s approach too often has focused narrowly on emerging crises. This is no longer the case. Our effort sets forth a comprehensive U.S. policy toward Sudan.

First, we view the crisis in Sudan as two-fold: The situation in Darfur remains unresolved after six years. And the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between North and South will be a flashpoint for renewed conflict if not fully implemented through viable national elections, a referendum of self-determination for the South, resolution of border disputes, and the willingness of the respective parties to live up to their agreements. So we are approaching two key issues – Darfur and the Comprehensive Peace Agreement – simultaneously and in tandem.

Second, we are looking to achieve results through broad engagement and frank dialogue. But words alone are not enough. Assessment of progress and decisions regarding incentives and disincentives will be based on verifiable changes in conditions on the ground. Backsliding by any party will be met with credible pressure in the form of disincentives leveraged by our government and our international partners.

Third, we will use our leadership globally to reconstitute, broaden, and strengthen the multilateral coalition that helped achieve the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, and we will work equally hard to translate international concern about Darfur into genuine international commitments.

Let me be clear: It is too late for talk, or idle promises, or delays over misperceptions and misunderstandings.

This crisis is both a responsibility and an opportunity for the international community to help steer Sudan along a path that can lead to stability and security for the people of Sudan, the region, and the world. It is also a responsibility and opportunity for the Sudanese people and their leaders to demonstrate their commitment to taking concrete steps toward durable peace. Anything short of that will destine Sudan to failure.

As I said earlier, this review has involved discussions among many members of the Administration, Congress, and outside experts. Now I’d like to call on Ambassador Rice and General Graption, both of whom have worked so hard on this issue, to offer their comments. Ambassador Rice, let me turn it over to you first.
AMBASSADOR RICE: Thank you very much, Madame Secretary. It’s an honor to be with you and with General Gration for this important announcement.

I’d like to begin by expressing our appreciation to Scott for the exceptional commitment, energy, and integrity he’s brought to this critical work as Special Envoy for Sudan. And on a more personal note, though Scott and I have long been friends, I want to thank him especially for being the only man ever to testify before the Senate that he loves me. (Laughter.) He did. (Laughter.)

SPECIAL ENVOY GRATION: I cleared it with my wife. (Laughter.)

SECRETARY CLINTON: Went through the clearance process. (Laughter.)

AMBASSADOR RICE: President Obama has repeatedly made clear that protecting civilians and forging lasting peace in Sudan is a top priority for his Administration. The President, like Secretary Clinton, has for many years been dedicated to ending the suffering and the genocide in Sudan. There was never any question that this deep commitment to improving the lives of the people of Sudan would be backed by a thoughtful and results-oriented strategy. I’m personally proud of the strategy that has emerged. It is the product of extensive deliberation, careful consideration of very complex challenges, and a lot of hard work by all of us on this stage and many others.

Let me underscore two core objectives of U.S. policy. First, as the Secretary said, to end the genocide that’s taking place in Darfur and to forge lasting peace for all Darfuris. And second, to support full and effective implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the North and the South. To meet these twin goals, the United States is prepared to work with all sides. We will employ calibrated incentives as appropriate and exert real pressure as needed on any party that fails to act to improve the lives of the people of Sudan. There will be no rewards for the status quo, no incentives without concrete and tangible progress. There will be significant consequences for parties that backslide or simply stand still. All parties will be held to account.

President Obama’s Sudan strategy is smart, tough, and balanced. It takes a clear view of history, which reminds us that for years, paths to peace have been littered with broken promises and unfulfilled commitments by the Government of Sudan. With both the lessons of the past and the opportunities of the future in mind, we embark on the challenging road ahead. Bringing about lasting peace and improving the lives of millions of people are daunting tasks. We understand the importance of effective and faithful implementation of our strategy, and we will use all elements of U.S. influence to transform our objectives into reality.

Let me conclude by underscoring this unrelenting truth. Too many lives have already been lost. Too many innocents have suffered immeasurably. Too much human dignity has been denied. Too much hatred has been sown. This painful reality drives the President’s commitment and our shared efforts to work to bring the Sudanese people the peace, security, and freedom they so deserve.
Thank you very much, and now, General Scott Gration.

**SPECIAL ENVOY GRATON:** Thank you. Madame Secretary, Ambassador Rice, it’s really an honor to be able to share this podium with you this morning. Secretary Clinton’s words are so very true. The challenges in Sudan are complex and serious. Success will require a unified approach, a renewed sense of urgency. The President’s Sudan strategy provides that approach, that resolve.

The strategy is comprehensive and integrated. It’s focused on fully implementing the Comprehensive Peace Agreement on achieving a broad and sustainable peace in Darfur. The strategy uses all elements of our nation’s influence – diplomacy, defense, development – to bring about a stability, a security, human rights, opportunities for a better future in Sudan. Our strategy aims to give the people of Sudan a country that is governed responsibly, justly, and democratically, a country that’s at peace with itself and with its neighbors. The United States Government is committed to creating an environment where the Sudanese people themselves can make positive changes for their future.

We’re acutely aware of the urgency of our task and the shortness of our timeline. We have only six months until Sudan’s national elections take place. The referendum on self-determination is only 15 months away. Success requires frank dialogue with all parties in Sudan, with the regional states and international community. We all must work together to get tangible results on the ground, to achieve a lasting peace, a better life for future generations of Sudanese. And we must not stop until our task is complete. The tragedies of Darfur, past and present, the threat of new violence in the South and North call for immediate action.

The people of Sudan have suffered terribly from the pain and loss that conflict brings, and millions continue to suffer today. It is for these people that we strive to produce verifiable progress on the ground. It’s for them that we’ll endeavor to generate positive change that they can experience. We have no option but to succeed. Working together, I believe we will. Thank you.

**SECRETARY CLINTON:** Thank you so much. Thank you, Scott and thank you, Susan, and the three of us would be willing and welcoming of your questions.

**MR. CROWLEY:** Jill.

**QUESTION:** Secretary Clinton, can you tell us, ultimately, what are these calibrated incentives and the real pressure that you can exert? And also could I ask, on Mr. Karzai, the word now is that he is refusing a runoff, there might be a prospect of the coalition government. What is the latest that you are hearing from him? And how is this going to affect this very important timing in moving forward on these election results?

**SECRETARY CLINTON:** Well, Jill, with respect to the second question, I would like to get back to you on that. We really would hope to stay focused on Sudan, because this
is such an important issue for so many people, and literally millions of people are kind of waiting to hear what we have to say on it. But I will certainly get back to you. I spent a lot of time over the last several days, as you know, working on this and I’d like to bring you and others up to date on that.

But let me just say with respect to Sudan, we have a very clear measure of whether or not the changes we are pursuing are being implemented, and that is whether conditions on the ground are changing and improving. We have a menu of incentives and disincentives, political and economic, that we will be looking to, to either further progress or to create a clear message that the progress we expect is not occurring. But we want to be somewhat careful in putting those out. They are part, in fact, of a classified annex to our strategy that we’re announcing the outline of today.

But suffice it to say, and let me underscore, that both incentives and disincentives based on changes in conditions are what we intend to employ going forward.

MR. CROWLEY: Mary Beth.

QUESTION: Thank you. Good morning, Secretary Clinton.

SECRETARY CLINTON: Good morning.

QUESTION: When President Obama was a candidate, he talked about imposing additional sanctions on Sudan to try to get them to move forward, and also discussed a no-fly zone. I’m wondering what has happened to those ideas that he put forth very forcefully.

And a second question, if I could, for General Gration. You’ve talked about the genocide as essentially being over. You’ve suggested taking Sudan off the terrorism list. I’m wondering, did you sort of lose out in this debate that’s occurred on Sudan?

SECRETARY CLINTON: Well, first, let me say that we don’t see winners and losers in this debate. We see collective agreement among many people with long and broad experience and concern about Sudan. And I’m very proud to be standing here with two of the principal architects of the strategy that we are rolling out today. So I think that – I know it’s kind of the typical sort of Washington back and forth, but I want to underscore how strongly we adhere to this new strategy. And the President, the principals, the deputies, all of the interagency process that hashed out this approach are fully on board in our going forward to implement it, and fully confident and supportive of Scott Gration’s work.

I think too that the sanctions issue is certainly part of our strategy. And I believe that the President’s commitment to sanctions as one of the tools that we have to employ in dealing with the leadership in Sudan is as important to our overall strategy today as it was yesterday and will be tomorrow. We want to take a hard look at these sanctions to make
sure they are producing the kind of changes in conditions that we’re looking for. But it is a tool, and it’s a tool that we have employed and we will continue to employ.

Scott, do you want to respond?

**SPECIAL ENVOY GRATION:** Sure. I just want to make sure everybody knows that I fully support this strategy, the comments that the Secretary and that Ambassador Rice have said. I will work diligently to implement the policies of this strategy. And we really have no option; people in Darfur continue to live in conditions that are dire and unacceptable. We must work every day to change those conditions on the ground. That’s what we’re committed to, that’s what the people deserve, and that’s what I will do.

**MR. CROWLEY:** Andy.

**QUESTION:** Yeah. Secretary Clinton, you mentioned that you’re – you will be judging this policy based on your assessment of whether or not things are changing on the ground. I’m wondering if you can give us a sense of how you’re going to make that judgment. On what information are you going to rely? The Ambassador spoke about backsliding and obfuscation on the part of the Khartoum Government in the past. How are we going to feel confident that we’re getting the right information going forward on what actually is happening on the ground?

**SECRETARY CLINTON:** Well – and I’ll let Susan add to this – but that’s why we are focused on outcomes and verifiable changes. There have been, as you rightly point out, lots of promises made, there have been white papers, there have been commissions. There have been all kinds of promises and agreements that have not been fulfilled. We’re looking past that. This is going to be a very results-oriented analysis that we’re engaged in. And there’s a lot of ways of measuring that.

And one of the reasons why Scott is spending so much time both in Sudan and the region is to enlist our international partners in helping us to measure the kind of progress that we all hope to see. The urgency, as he pointed out, is acute. The elections are coming up. The referendum is coming up. And there are many aspects of how we try to secure a credible, legitimate election, how we try to help the Sudanese, both South and North, prepare for the referendum.

In Darfur, we are looking to help unite a lot of the disparate groups so that there can be a stronger voice on the ground about what’s needed. Scott helped to negotiate a return of NGOs to help alleviate the suffering in the camps. I mean, there’s many different factors that have to be taken into account, but we’re way beyond just taking anybody at their word or their stated commitment. We want to see results that we can point to.

Susan, do you want to add?

**AMBASSADOR RICE:** I would just add that we have many different sources of information, more so than in the past. Obviously, we have a substantial American
presence throughout Sudan. Other partners have a presence as well. We now have two substantial United Nations forces on the ground that do a lot of observation and reporting and monitoring on violations, and so we received that information as well through the Security Council and other channels. And the human rights – the High Commissioner for Human Rights also has a person that will remain in the position of reporting on what occurs on the ground.

So we have many sources. We’re in contact with all the parties. And I have every confidence that our challenge will not be lack of information.

**QUESTION:** Yes. Secretary Clinton, Ambassador Rice, and Envoy Gration, all of you have mentioned that too many people have been suffering. And I think the sentence applied to nearly five million people living in the refugee camps. And I will get you back to a comment Secretary Powell one day said here, that the only thing these people need is to be sent home, and they know how to take care of themself.

It’s been more than five years now. The situation is dire. New kids are born there, no school, no healthcare. They all are divided and it’s very difficult to unite them as we are following your effort, Special Envoy Gration. And also the government in Sudan hasn’t produced any solution to this.

Don’t you think there is a sense of urgency to get these people back and secure their villages, and to get them back to their villages? And then, you wait to see when the political settlement will come to this, as we all – we don’t know when that will happen.

**SECRETARY CLINTON:** Well, certainly, we are well aware of the difficulty of our goals here to work on behalf of the people of Sudan for a better future, peace, and stability. And that is one of the reasons why this strategy clearly integrates our approach to Darfur and our approach on the North-South. These are two critically important aspects of the overall challenge that Sudan faces and they can’t be treated separate from one another. They have to be treated in this integrated approach that we are advocating. And we are, of course, doing all we can in our strategic approach to empower the people of Sudan to solve their own problems. That’s what the election is about, that’s what the referendum is about. But we are conscious of how difficult this will be. We don’t expect quick or easy solutions to these quite complex problems. But we are working to try to create the conditions on the ground that will lead to both better lives for individual Sudanese, but also a potential environment in which a political settlement of all of these various problems could be achieved.

Scott, do you want to add to that?

**SPECIAL ENVOY GRATION:** Sure. Security is the number one issue that we are facing that’s keeping people from going back. And we support the efforts of the Chad Government and the Sudanese Government to end the tensions on the border and to stop that proxy war. We’re working very closely with UNAMID to ensure that it gets the forces and the capability that it needs, and they can provide some security. We’re also
working with local forces to increase local security with the people of the camps themselves to try to improve security.

But we believe that we have to reach a position where the people can voluntarily return with their dignity and human rights, and live in security and stability. And until those conditions are met, we cannot have them go back. And so that’s what we’re trying to achieve. That’s what we’re working for in our efforts.

**MR. CROWLEY:** We have time for one more question. Charlie.

**QUESTION:** Madame Secretary, can you talk about international contacts that have already been made? And specifically, have you – how much have the Chinese signaled a willingness to help or not? And secondly, can you talk about any new monies that you’re going to commit to this? Are you going to do this with whatever presently is there?

**SECRETARY CLINTON:** Well, Charlie, I’ll have both Susan and Scott add to this. We have had intensive international outreach, both Susan at the UN, Scott in numerous meetings around the world, including one that he convened here in Washington, bringing together the international partners who have either already been involved or we wish to see more involved. During our meetings with the Chinese back in July, I raised it directly, seeking more support and a partnership that would result in some additional opportunities for us to influence the Sudanese Government.

So I’m going to ask Scott first to talk about what he’s been doing, because it’s extensive, and I’m not sure everybody knows, and then Susan to have the final word on the UN.

**SPECIAL ENVOY GRATION:** Thank you. We’ve worked in several venues to get international cooperation. We’ve put together a group, what we call the Envoy 6, and they include the envoys from the P-5 countries, plus the EU, and we meet regularly and exchange emails and VTCs. And that group has been very important. China and Russia, obviously, are part of that. And we continue to reach out to them on a consistent basis.

We also have a group called the contact group. It grew out of the donors. And we continue to meet with them not only to get the donations, but also to help us with policy and implementation issues. As you know, that – during the Nevasha discussions in 2005, the troika made up of the UK and Norway were very helpful. We’ve reconvened that group to help us not only with the implementation of the CPA, but also to help us as we work these negotiations on the sticky points like the census, the elections, and referendum.

So there’s a whole large group that includes EGAD countries, that includes neighbors, and it includes an international community that’s working very well together.

**QUESTION:** Well, I don’t doubt the willingness in the meetings, but how positive have the Chinese especially been in signaling a willingness to do what you want to do?
SPECIAL ENVOY GRATATION: The Chinese have been very helpful. If you look at their objectives in the region, they require stability and security. And so there’s a great overlap. And while we might have differences in some of the tactical issues, certainly strategically, we have the same goals. We’re working very closely together and the Chinese have been very helpful in providing influence and pressures not only to work the Darfur issue with the proxy war, but also working in the South.

SECRETARY CLINTON: Susan? Final word?

AMBASSADOR RICE: Thank you. I would just add that at the United Nations, we look at the situation in Darfur. And between the North and South, on a very regular basis, this is an issue that’s constantly almost every month on the Security Council agenda. We are now in a position where there’s a substantial presence on the ground of some close to 10,000 each of Darfur and the South. And that presence is very much engaged in the implementation of the very objectives that support the policy we outlined today.

So while we do differ on occasion with partners in the Security Council about tactics and the relative timing and nature of pressures versus incentives, this is something we will continue to work on with them. And as we pursue implementation of our strategy, obviously, the good work that Scott has done and continues to do to keep our partners with us is very important, and we will see it manifest in the United Nations.

SECRETARY CLINTON: Thank you all.

QUESTION: Is this new money, any new money here or --

SECRETARY CLINTON: I don’t know the answer to that, so I – let me get back to you, Charlie. I mean, I want to make sure that we don’t misstate things.

QUESTION: Okay.

AMBASSADOR RICE: Thank you all.

---

Congratulating Sudan on the Results of the Southern Sudan Referendum

Press Statement
Hillary Rodham Clinton
Secretary of State
Washington, DC

February 7, 2011
The United States congratulates the Government of Sudan on the announcement of the Southern Sudan referendum results. We congratulate northern and southern leaders for facilitating a peaceful and orderly vote, and now that the people of Southern Sudan have made this compelling statement, we commend the Government of Sudan for accepting its outcome.

We look forward to working with southern leaders as they undertake the tremendous amount of work to prepare for independence in July and ensure the creation of two viable states living alongside each other in peace. The Government of Southern Sudan must launch a process of inclusive governance and take steps to improve good governance and service delivery, as well as to adopt long-term security and economic arrangements with the North.

In line with the bilateral discussions held between the United States and the Government of Sudan, and in recognition of the success of the Southern Sudan referendum as a critical milestone of the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, the United States is initiating the process of withdrawing Sudan’s State Sponsor of Terrorism designation, the first step of which is initiating a review of that designation. Removal of the State Sponsor of Terrorism designation will take place if and when Sudan meets all criteria spelled out in U.S. law, including not supporting international terrorism for the preceding six months and providing assurance it will not support such acts in the future, and fully implements the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement, including reaching a political solution on Abyei and key post-referendum arrangements.

We urge both northern and southern leaders to continue to work together toward full implementation of the CPA, and urge them to work expediently to reach agreement on the post-referendum arrangements that will define their future and lead to a mutually beneficial relationship.
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H. CON. RES. 309

Condemning the forced abduction of Ugandan children and their use as soldiers.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

July 24, 1998

Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. Berman, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Lantos, and Mr. Hastings of Florida) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Condemning the forced abduction of Ugandan children and their use as soldiers.

Whereas the rebel Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) has abducted approximately 10,000 children, some as young as 8 years old, in northern Uganda to support its efforts to overthrow the Government of Uganda;

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in March 1998 condemned 'in the strongest terms' the LRA's child abductions;

Whereas children kidnapped by the LRA are forced to raid and loot villages, fight in the front lines against the Ugandan army, serve as sexual slaves to rebel commanders, and help kill other abducted children who try to escape;

Whereas the LRA, led by Joseph Kony, has continued to kill, torture, maim, rape, and abduct large numbers of civilians, virtually enslaving numerous children;

Whereas LRA child abductees serve as surrogates for Sudanese government forces against the south;

Whereas Sudanese government soldiers deliver food supplies, vehicles, ammunition, and arms to LRA base camps in government-controlled southern Sudan;

Whereas children who manage to escape from LRA captivity find their families displaced or deceased and have little access to rehabilitation programs, and in many instances their families are afraid for their children turned toy soldiers to return home;
Whereas children are conscripted, coaxed, or tricked into volunteering for the armed forces and are sometimes sold to armies and armed groups by impoverished families;

Whereas the United Nations has established, through the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, 18 as the minimum age for recruitment and participation of individuals in armed forces; and

Whereas the International Committee of the Red Cross, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, and the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights, as well as many nongovernmental organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, also support the establishment of 18 as the minimum age for military recruitment and participation in armed conflict: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives--
(1) condemns the abduction of children by the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) in northern Uganda and calls for the immediate release of all LRA child captives;
(2) urges Olara Otunnu, the recently appointed United Nations Special Representative on Children and Armed Conflict, to take appropriate measures to resolve the LRA problem;
(3) encourages the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child to investigate the situation in northern Uganda;
(4) calls on the Al-Bashir government to cease supporting the LRA in the abductions and kidnapping of children in Northern Uganda;
(5) calls on the President and the Secretary of State to support efforts to end the abduction of children by the LRA and obtain their release;
(6) asks the President to provide more support to United Nations agencies and nongovernmental organizations working to rehabilitate former child soldiers and reintegrate them into society; and
(7) encourages the President to appoint a Special Humanitarian Envoy for Sudan.

One Hundred Eighth Congress
of the
United States of America
AT THE SECOND SESSION

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday,
the twentieth day of January, two thousand and four

An Act
To require a report on the conflict in Uganda, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the `Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act'.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.
Congress makes the following findings:
(1) The United States and the Republic of Uganda enjoy a strong bilateral relationship and continue to work closely together in fighting the human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (`HIV/AIDS') pandemic and combating international terrorism.
(2) For more than 17 years, the Government of Uganda has been engaged in a conflict with the Lord's Resistance Army that has inflicted hardship and suffering on the people of northern and eastern Uganda.
(3) The members of the Lord's Resistance Army have used brutal tactics during this conflict, including abducting and forcing individuals into sexual servitude, and forcing a large number of children, estimated to be between 16,000 and 26,000 children, in Uganda to serve in such Army's military forces.
(4) The Secretary of State has designated the Lord's Resistance Army as a terrorist organization and placed the Lord's Resistance Army on the Terrorist Exclusion list pursuant to section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)).
(5) According to Human Rights Watch, since the mid-1990s the only known sponsor of the Lord's Resistance Army has been the Government of Sudan, though such Government denies providing assistance to the Lord's Resistance Army.
(6) More than 1,000,000 people have been displaced from their homes in Uganda as a result of the conflict.
(7) The conflict has resulted in a lack of security for the people of Uganda, and as a result of such lack, each night more than 18,000 children leave their homes and flee to the relative safety of town centers, creating a massive `night commuter' phenomenon that leaves already vulnerable children subject to exploitation and abuse.
(8) Individuals who have been displaced by the conflict in Uganda often suffer from acute malnutrition and the mortality rate for children in northern Uganda who have been displaced is very high.
(9) In the latter part of 2003, humanitarian and human rights organizations operating in northern Uganda reported an increase in violence directed at their efforts and at civilians, including a sharp increase in child abductions.
(10) The Government of Uganda's military efforts to resolve this conflict, including the arming and training of local militia forces, have not ensured the security of civilian populations in the region to date.

(11) The continued instability and lack of security in Uganda has severely hindered the ability of any organization or governmental entity to deliver regular humanitarian assistance and services to individuals who have been displaced or otherwise negatively affected by the conflict.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should--

(1) work vigorously to support ongoing efforts to explore the prospects for a peaceful resolution of the conflict in northern and eastern Uganda;

(2) work with the Government of Uganda and the international community to make available sufficient resources to meet the immediate relief and development needs of the towns and cities in Uganda that are supporting large numbers of people who have been displaced by the conflict;

(3) urge the Government of Uganda and the international community to assume greater responsibility for the protection of civilians and economic development in regions in Uganda affected by the conflict, and to place a high priority on providing security, economic development, and humanitarian assistance to the people of Uganda;

(4) work with the international community, the Government of Uganda, and civil society in northern and eastern Uganda to develop a plan whereby those now displaced may return to their homes or to other locations where they may become economically productive;

(5) urge the leaders and members of the Lord's Resistance Army to stop the abduction of children, and urge all armed forces in Uganda to stop the use of child soldiers, and seek the release of all individuals who have been abducted;

(6) make available increased resources for assistance to individuals who were abducted during the conflict, child soldiers, and other children affected by the conflict;

(7) work with the Government of Uganda, other countries, and international organizations to ensure that sufficient resources and technical support are devoted to the demobilization and reintegration of rebel combatants and abductees forced by their captors to serve in non-combatant support roles;

(8) cooperate with the international community to support civil society organizations and leaders in Uganda, including Acholi religious leaders, who are working toward a just and lasting resolution to the conflict;

(9) urge the Government of Uganda to improve the professionalism of Ugandan military personnel currently stationed in northern and eastern Uganda, with an emphasis on respect for human rights, accountability for abuses, and effective civilian protection;

(10) work with the international community to assist institutions of civil society in Uganda to increase the capacity of such institutions to monitor
the human rights situation in northern Uganda and to raise awareness of abuses of human rights that occur in that area;
(11) urge the Government of Uganda to permit international human rights monitors to establish a presence in northern and eastern Uganda;
(12) monitor the creation of civilian militia forces in northern and eastern Uganda and publicize any concerns regarding the recruitment of children into such forces or the potential that the establishment of such forces will invite increased targeting of civilians in the conflict or exacerbate ethnic tension and violence; and
(13) make clear that the relationship between the Government of Sudan and the Government of the United States cannot improve unless no credible evidence indicates that authorities of the Government of Sudan are complicit in efforts to provide weapons or other support to the Lord's Resistance Army.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

(a) REQUIREMENTS- Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the conflict in Uganda.
(b) CONTENT- The report required by subsection (a) shall include a description of the following:
(1) The individuals or entities that are providing financial and material support for the Lord's Resistance Army, including a description of any such support provided by the Government of Sudan or by senior officials of such Government.
(2) The activities of the Lord's Resistance Army that create obstacles that prohibit the provision of humanitarian assistance or the protection of the civilian population in Uganda.
(3) The practices employed by the Ugandan People's Defense Forces in northern and eastern Uganda to ensure that children and civilians are protected, that civilian complaints are addressed, and that any member of the armed forces that abuses a civilian is held accountable for such abuse.
(4) The actions carried out by the Government of the United States, the Government of Uganda, or the international community to protect civilians, especially women and children, who have been displaced by the conflict in Uganda, including women and children that leave their homes and flee to cities and towns at night in search of security from sexual exploitation and gender-based violence.
(c) FORM OF REPORT- The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.
(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED- In this section, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Vice President of the United States and
President of the Senate.

109th CONGRESS
2d Session
S. RES. 573

Calling on the United States Government and the international community to support the successful transition from conflict to sustainable peace in Uganda

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

September 19, 2006

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to

RESOLUTION

Calling on the United States Government and the international community to support the successful transition from conflict to sustainable peace in Uganda.

Whereas, for nearly 2 decades, the Government of Uganda has been engaged in a conflict with the Lord's Resistance Army (referred to in this preamble as the 'LRA') that has resulted in--

(1) the deaths of approximately 200,000 individuals from violence and disease; and

(2) the displacement of more than 1,600,000 individuals from the northern and eastern regions of Uganda;

Whereas more than half of those internally-displaced individuals are under the age of 15, and 95 percent of those individuals live in absolute poverty in camps where they face malnutrition, high rates of AIDS and malaria, and egregious abuses of their human rights;

Whereas the LRA has used brutal tactics during that conflict, including the abduction and abuse of more than 25,000 children who the organization forces to attack, rape, and murder members of their families and communities on behalf of the LRA;
Whereas continued instability and a lack of security in the northern region of Uganda has severely hindered the delivery of sufficient humanitarian assistance and services to individuals who have been displaced or otherwise negatively affected by that conflict;

Whereas spillover from the war in the northern region of Uganda have had negative consequences in the neighboring countries of Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Whereas a successful transition to sustainable peace in the northern region of Uganda and throughout the country will depend in large part on a coordinated and comprehensive effort by the Government of Uganda, regional partners, and the international community to create new social, economic, and political opportunities for the citizens of Uganda who are affected by that conflict;

Whereas a sustainable political resolution to that conflict must include a range of locally and nationally driven reconciliation efforts that will require the endorsement and involvement of all parties to the conflict, as well as support from the international community;

Whereas the 2005 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, published by the Department of State, relating to the Government of Uganda indicated that the ‘security forces committed unlawful killings...and were responsible for deaths as a result of torture' along with other ‘serious problems', including repression of political opposition, official impunity, and violence against women and children;

Whereas, in the Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act (Public Law 108-283; 118 Stat. 912), the Senate--

(1) declared its support for a peaceful resolution of the conflict in the northern and eastern regions of Uganda ; and

(2) called for the United States and the international community to assist in rehabilitation, reconstruction, and demobilization efforts; and

Whereas the cessation of hostilities agreement, that was mediated by the Government of Southern Sudan and signed by representatives of the Government of Uganda and the LRA on August 20, 2006--

(1) required both parties to cease all hostile military and media offensives; and

(2) asked the Sudanese People's Liberation Army to facilitate the safe assembly of LRA fighters in designated areas for the duration of the peace talks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate--
(1) commends the delegates from the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army for agreeing to a cessation of hostilities for the first time in the 20 years of that devastating conflict;
(2) recognizes the leadership role that the Government of Southern Sudan played in mediating that cessation of hostilities and establishing a framework within which a lasting peace to that conflict could be achieved;
(3) emphasizes the importance of a complete implementation of the cessation of hostilities agreement by all parties to maintain progress towards a permanent resolution of that conflict;
(4) expresses the support of the citizens of the United States for the people of Uganda who have endured decades of violence as a result of that conflict;
(5) entreats all parties to address issues of accountability and impunity for war crimes and crimes against humanity, and to support broader national reconciliation efforts;
(6) strongly encourages the Government of Uganda to improve the professionalism of Ugandan military personnel currently stationed in the northern and eastern regions of Uganda, with an emphasis on enhancing respect for human rights, accountability for abuses, and effective protection of civilians;
(7) urges the Government of Uganda to follow through and augment its resettlement plan by--
   (A) expanding social services;
   (B) deploying professional civil servants; and
   (C) developing the legal, political, and security infrastructure--
      (i) necessary to facilitate the freedom of movement of civilians to their homes, land, and areas within and around camps; and
      (ii) essential to fulfill the needs of returnees and former combatants; and
(8) calls on the United States Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, as well as the international community--
   (A) to provide adequate and coordinated humanitarian assistance through nongovernmental organizations to the individuals and areas most affected by that conflict;
   (B) to, while providing humanitarian assistance, pay particular attention to women and children who have been victimized; and
   (C) to provide--
      (i) sufficient technical assistance for the demobilization and reintegration of rebel combatants and abductees;
      (ii) both financial and technical support for reconciliation and reconstruction efforts; and
      (iii) diplomatic and logistical support for the cessation of hostilities agreement and subsequent progress towards a sustainable peace in Uganda.
S.CON.RES.16 -- Calling on the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda and to recommence vital peace talks,... (Referred in House - RFH)

SCON 16 RFH

110th CONGRESS
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S. CON. RES. 16
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 6, 2007

Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Calling on the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda and to recommence vital peace talks, and urging immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community.

Whereas for nearly two decades, the Government of Uganda has been engaged in an armed conflict with the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) that has resulted in up to 200,000 deaths from violence and disease and the displacement of more than 1,600,000 civilians from eastern and northern Uganda.

Whereas former United Nations Undersecretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator Jan Egeland has called the crisis in northern Uganda `the biggest forgotten, neglected humanitarian emergency in the world today';

Whereas Joseph Kony, the leader of the LRA, and several of his associates have been indicted by the International Criminal Court for war crimes and crimes against humanity, including rape, murder, enslavement, sexual enslavement, and the forced recruitment of an estimated 66,000 children;

Whereas the LRA is a severe and repeat violator of human rights and has continued to attack civilians and humanitarian aid workers despite a succession of ceasefire agreements;

Whereas the Secretary of State has labeled the LRA `vicious and cult-like' and designates it as a terrorist organization;
Whereas the 2005 Department of State report on the human rights record of the Government of Uganda found that 'security forces committed unlawful killings... and were responsible for deaths as a result of torture' along with other 'serious problems,' including repression of political opposition, official impunity, and violence against women and children;

Whereas, in the 2004 Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act (Public Law 108-283; 118 Stat. 912), Congress declared its support for a peaceful resolution of the conflict in northern and eastern Uganda and called for the United States and the international community to assist in rehabilitation, reconstruction, and demobilization efforts;

Whereas the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement, which was mediated by the Government of Southern Sudan and signed by representatives of the Government of Uganda and the LRA on August 20, 2006, and extended on November 1, 2006, requires both parties to cease all hostile military and media offensives and asks the Sudan People's Liberation Army to facilitate the safe assembly of LRA fighters in designated areas for the duration of the peace talks;

Whereas the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement is set to expire on February 28, 2007, and although both parties to the agreement have indicated that they are willing to continue with the peace talks, no date has been set for resumption of the talks, and recent reports have suggested that both rebel and Government forces are preparing to return to war;

Whereas a return to civil war would yield disastrous results for the people of northern Uganda and for regional stability, while peace in Uganda will bolster the fragile Comprehensive Peace Agreement in Sudan and de-escalate tensions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Whereas continuing violence and instability obstruct the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the people of northern Uganda and impede national and regional trade, development and democratization efforts, and counter-terrorism initiatives; and

Whereas the Senate unanimously passed Senate Resolution 366, 109th Congress, agreed to February 6, 2006, and Senate Resolution 573, 109th Congress, agreed to September 19, 2006, calling on Uganda, Sudan, the United States, and the international community to bring justice and provide humanitarian assistance to northern Uganda and to support the successful transition from conflict to sustainable peace, while the House of Representatives has not yet considered comparable legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress--

(1) disapproves of the LRA leadership's inconsistent commitment to resolving the conflict in Uganda peacefully;
(2) urges the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) and the Government of Uganda to return to negotiations in order to extend and expand upon the
existing ceasefire and to recommit to pursuing a political solution to this conflict;
(3) entreats all parties in the region to immediately cease human rights violations and address, within the context of a broader national reconciliation process in Uganda, issues of accountability and impunity for those crimes against humanity already committed;
(4) presses leaders on both sides of the conflict in Uganda to renounce any intentions and halt any preparations to resume violence and to ensure that this message is clearly conveyed to armed elements under their control; and
(5) calls on the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other similar governmental agencies and nongovernmental organizations within the international community to continue and augment efforts to alleviate the humanitarian crisis in northern Uganda and to support a peaceful resolution to this crisis by publicly and forcefully reiterating the preceding demands.

Passed the Senate March 1, 2007.

Attest:

NANCY ERICKSON,
Secretary.

H.CON.RES.80 -- Calling on the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda by engaging in good-faith negotiations,... (Referred in Senate - RFS)
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H. CON. RES. 80
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
June 19, 2007

Received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
Calling on the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda by engaging in good-faith negotiations, and urging immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community.

Whereas for over two decades, the Government of Uganda has been engaged in an armed conflict with the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) that has resulted in up to 200,000 deaths from violence and disease and the displacement of more than 1,600,000 civilians from eastern and northern Uganda;

Whereas former United Nations Undersecretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator Jan Egeland called the crisis in northern Uganda `the biggest forgotten, neglected humanitarian emergency in the world today';

Whereas Joseph Kony, the leader of the LRA, and several of his associates have been indicted by the International Criminal Court for war crimes and crimes against humanity, including rape, murder, enslavement, sexual enslavement, and the forced recruitment of an estimated 66,000 children;

Whereas the LRA is a severe and repeat violator of human rights and has continued to attack civilians and humanitarian aid workers despite a succession of ceasefire agreements;

Whereas the Secretary of State has labeled the LRA `vicious and cult-like' and designates it as a terrorist organization under the Immigration and Nationality Act;

Whereas the 2006 Department of State report on the human rights record of the Government of Uganda found that `security forces committed unlawful killings. . . and were responsible for deaths as a result of torture' along with other `serious problems', including repression of political opposition, official impunity, and violence against women and children;

Whereas in the 2004 Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act (Public Law 108-283; 118 Stat. 912), Congress declared its support for a peaceful resolution of the conflict in northern and eastern Uganda and called for the United States and the international community to assist in rehabilitation, reconstruction, and demobilization efforts;

Whereas the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement, which was mediated by the Government of Southern Sudan and signed by representatives of the Government of Uganda and the LRA on August 20, 2006, and extended on November 1, 2006, requires both parties to cease all hostile military and media offensives and asks the Sudan People's Liberation Army to facilitate the safe assembly of LRA fighters in designated areas for the duration of the peace talks;

Whereas the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement expired on February 28, 2007, without ever having been fully implemented, and though the parties resumed peace talks on April
26, 2007, and signed a preliminary agreement on May 2, 2007, they have not yet arrived at a sustainable negotiated settlement and observers remain concerned that hostilities between rebel and government forces could resume;

Whereas a return to civil war would yield disastrous results for the people of northern Uganda and for regional stability, while peace in Uganda will bolster the fragile Comprehensive Peace Agreement in Sudan and de-escalate tensions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and

Whereas continuing violence and instability obstruct the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the people of northern Uganda and impede national and regional trade, development and democratization efforts, and counter-terrorism initiatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress--

(1) disapproves of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) leadership's inconsistent commitment to resolving the conflict in Uganda peacefully;
(2) urges the LRA and the Government of Uganda to engage in good-faith negotiations to pursue a political solution to this conflict;
(3) encourages all parties in the region to immediately cease human rights violations and address, within the context of a broader national reconciliation process in Uganda, issues of accountability and impunity for those crimes against humanity already committed;
(4) urges leaders on both sides of the conflict in Uganda to renounce any intentions and halt any preparations to resume violence and to ensure that this message is clearly conveyed to armed elements under their control; and
(5) calls on the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other similar governmental agencies and nongovernmental organizations within the international community to continue to augment efforts to alleviate the humanitarian crisis in northern Uganda and to support a peaceful resolution to this crisis by publicly and forcefully reiterating the preceding demands.

Passed the House of Representatives June 18, 2007.

Attest:

LORRAINE C. MILLER,

Clerk.
To support stabilization and lasting peace in northern Uganda and areas affected by the Lord's Resistance Army through development of a regional strategy to support multilateral efforts to successfully protect civilians and eliminate the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army and to authorize funds for humanitarian relief and reconstruction, reconciliation, and transitional justice, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 19, 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

A BILL

To support stabilization and lasting peace in northern Uganda and areas affected by the Lord's Resistance Army through development of a regional strategy to support multilateral efforts to successfully protect civilians and eliminate the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army and to authorize funds for humanitarian relief and reconstruction, reconciliation, and transitional justice, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the `Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009'.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) For over 2 decades, the Government of Uganda engaged in an armed conflict with the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) in northern Uganda that led to the internal displacement of more than 2,000,000 Ugandans from their homes.

(2) The members of the Lord's Resistance Army used brutal tactics in northern Uganda, including mutilating, abducting, and forcing individuals into sexual servitude and forcing a large number of children and youth in Uganda, estimated by the Survey for War Affected Youth to be over 66,000, to fight as part of the rebel force.

(3) The Secretary of State has designated the Lord's Resistance Army as a terrorist organization and placed the Lord's Resistance Army on the
Terrorist Exclusion list pursuant to section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)).

(4) In late 2005, according to the United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the Lord's Resistance Army shifted their primary base of operations from southern Sudan to northeastern Democratic Republic of Congo, and the rebels have since withdrawn from northern Uganda.


(6) After nearly 2 years of negotiations, representatives from the parties reached the Final Peace Agreement in April 2008, but Joseph Kony, the leader of the Lord's Resistance Army, refused to sign the Final Peace Agreement in May 2008 and his forces launched new attacks in northeastern Congo.

(7) According to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Relief, the new activity of the Lord's Resistance Army in northeastern Congo and southern Sudan since September 2008 has led to the abduction of at least 711 civilians, including 540 children, and the displacement of more than 160,000 people.

(8) In December 2008, the military forces of Uganda, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and southern Sudan launched a joint operation against the Lord's Resistance Army's bases in northeastern Congo, but the operation failed to apprehend Joseph Kony, and his forces retaliated with a series of new attacks and massacres in Congo and southern Sudan, killing an estimated 900 people in 2 months.

(9) The escalated activity of the Lord's Resistance Army over recent months and the inability of military operations to stop them or protect civilians has perpetuated fears amongst communities in northern Uganda that the rebels could cross back into Uganda in the future, which complicates ongoing recovery efforts.

(10) Despite the refusal of Joseph Kony to sign the Final Peace Agreement, the Government of Uganda has committed to continue reconstruction plans for northern Uganda, and to implement those mechanisms of the Final Peace Agreement not conditional on the compliance of the Lord's Resistance Army.

(11) Since April 2008, recovery efforts in northern Uganda have moved forward with the financial support of the United States and other donors, but have been hampered by a lack of strategic coordination, logistical delays, and limited capacity of the Government of Uganda.

(12) Continued economic disparities between northern Uganda and the rest of the country and a failure to take meaningful steps toward
reconciliation and accountability, if unchanged, risk perpetuating longstanding political grievances and fueling new conflicts.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to work vigorously for a lasting resolution to the conflict in northern and eastern Uganda and other affected areas by--

(1) eliminating the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army to civilians and regional stability through political, economic, military, and intelligence support for a comprehensive multilateral effort to protect civilians in affected areas, to apprehend or otherwise remove Joseph Kony and his top commanders from the battlefield, and to disarm and demobilize Lord's Resistance Army fighters; and

(2) further supporting comprehensive reconstruction, transitional justice, and reconciliation efforts as affirmed in the Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-283) and subsequent resolutions, including Senate Resolution 366, 109th Congress, agreed to February 2, 2006, Senate Resolution 573, 109th Congress, agreed to September 19, 2006, Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, 110th Congress, agreed to in the Senate March 1, 2007, and House Concurrent Resolution 80, 110th Congress, agreed to in the House of Representatives June 18, 2007.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT OF A REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR DISARMING THE LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY.

(a) Requirement for Strategy- Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a regional strategy to guide United States support for multilateral efforts to protect civilians from attacks by the Lord's Resistance Army, to eliminate the threat to civilians and regional stability posed by the Lord's Resistance Army, and to enforce the rule of law and ensure full humanitarian access in LRA-affected areas.

(b) Content of Strategy- The strategy should include the following:

(1) A viable plan to protect civilians from attacks by the Lord's Resistance Army and eliminate the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army, while building institutions in the affected areas that can help to maintain the rule of law and prevent conflict in the long term.

(2) An interagency framework to plan, coordinate, and execute all diplomatic economic, intelligence, and military elements of United States policy across the region regarding the Lord's Resistance Army.

(3) A description of the type and form of diplomatic engagement to work with regional mechanisms, including the Tripartite Plus Commission and the Great Lakes Pact, and to coordinate the implementation of United States policy toward the Lord's Resistance Army across the region.

(4) A description of how this engagement will fit within the context of broader efforts and policy objectives in the Great Lakes Region.
(5) A framework to evaluate the progress and effectiveness of the United States strategy toward eliminating the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army.

(c) Form- The strategy under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 5. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR AREAS OUTSIDE UGANDA AFFECTED BY THE LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY.

(a) Authority- In accordance with section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2292) and section 2 of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (22 U.S.C. 2601), the President is authorized to provide assistance to respond to the humanitarian needs of populations in northeastern Congo, southern Sudan, and Central African Republic affected by the activity of the Lord's Resistance Army.

(b) Authorization of Appropriations- There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2010 to carry out this section.

SEC. 6. ASSISTANCE FOR RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION IN NORTHERN UGANDA.

(a) Authority- It is the sense of Congress that the President should support efforts by the people of northern Uganda and the Government of Uganda-

(1) to assist internally displaced people in transition and returnees to secure durable solutions by spurring economic revitalization, supporting livelihoods, helping to alleviate poverty, and advancing access to basic services at return sites, specifically clean water, health care, and schools;

(2) to enhance the accountability and administrative competency of local governance institutions and public agencies in northern Uganda with regard to budget management, provision of public goods and services, and related oversight functions;

(3) to strengthen the operational capacity of the civilian police in northern Uganda to enhance public safety, prevent crime, and deal sensitively with gender-based violence, while strengthening accountability measures to prevent corruption and abuses;

(4) to rebuild and improve the capacity of the justice system in northern Uganda, including the courts and penal systems, with particular sensitivity to the needs and rights of women and children;

(5) to establish mechanisms for the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of former combatants, including vocational education and employment opportunities; and

(6) to promote programs to address psychosocial trauma, particularly post-traumatic stress disorder.

(b) Future Year Funding- It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State and Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development should work with the appropriate committees of Congress to increase assistance in future fiscal years to support activities described in this section if the Government of Uganda demonstrates a commitment to transparent and
accountable reconstruction in war-affected areas of northern and eastern Uganda, specifically by--

(1) finalizing the establishment of mechanisms within the Office of the Prime Minister to sufficiently manage and coordinate the programs under the framework of the Peace Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda (PRDP);

(2) increasing oversight activities and reporting to ensure funds under the Peace Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda framework are used efficiently and with minimal waste; and

(3) committing substantial funds of its own, above and beyond standard budget allocations to local governments, to the task of implementing the Peace Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda such that communities affected by the war can recover.

(c) Coordination With Other Donor Nations- The United States should work with other donor nations, on a bilateral and multilateral basis, to increase contributions for recovery efforts in northern Uganda and strengthen accountability mechanisms to ensure the transparent and timely use of those funds.

(d) Termination of Assistance- It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should withhold bilateral assistance to the Republic of Uganda for the purposes described under this section if the Secretary determines that the Government of Uganda is not committed to transparent and accountable reconstruction and reconciliation in the war-affected areas of northern and eastern Uganda.

SEC. 7. ASSISTANCE FOR RECONCILIATION AND TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE IN NORTHERN UGANDA.

(a) Sense of Congress- It is the sense of Congress that the President should support efforts by the people of northern Uganda and the Government of Uganda to advance efforts to promote transitional justice and reconciliation on both local and national levels, including to implement the following mechanisms outlined in the Annexure to the Agreement on Accountability and Reconciliation between the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army/Movement, signed at Juba February 19, 2008, namely--

(1) a body to investigate the history of the conflict, inquire into human rights violations committed during the conflict by all sides, promote truth-telling in communities, and encourage the preservation of the memory of events and victims of the conflict through memorials, archives, commemorations, and other forms of preservation;

(2) a special division of the High Court of Uganda to try individuals alleged to have committed serious crimes during the conflict, and a special unit to carry out investigations and prosecutions in support of trials;

(3) a system for making reparations to victims of the conflict; and

(4) a review and strategy for supporting transitional justice mechanisms in affected areas to promote reconciliation and encourage individuals to take personal responsibility for their conduct during the war.
(b) Authorization of Appropriations- There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2012 to carry out this section.

SEC. 8. REPORT.

(a) Report Required- Not later than 1 year after the submission of the strategy required under section 4, the Secretary of State shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the progress made toward the implementation of the strategy required under section 4 and a description and evaluation of the assistance provided under this Act toward the policy objectives described in section 3.

(b) Contents- The report required under section (a) shall include--

(1) a description and evaluation of actions taken toward the implementation of the strategy required under section 4;
(2) a description of assistance provided under section 5 and section 6;
(3) an evaluation of bilateral assistance provided to the Republic of Uganda and associated programs in light of stated policy objectives;
(4) a description of the status of the Peace Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda and the progress of the Government of Uganda to take the steps outlined in section 6(b); and
(5) a description of amounts of assistance committed, and amounts provided, to northern Uganda during the reporting period by the Government of Uganda, each donor country, and all relevant organizations.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS- The term 'appropriate committees of Congress' means the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.
(2) GREAT LAKES REGION- The term 'Great Lakes Region' means the region comprising Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, southern Sudan, and Uganda.
(3) LRA-AFFECTED AREAS- The term 'LRA-affected areas' means the territory affected by the activity of the Lord's Resistance Army in the past and as of the date of the enactment of this Act, comprising all or parts of northern Uganda, southern Sudan, northeastern Democratic Republic of Congo, and southeastern Central African Republic.