Madam Speaker, I have one issue that brings me to the

floor tonight and that I hope to get to in a moment. As I listened, however, to

my colleagues, it does come to mind that there would undoubtedly be a new

vision for America if the ticket that

they were extolling the virtues of actually becomes the leadership of the

country as President and Vice President. It is true that there would be a

difference in the way we look at life,

the way we look at government in particular. It is certainly true that for

those people who believe that the government is the primary focus of all of

our activity and strength as a Nation, those people who believe that taxation

can be euphemistically described as investment; those people who believe

that the Constitution is really nothing

more than a document that deserves to

be interpreted, restructured, and changed by courts and judges; those

people who believe that America’s best

days are behind us, those folks will indeed be happy if, in fact, the Kerry-Edwards ticket prevails.

Good men, I think, all good men are running for the office of President and

Vice President of the United States.

Certainly good things can be said about

all. But it is undeniably true that we

can also talk about the fact that incredible differences exist between the

ways in which these people view their

responsibilities as chief executive, as

Commander in Chief; the way they look at the role of the United States in

the world. One sees the United States

as being subservient in many ways to international bodies, world courts,

United Nations, other international organizations that I believe Senator

KERRY and Senator EDWARDS think

should have priority in terms of deciding how America actually goes about

its business and determines its own policies.

Or President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, who recognize that although

interaction with the world community

is important, America must be strong

enough and resilient enough to actually establish its own set of goals and

purposes, and then act to achieve

them, hopefully with the agreement of

a large part of the world community; but even if that agreement were not to

be reached, to understand that our

goals may be unique to us, and that,

therefore, we may have the responsibility of trying to achieve them, even by ourselves.

So there are certainly differences,

undeniably true. That is the one thing with which I can totally agree with

what our colleagues on the other side were talking about for the last hour,

the differences that exist. But I believe

that when the final tally is made, that

most Americans will decide that the

person who will decide who, for instance, is on the Supreme Court of the

United States and will be making laws,

interpreting laws for the next generation or two, because that is really how

much of an effect it will eventually

have if two or three members of that

Supreme Court have to be, or actually end up being, changed.

And when people think about the fact

that we are in a war that does threaten

our very existence, even if it is not described on the front pages every day as

a war between armies and one moving

and advancing, but one retreating, but

nevertheless an understanding that we are in a clash of civilizations; when one

thinks about these things, one will come to the conclusion that it is better

to have people in charge who think

about the Constitution as strict constructionists do, that it is a document

to be adhered to because it was divinely inspired. They will think about

the fact that those folks who they want

making a decision about their national security are people who are desirous of

having the support of the international

community, but not willing to be subservient to it; and, I think, of course,

they will come to the conclusion that

they will keep the President, the

present President and Vice President on for the next 4 years.

But that really was not the main purpose of my coming down to the floor

tonight. When I came to this Congress in 1998, I determined that there were a

number of issues that I wanted to focus on. One of them dealt with a situation

that was developing in a land far, far

away, a land that very few people really knew much about. I had become acquainted

with it mostly through discussions at my church about the persecuted Christians throughout the world.

This land is known as Sudan. It is

one of the largest countries in Africa.

It is the poorest country in Africa. It has suffered through an enormous

amount of pain. It has sustained itself after 27 years of internal strife. Two

million, at least 2 million, are dead;

four million, at least, displaced in this civil war that has been ongoing, as I

say, for over 25 years. Little is known

about it. Certainly, in 1998, very few people thought much about Sudan or,

frankly, almost any other country on

the African continent. But certainly,

Sudan was not on the top of anyone’s

list as a nation that we should be concerned about, a nation that had any

relevance for us in the United States or

really anywhere else in the world. Yes,

it was just another one of those countries that was involved with internal strife.

Many people died, but that is just the

way it is over there, and that was the thought. That was, to the extent that

anybody gave it any thought, to the extent that Sudan mattered to anyone, it

was just another place on the African

continent where people were dying and

were dying because of the internal conflicts that we thought we had nothing to say about.

Well, in fact, several Members, including myself, Senator BROWNBACK, the gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) talked about this issue at great length every time we had the opportunity. Anyone who would listen, we

would talk about what was happening

in Sudan. We would talk about this incredible tragedy that was evolving in

front of our eyes. And we would ask

people to be concerned, because it was

a human tragedy of enormous proportion. And we found ourselves, frankly,

in this strange sort of situation where the focus of the world was always

taken away to a different place, to a

different set of circumstances. Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia.

Mr. Milosevic, a name that most people in this body and certainly many

Americans will recognize, Mr. Milosevic was the head of a country

that was, as we determined, as this

body determined, conducting genocide, that it was involved with ethnic

cleansing, where thousands, perhaps

hundreds of thousands, of people were

being killed. And we spent a great deal

of time and we debated in this body at

great length exactly what actions should be taken by the West, by the

United States in particular, and by NATO, if the United Nations would not

get involved. And the United Nations

chose not to get involved, but the United States led the way with NATO

to go in to Yugoslavia and to, in fact,

change the situation there. And we did

so at the cost of a significant amount of our treasure and, certainly, many

lives were lost in the process.

But there was a general agreement

that that was the right thing to do because something terrible was going on

in the country at the time in Serbia.

And so there was a debate on the floor

and the permission was given and we

went to war, essentially, with the

United Nations and eventually overturned the regime, and the United Nations is now involved with trying to do

some sort of rebuilding effort of the country.

By the way, it was not very successful. The economy is disastrous. There

are now signs of ethnic controversy

and conflict starting all over again.

This time it is the Albanian Muslims against the Christian Serbians, but the

United Nations seems helpless to try and do anything about it. And so we

did that, and that was where all of our

attention and resources were focused,

at a time when, as I say, another part of the world was suffering far more,

under any criteria you want to establish as to why anybody else should be concerned.

If you look at the Sudan, you will see a nation tormented, and you will see a

level of human sacrifice, a level of human rights violations that is unprecedented since the Second World War.

And yet no focus. Nobody cared.

And we talked and we talked about it, and finally I remember I got a call

from Senator BROWNBACK’s office, and I

had only been in Congress for a couple

of months. His staff person called our

staff person and said, ‘‘I understand your boss is interested in Sudan. Well,

so is mine, and we are going over there in May, and does he want to come?’’

And I said, ‘‘Gee whiz, the Sudan? I have only been in Congress a couple of

months, and I am really not sure. I always thought that our first trips were,

like, Paris or Rome or someplace like that.’’

That is what everybody always told me, that we were going to head

out on these really exciting and cosmopolitan places, but in fact I said,

okay, and I went with Senator BROWNBACK and with Congressman

PAYNE to Sudan. And what I saw was,

with my own eyes, the pictures of what

many have seen of strife and horror

and degradation of the human spirit, but I saw it with my own eyes, and it

was a very moving experience, of

course. It was one of those life-altering experiences.

I will never forget. There was a town

called Yei, and it was a town that had

been bombed often. And I remember

there were a lot of chickens that the

people would be watching, and people would talk about the fact that if the

chickens started to run, because they could hear the engine of planes coming

before the people, that the chickens ran, then the children ran, and then

the adults ran, because they knew that

was their early warning system, was

the chickens who heard the actual planes coming.

And all these kids came around me and Senator BROWNBACK and others,

and they gathered so close, you could

hardly move. And they were shouting

and they were looking up and they

were pointing at the sky, and I asked

the interpreter who was with us, I said,

‘‘What are they saying?’’ He said they are saying that they are going to stay

as close to you as possible, because they do not think that they will be

bombed. They do not think they will bomb an American Congressman. So

they stand as close as they possibly can so they will not be hurt.’’

I said, ‘‘Well, you know, I hope they

are right, but I don’t think that anybody knows that I am here, but I hope

they are right, of course.’’ And I could

see in their eyes the terror that they live through every single day. Most of

them had lost parents, brothers and sisters. Many, many thousands and

thousands were homeless, thousands

were orphaned, and what they looked for was some degree of hope.

Now that was the situation in 1998,

and we came back here and worked

very hard, and we passed something. I

introduced a bill, and it passed, and it is called the Sudan Peace Act. And it

established certain criteria that had to be met by both the north and the south

in terms of good-faith bargaining to come to some sort of peace agreement.

And if they did not have that kind of good-faith bargaining, then there

would be certain sanctions that we would apply.

Eventually, and just a few months

ago, really, peace did come to that part

of the Sudan that was afflicted by the

civil war, and we are, of course, happy.

A peace agreement was reached. The

details now have to be worked out, but

the fighting between the north and the south stopped.

Now I have explained that part of

this, well, that the world was told that the civil war in Sudan started because

you have an Arabic Muslim north and a black Christian south, and really the

cultures were in conflict. Certainly true. And that the north where the

government exists in Khartoum was always oppressive, acted oppressively

against the south, and that is certainly

true. In fact, the north sponsored raids, actual slave raids.

Sudan is one of the countries left in

this world that actually has institutionalized slavery, and slave raids were

encouraged by the government of the

north in Khartoum. The Arab Muslims

would come down, raid villages, take

people away, back into both sexual

slavery and just slavery for the labor that could be obtained. But this was the conflict, Arabic

Muslim, black Christian. Well, because

of the enormous amount of international pressure that eventually developed after years, literally years of

pressing every government we could

think of, including our own, to force

some sort of peace in this war-torn

area of the world, peace finally occurred of a sort. But then, almost I

guess because it was too good to believe, there was too much hope that in

fact some degree of tranquility could

overtake this troubled land, another

problem, another conflict began to develop, and this is in the Darfur region,

western region of Sudan, mostly in the

north, where again Arabs were confronting black Africans.

This time, however, there was no difference of religion. This is the very interesting

aspect of this particular conflict, because it really does go to the heart of the entire conflict that has

been there for 27 years, yet really is

not Muslim against Christian. It is

Arab against black. It is genocide. Yes, the word is genocide.

They have talked about this for a

long time, the north, about how they wanted to essentially cleanse the

south, but they certainly wanted to

move everyone out of the north that was in fact black African. They have

now embarked upon a genocidal war in

this province of Darfur. So far, around

50,000 dead, 200,000 displaced, and the

numbers are growing every single day.

The government of Sudan in Khartoum is aiding and abetting the

Janjaweed. The Janjaweed, they are

Arabs, traders, Arab militiamen, essentially, who raid, kill and rape, and they

are given the arms and the go-ahead by

the government of Khartoum to pursue this.

Of course, the Khartoum government tells us and the rest of the world they

have nothing to do with it, they will

try their best to stop this, but the only

thing that they have stopped so far is the transportation of any resources,

the transportation through Sudan into

this particular area of any of the food-stuffs that USAID or other NGOs, non-government organizations, are trying

to deliver. They have done everything

possible to halt any humanitarian effort to the region. They have done everything possible to aid the activities

of the Janjaweed and to encourage them in this bloodbath.

Rape has become a tactic to advance

the strategy of genocide. The women

are told at the time of rape that they

are impregnating them with lighter-skinned children and that they should

leave once the child is born of that

rape, that they could leave and leave

the child, because the child would be of lighter skin.

The camps that have been established in and around the interior in

Darfur, camps because, of course, people have been driven out of their villages and into these camps, the camps

are surrounded by the Janjaweed. They

patrol it, and they wait for people to

walk outside. And the women come out

in the morning, and they try to get out

earlier and earlier to avoid attack, but

the women are raped. The men are

killed the minute they get outside of

this camp. So there is no sustenance, there is no food, and now the rains are

starting in Sudan in this part.

We have camps now with, as I say, a

couple of hundred thousand people and

more arriving every single day. There

is no sanitation. There is very little

food. All of them have been walking for some times hundreds of miles to get

there. They are weak. They are starving. The rains are coming. Disease will

spread and hundreds of thousands will die and it is planned. This is not just

an accident. It is not just what is going

to happen simply because of the forces

of nature. It is going to happen because

the government of Khartoum, the government of Sudan in Khartoum has designed this plan, to kill or move out

the black people who inhabit this part of their country.

This is amazing. This is incredible

that this could be happening in the

world today, and again, relatively few people care.

Now, to the government’s credit, Secretary Powell has gone to this area,

just returned I think last week. He said

that something like, well, I do not

think we should argue about what it is

called, whether it is genocide or something else. We have to do something.

But the reality is we have to argue

about what it is called because what it

is called matters. If you say it is genocide, then there is a course of action that must be taken.

There is a 1948 agreement. It was

signed by many nations of the world,

including the United States. It is called

The Genocide Treaty, and it sets up

some criteria. And it says if this criteria are met, then in fact genocide is

what is happening and you have to do

certain things, including eventually

maybe even military intervention. And

that is what scares everybody off, and

it certainly scares us because, God knows, we are spread thin, it is true.

But I nonetheless believe that we

must go to the United Nations, and we

must ask them for a declaration of

genocide, because everything that is

happening in Darfur, in the Sudan

meets those criteria. It is purposeful. It

is designed to actually eliminate a certain specific group of people. They are

black. That is their crime. They are

Muslims. But they are being killed by

Muslims who are Arabic. It is racism.

It is the most virulent form of racism we can possibly imagine.

The world has to focus on this even

though there are things that pull us away, I know.

It is interesting, there is an article in

the Guardian Review, ‘‘Human Rights on Trial’’ by Nick Cohen, May 16, 2004.

It says, we choose to ignore atrocities

committed in the third world when it

is politically expedient as in Sudan. It

goes on to say that ‘‘there is a bell curve in the international appreciation

of atrocity. Safe countries receive no coverage for the obvious reason that

there is no atrocities to cover in, say, Denmark or Belgium. The curve begins

to climb from these dull lowlands and hits its peak in countries which are

dangerous but not too dangerous to make reporting to them impossible, today’

s Iraq and the former Yugoslavia in the age of Milosevic.

‘‘From here the curve slithers down again until it reaches countries at the

furthest extreme from civilized life which are either too dangerous or too

tyrannical for free investigation to be an option for anyone but the recklessly

brave, the Congo and North Korea today or Iraq before the war. The lesson for tyrants is they risk becoming

the objects of global outrage when they are not tyrannical enough.’’

Is that not just great? Is that not an

absolutely perfect description of what

is happening in the world? There is this

range or atrocity that we will cover because it is safe enough to do it, but

then once it gets beyond that, no coverage, nobody pays attention to the

worst of all.

‘‘The rulers of Sudan know this well,’’

Mr. Cohen goes on to say.

‘‘Foreign journalists are not murdered there but pretty much everyone else is. An

extraordinary Islamists regime filled with apocalyptic fervor of the fundamentalist revival

has enslaved Christians and animist tribes in the black African south, as it prosecuted a civil war

which has claimed the lives of 2 million since the early 1980s. Two million is the provisional estimate of the

number killed by the Khymer Rouge in Cambodia. But while every politically sentient person has heard of Pol Pot

and the killing fields, I doubt if many know of President Omar al-Bashir of Sudan and Hassan al-Turabi, a cleric

who provided the ideological justification for the terror until he fell out with his murderous patron.

‘‘If the names ring a bell, my guess is that you are active in one of the Christian or human rights campaigns which

has doggedly monitored the extermination campaigns. The killings have subsided,’’

the peace act is in force,

‘‘and there is now a faint hope of peace agreement but this seemingly happy

prospect has only made the randomness of global compassion more unhinged and unprincipled.

‘‘This year is the tenth anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda. It has seen

Kofi Annan apologize for ignoring warnings that a mass slaughter was

about to begin. And every Western government except those that were guilty

of sins of omission, except, inevitably,

the French, whose despicable role in Rwanda came close to the sin of commission. As the air was filled with the

drumming of chests being beaten and the cries of ‘never again’

being bellowed in languages except French, another African disaster was being ignored. Since the autumn of last year,

Arab militias have driven 1 million people from their homes of the Darfur

province of Sudan. Government forces have overseen and participated in massacres, the summary execution of civilians, and the burning of towns and villages. Those who escape now face the risk of famine.’’

Atrocities must be allowed to flourish so other atrocities can be prevented. That is one of the strange sorts

of anomalies of foreign policy that we

are dealing with. I think this article

was fascinating for its insight into how

we handle issues of this nature and how

difficulty it is to get the world to go act in situations like this.

Is it does seem odd, does it not, that

we are willing to do so much more in

other places of far less significance in terms of human rights tragedies? But

we are all God’s children. We are all

made in his imagine and likeness, be

we black, or brown or white or yellow.

And for that reason we have to show

compassion to those who are being persecuted. And we should act as vigorously in Sudan as we have in other parts of the world.

The Secretary of State should go to

the United Nations tomorrow and demand a genocide statement be accepted

and that the world, therefore, take action in Sudan. The government, every

single time they have been pushed to

the end, have retreated. They need to

be pushed to the end again here. I hope and pray that we will do what is the

right thing to do, what is expected of us as those occupying the moral high

ground in the world, which we are. But in order to maintain that position, in

order to keep the moral high ground, it is imperative that we pay attention to

places like Sudan, even though I know

our attention is being pulled in so many other places. And it is difficult

because I do not know that there were

any votes that anybody can count on if

they champion this issue. I certainly cannot say that is true.

There are things that we should do

here simply because they are the right

thing to do, not because there are any

votes connected to it, not because

there are any lobbying groups that are

pressuring us, not because anybody’s giving us money in order to champion a cause, but simply because it is the

right thing to do. It is what we are

asked to do as human beings of conscience, which is what I want to believe

the United States still is, and I do believe it. It just needs to have its attention drawn to the areas of the world that command it.

So I do hope, Madam Speaker, that

we will encourage our government to

take every action possible, as I say, including any action that is designed to

influence a decision by the United Nations that would lead to a declaration

stating that genocide is actually what is happening.

Yes, the word matters. It is not the seeds of genocide. It is not a potential

genocide. It is, in fact, genocide. Say

it, let the chips fall where they may, and we can all rest easier because we

have done what we can do, and that is all really God expects of any of us.