Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight

to bring attention to the worst

tragedy ongoing and occurring in the

world today; and that is the tragedy in

the Sudan. As my colleagues well recall

and are aware, Sudan is the largest

country in Africa, becoming the first

independent country in sub-Saharan

Africa in 1956.

For almost four decades, the African

giant with the population of 32.6 million

people have been the scene of

intermittent conflict. But how many

people have really paid careful attention

to these numbers? An estimated 2

million people have died in war-related

causes and famine in southern Sudan,

and 4 million people have been displaced.

Why did these many people have to

die? Could we have done something to

prevent the massive loss of life in

Sudan? Indeed the answer is a resounding

yes. But we chose to ignore or to

engage only marginally.

We are the largest provider of humanitarian

assistance to the Sudan,

yet many continue to die. In 1998 alone,

an estimated 100,000 people died due to

the government’s refusal to allow the

United Nations relief aid from going

into that country.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, some have written

and others have talked about the

tragedy as a religious conflict or a tribal

conflict. The Sudanese conflict, Africa’s

longest running civil war, is deeper

and more complicated than the claims

of political leaders and some observers.

Religion, indeed, is a major factor because

of the Islamic fundamentalist

agenda of the current government

dominated by the northern-based National

Islamic Front, the NIF government.

Southerners who are Christians

and animists reject the Islamization of

the country in favor of secular agreement.

Social and economic disparities are

major contributing factors to the Sudanese

conflict. But the regime is not

merely opposed by Christians or southerners.

The NIF regime is a minority

government led by extremist clique in

Khartoum headed by Al Bashir. Muslim

leaders have also been victims of the

NIF government over the years.

The NIF government is clearly opposed

by a majority of notherners inside

and outside of the country. The

National Democratic Alliance, a coalition

of northern or southern opposition

groups, have been actively challenging

the NIF government’s hold on power

since it ousted the democratically

elected civilian government in June

1989. In fact, the NIF government came

to power precisely to abort a peace

agreement between Sudanese People’s

Liberation Movement, the SPLM, and

the majority northern parties in 1989.

But the NIF government is just one

of the many obstacles of lasting peace

in Sudan, and the second phase of the

civil war erupted under the military

dictatorship of Nimeiri. In fact, the abrogation

of the 1972 Addis Ababa agreement

in 1983, which ended the first

phase of the civil war in the south by

former President Nimeiri, is considered

a major triggering factor for the current

civil war.

Although, the NIF government has

persuaded and pursued the war in

southern Sudan with vigor, previous

governments, both civilian and military,

have rejected southern demands

for autonomy and equality. This has

gone on for the over 40 years that there

has been a push for equality, now approaching

50 years.

Mr. Speaker, northern political leaders

for decades treated southerners as

second-class citizens and did not see

the south as an integral part of the

country. Southern political leaders argued

that, under successive civilian

and military governments, political

elites in the north have made only superficial

attempts to address the grievances

of the south without compensating

the north’s dominant economic

political and social issues and status.

In recent years, most political leaders

in the north, now in opposition to

the current government, say that mistakes

were made and that they are prepared

to correct them. But the political

mood among southerners has

sharply shifted in favor of separation

from the north.

Mr. Speaker, slavery has reemerged

with a vengeance in Sudan. The inhumane

practice is directly tied to the

civil war in southern Sudan that has

raged intermittently for over 40 years.

The slaving of innocent southern Sudanese

citizens have intensified since the

National Islamic Front usurped power

in 1989. It is now being condoned, if not

orchestrated, by the NIF government

and perpetrated by Arab militia allies.

Slavery in this time is wrong, but

enough is not being done to stop it.

The international community as a

matter of fact has done very little, if

anything, to prevent this terrible practice.

Some organizations have resorted

to freeing slaves or buying them back.

But buying back freedom of slaves by

these groups have raised some other

questions, and some have said it has increased

the trafficking in slaves.

But no one can question the yearning

of families to free their loved ones

from bondage almost at any price. If in

fact one had a child in slavery, would

not one want that child to be bought

back? Nor can anyone question the

moral impetus to provide assistance to

these families by means of buying back

their relatives from slavery.

The generous response, for example,

by school children in Colorado have

raised large sums of money for the purpose;

and in many parts of the United

States, it dramatizes the compelling

case for buying back the freedom.

Sudan’s human hunters are members

of Arab militias and the popular defense

forces which the government of

Sudan has mobilized, trained, armed

and unleashed on the civilian population

in their racial and religious war

against the southern Sudanese. Unlike

the Arabized Muslim north, southern

Sudanese are black Africans who mostly

adhere to traditional beliefs but

whose leadership is overwhelmingly

Christian.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Sudan is certainly

a major factor contributing to

the slavery in Sudan. The war is essentially

one of the southerners resistance

in fighting against the domination of

the north. But it is the government,

the NIF government, which is perpetrating

this terrible sin.

And until we change the NIF government

in the north, this problem will

exist. And so what we see in the Sudan

in general is that innocent civilians are

victims of this war.

In many wars that have been fought,

armies fight each other. It is the military

against the military. But in

Sudan, it is the military against the

people, the children, the women. This

is wrong. Just the other day the NIF

government announced that it had resumed

its aerial bombing of the south,

after claims of suspension of these

bombings. Who are those being

bombed? Of course, children, women,

the helpless, the poor, the hungry.

According to a report by the United

States Committee on Refugees, the

government bombed civilian targets

last year 167 times. The NIF government

uses the old Russian Antonovs

and drops bombs on communities trying

to hit schools and hospitals, disrupting

the community. All day the

community waits and listens to hear

whether the planes will come over. And

this is a continuous disruption of the

community.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the

number of people killed and maimed

and displaced and enslaved; yet we as

the international community have

really failed to do anything significant

to end the suffering. Over the years, I

have visited southern Sudan on numerous

occasions. I have been to Yei,to

Labone, to Kukuma, to Loki, and on

each trip I see the suffering. I must say

with all sincerity that I can no longer

see these innocent civilians and promise

to end their suffering because I

must admit that despite all of the efforts

that I have done over the years,

we have failed the people of Sudan.

But we have also failed other people.

We have failed the people of Rwanda in

1994, when the world turned their back

as close to a million people were victims

of genocide. We cannot say we did

not know this was happening. We did

know, as we do know what is happening

in Sudan. As I speak here before you

this evening, more and more people

will die. Dozens will be forced out of

their homes. Many will be enslaved.

Imagine waking up one morning and

losing everything you have, your property,

your dignity, your family, and,

most importantly, your freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to

wait any longer. The people of Nuba

have become an endangered species. A

few years from now, there will be no

one left except the barren land. In the

past several weeks, government forces

burned, looted, and destroyed a number

of villages, displacing tens of thousands

of civilians. In fact, they attempted

to destroy and capture the

burial place of the recently deceased

leader of Nuba, Commander Yusuf

Kowa.

The people of southern Sudan are

also being exterminated systematically.

The handful of educated southern

Sudanese are aging and many have

died. This generation of southern Sudanese

is growing up in an environment

of war and suffering. And unless this

situation is quickly reversed, there can

be no peace in Sudan. Those who beat

the drums of reconciliation must remember

the sacrifices paid by millions

of Sudanese. There can be no peace if

there is not a just and lasting peace.

Indeed, ending the war must be a priority,

but we must address the root

causes of the war if we are going to

achieve a lasting peace. The NIF government

is the obstacle to peace, as

was the case with Hitler during World

War II. They must be eliminated from

Khartoum.

Since the development of Sudan’s oil

sector, hundreds of thousands of people

have been displaced and thousands

have been killed. Revenues from oil,

blood oil, are being used to buy deadly

weapons to kill innocent civilians. Foreign

oil companies, like Talisman and

PetroChina, are collaborating with the

genocidal regime in Khartoum. We

must put an end to the killing fields in

the oil fields of Sudan.

The United States Government cannot

ignore or look with indifference on

the destructive role of oil development.

The extraordinary nature of human destruction

and suffering in Sudan and

the deep complexity of the publicly

traded oil companies in Sudan’s ongoing

catastrophe mark this as a singular

moment, one in which America’s moral

outrage is appropriately reflected in

actions which deny market listings to

NIF’s willing corporate accomplice. We

must finally put an end to allowing

these companies to have access to capital

markets.

Yesterday, The Washington Post

printed a front page story about the

devastation being caused by the oil development

and the exploration in

southern Sudan. It is called, ‘‘Oil

Money Is Fueling Sudan’s War. New

Arms Used to Drive Southerners From

Land,’’ by Karl Vick, Washington Post

Foreign Service. And in the article it

says, ‘‘Today, four oil companies are

producing more than 200,000 barrels of

oil a day and more firms are exploring

other reserves. Export revenues have

doubled the government’s defense

budget over the last 2 years, and a multitude

of eyewitness reporters say that

new guns are being used to drive tens

of thousands of Sudanese like Veronica

and her family off their land to secure

the oil underneath it.’’

‘‘The fighting follows the oil,’’ says

John Ryle, an independent investigator,

who recently released a report

that documented a broad government

effort to clear the petroleum concession,

sometimes using helicopter gun

boats stationed at oil field airports.

They all say the same thing, an aide

worker said. People came and destroyed

their homes and they had to

flee. Time after time we hear that from

the people, because it is the grab for

the oil by this brutal government and

these companies that are looking the

other way to make a profit from the

blood of the people as they drill the oil

for wealth.

The fighting follows the oil, as we

said. They all say the same thing. They

have to flee. The situation has further

stoked Western outrage over the Sudanese

government’s human rights

record. While no American companies

are involved, fortunately U.S. law prohibits

them from doing business in

Sudan, the involvement of Canadian

and European firms in extracting Sudanese

oil has prompted disinvestment

campaigns. And that is what we must

do. The same way that we did with

firms in South Africa, we must urge

our people to disinvest from the

Talismans and other companies that

are drilling oil in the Sudan.

‘‘These are war crimes,’’ said Eric

Reeves, a Smith College professor who

works against companies doing business

in Sudan. The criticism has fallen

hardest on Talisman Oil, as I mentioned

a Calgary-based firm that was

little known outside of Canada until it

bought a 25 percent stake in Sudan’s

most promising oil field. The Muglad

Basin is classical geography for oil, a

sedimentary plain exposed by two

plates being pulled apart. Unfortunately,

the same area roughly defines

the boundaries between Sudan’s north

and the south.

Mr. Speaker, a recent report by the

British based NGO Christian Aid stated

the following: ‘‘In the oil fields of

Sudan, civilians are being killed, being

raped. The villages are being burned to

the ground. They are caught in a war

for oil. Part of the wider civil war between

the north and the south has been

waged for decades, but now oil is a key

factor.

This makes it different. Since largescale

productions began 2 years ago, oil

has moved the war into a new league.

Across the oil-rich regions of Sudan,

the government is pursuing a scorched-

Earth policy to clear the land of civilians

and to make way for exploration

of oil by foreign oil companies. The

Christian Aid report, ‘‘The Scorched

Earth,’’ shows how the presence of

international oil companies is fueling

the war.

Companies from Asia, from the west,

including the U.K., have helped to

build Sudan’s oil industry offering finance,

technology, expertise, and supplies

to create a strong and growing oil

industry in the center of the country.

In the name of oil, government forces

and government-supported militias are

entering the land of civilians, killing

and displacing hundreds and thousands

of southern Sudanese.

The fact that this is continuing is an

outrage. We must focus our attention

to that, and in that regard the involvement

of Talisman Energy Company has

prompted me to introduce legislation,

H. Con. Res. 113, which calls for divestment

in Sudan’s oil companies. It also

calls on the President to deny oil companies

the ability to raise capital or

trade equities in the United States capital

markets, and calls on oil companies

to freeze oil production. Talisman

Energy’s role in scorched-Earth warfare

against civilians in southern

Sudan has been documented clearly.

A Canadian-British team just back

from Sudan has established clearly and

authoritativly that Talisman’s concession

at its air strips, that they are allowing

offensive military missions, including

attack helicopters to be used

from their air strips, gun boats, helicopter

gun ships, and it was confirmed

by information held by the Canadian

Foreign Ministry for over 2 months and

leaves only one question: When will the

foreign minister, John Manley, halt

clearly and start to really pressure this

Canadian corporation in its behavior in

the Sudan. We cannot allow this to

continue. For the most part in the

1990s, the United States and its European

allies worked together to contain

and isolate the National Islamic Front

government in the Sudan, considered

by Washington to be a threat to regional

stability.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. policy objectives

have long been forged in three main

areas: the massive destruction to end

the civil war; to attempt to stop terrorism

which was being conducted in

Sudan; and to improve the human

rights issues in that country.

In early 1990, the United States attempted

unsuccessfully to achieve its

policy objectives through diplomatic

means. By the mid-1990s, in response to

the NIF’s defiant attitude and intransigence,

the U.S. diplomatic efforts

were replaced by a policy of containment

and pressures.

This evolution in approach culminated

in November 1997 when the

Clinton administration imposed comprehensive

sanctions on the NIF government

after really reviewing its policy.

The sanctions restrict imports and

exports from Sudan, financial transactions,

and prohibit U.S. investment.

This was done by the Clinton administration,

and it was a bold move in the

right direction.

On August 20, 1998, U.S. Naval forces

struck a suspected chemical weapons

facility in Khartoum in a terrorist

training camp in Afghanistan in retaliation

for the U.S. embassy bombings

in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam,

Tanzania. More than 250 people were

killed in the embassy attacks, including

12 Americans. The bombing of

Khartoum was seen by observers as a

message to the NIF regime to stop supporting

terrorist groups.

In December 1999, hardliners within

the ruling NIF government ousted the

founder of the party, Hassan el-Turabi,

and his allies from the party and the

government in Khartoum. This wellplanned

move by the NIF leadership

was designed to pave the way for rapprochement

with the international

community and to escape the consequences

of U.S. sanctions. Government,

eager to reestablish relations

with Khartoum, allowed themselves to

see the current NIF leadership as having

become more moderate, a very

cleverly orchestrated plan on the part

of the NIF government to give way to

allow European governments to say

there is a change in Khartoum, but

there was no real change in Khartoum.

In contrast, many observers saw the

rift within the NIF as a struggle between

the old generation and the

younger, highly ambitious Islamists. It

appeared that there is little ideological

difference between el-Turabi and the

current crowd that are running Khartoum.

In fact, those now in power have

taken a tougher, more strident ideological

stance than the reckless fundamentalists

of the el-Turabi faction.

Indeed, a closer look at the leadership

reveals that this group was the author

of the NIF’s extremist policies in the

1990s, so there is no change. Only a

change to the worse.

Mr. Speaker, the desire of some governments

in Europe and the Middle

East to embrace the National Islamic

Front government under the guise of

the changing of the guard in Khartoum

is driven in large part by commercial

interests, and it is clear European oil

companies have large stakes in Southern

Sudan and are now operational and

on the verge of becoming even more

prosperous as they go and explore oil.

Unsurprisingly, officials in the NIF

government have given a red carpet

treatment to European governments.

Despite U.N. sanctions, the U.N. Security

Council sanctions which intended

to restrict the travel of senior Sudanese

officials, members of the European

Union began this critical dialogue,

as they call it, with the National

Islamic Front government regime several

years ago, rejecting the U.S. policy

of containment of the NIF regime.

They saw an opportunity to move

ahead commercially, and we have to

appeal to our allies that they must also

have a standard of dignity and not to

allow themselves to be corrupted by

these pariah regimes.

This new approach, according to EU

officials, seek to achieve reform

through dialogue and quiet persuasions

without pressure, they say. Supporters

of this policy argue that the policy of

containment and isolation has failed to

achieve its desired objectives. But

many observers see the European approach

as a synonym for a policy of appeasement,

one that too obviously

serves the commercial interests in

Sudan, once again simply because of

the potential lucrative oil sector.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this so-called

critical dialogue is empty rhetoric designed

to cover those wishing simply to

do business with the NIF government.

It is ironic and frustrating to many of

us in Washington that America’s allies

in Europe continue to turn a blind eye

to the abuses of the NIF government.

Certainly if the objectives of the socalled

critical dialogue were to moderate

the behavior of the NIF government

to improve human rights conditions,

to stop the bombing, to end the

government controlling the food supply,

then we would say fine, let us

move in that direction; but it has not

done that, and the policy followed by

the Europeans has failed miserably.

The government continues to bomb

civilian targets in the south. The NIF

militia continues to enslave women

and children at alarming rates. And

the government has become increasingly

intransigent in the peace process.

They really do not want peace, and

they feel the new strength provided to

them by the oil revenues.

There were high level contacts between

Washington and Khartoum in

late 2000, just last year, intended to

test and verify Khartoum’s seriousness

about reform. The United States delivered

a road map for the regime to follow

if it sought improvements with relations

to the United States. Special

envoy, former Congressman and former

chairman of the Africa Subcommittee

from Florida Harry Johnston became

that special envoy and visited Khartoum

twice to engage the government

in discussions on human rights, humanitarian

issues, the IGAD process

led by Mr. Moi from Kenya, and other

areas to try to see whether the government

had new ideas, whether they were

really interested in having a relationship

with the U.S. by ending some of

these horrible situations that they

have engaged in through the years. The

NIF regime balked at any kind of

change. And the United States said

that enough was enough. There was an

attempt to have a lifting of the U.N.

sanctions and to get Sudan into the

U.N. Security Council as an alternative

member, but an aggressive push by the

U.S. prevented it in late 2000. That was

a victory for us.

What has become clear, though, is

that the U.S. and its European allies

differ fundamentally on the proper approach

to Sudan and basic principles

for engagement. We must try to be in

sync with our European allies because

together we can make a difference in

this world, but we have to attempt to

get on the same page. Advocates of a

tough policy believe that without pressure

and support for the democratic

forces in Sudan, change is unlikely to

come in the near future. Some of our

allies in Europe and the Middle East

believe that the NIF has changed and

further reforms will come through critical

dialogue and expanded economic

interactions.

The Bush administration undoubtedly

will have to weigh both approaches

in formulating its new policy

toward the NIF regime. Indeed, there

are those who are advocating the European

line here in Washington, that we

should abandon the tough policy toward

the NIF government. They say it

has not worked in the past, so we ought

to just start to have engagement like

the Europeans. President Bush courageously

spoke out about the issue in

the Sudan on several occasions since he

took office. Secretary of State Colin

Powell has spoken on this issue more

than any other issue in Africa to date.

He said in his confirmation hearings

that this was an area that they were

going to concentrate on. And as I have

indicated, he has spoken out against

what has happened there.

There are encouraging signs, but the

administration must now move forth

and needs to articulate its policy clearly.

It must do so soon.

I recently read an article about the

possible appointment of Chester Crocker,

former assistant Secretary of State

for African Affairs under the Reagan

administration as the special envoy to

Sudan. I know Dr. Crocker. He is well

known in the African circles. He is extremely

familiar with Africa, its

issues, its problems. He has studied and

taught about the continent for many,

many years. And he has a good grasp of

the continent.

However, I think it is not the person,

it is the policy; and I believe that the

policy that we saw as it related to the

apartheid government in South Africa,

the policy of constructive engagement

during those horrible years, lead me to

have some questions about whether

constructive engagement is the policy

at hand today. I fiercely disagreed with

the policy, as did the majority of the

American people during the South Africa

regime.

The constructive engagement policy

that Dr. Crocker authored in my view

was a policy that did not serve the

American people well, and it was really

a policy that finally, with the leadership

of Ron Dellums, the CAAA legislation

was passed, the Comprehensive

Anti-Apartheid Act, in 1986, where

many people in the House pushed this

bill through. It went through both

Houses, but was vetoed by the President.

Dr. Crocker, of course, opposed

the legislation. And it was the courageous

vote of Senator LUGAR of Indiana

that cast the 67th vote to override the

first overridden law of President

Reagan, and the good Republican Senator

from Indiana said that it was the

only right thing to do to end this

apartheid government in South Africa.

We also have people in the White

House who felt that Nelson Mandela

should remain in prison. Vice President

CHENEY was one of only five Members

of the House who voted that Mr.

Mandela after 23 years in prison at that

time should not be allowed to be released

from prison. It said nothing

about the sanctions; it said nothing

about the government of South Africa,

just that Mr. Mandela should be freed.

Mr. CHENEY voted no. Twenty-three

years was not long enough for a person

to be imprisoned only because he wanted

the right to vote.

And so the sensitivity of the envoy to

Sudan is going to be very important,

and it is going to be the way that people

view the envoy. When a person was

selected to do the negotiations in

Northern Ireland, it was a very carefully

done process. Senate leader

Mitchell was selected to do the negotiations.

Senator Mitchell was respected

by both the Protestant majority

and the Catholic minority. He was

embraced by the Ulster regime and the

Sinn Fein, the Gerry Adamses and the

Trimbles and the Blair government and

the Taoisech government in Ireland. He

was a person that did not have any dislike

from any group.

I would hope that when we select an

envoy for Sudan, it would be the same

type of person that Senator Mitchell is.

As a matter of fact, it does not have to

be anyone who favors the south over

the north. I have had the privilege of

traveling with a Republican colleague

of mine who served in the House, Republican

Representative Tom Campbell

from California. Mr. Campbell was a

person who visited southern Sudan and

visited other parts of Arab Northern

Africa. He is a person who in my opinion

would be the type of person that

you would want to possibly be the

envoy. He is a person who speaks foreign

languages. He is a person who understands

both views. He is a person

that is not prejudiced to one side or the

other.

He is a capable, caring, friend of Africa,

who I think would make a difference.

Finally, I would say that tomorrow

the House will consider H.R. 20, the Sudanese

Peace Act, which I strongly

support, one of the original cosponsors.

The Sudan Peace Act will reassert the

findings from the 106th Congress that

the government of Sudan is committing

genocide against its people of

Southern Sudan; that they are employing

divide and conquer techniques to

further fracture southern opposition to

northern governance; that it is helping

to allow paramilitary groups to conduct

raids and enslave its population.

In the bill, we talk about the way

that the government of Sudan is inflicting

an ongoing campaign of aerial

bombing its citizens, a scorched earth

policy designed to drive out people

from the land so they can then take

the oil revenues.

In this legislation, it expresses a

sense of Congress that the Secretary of

State should use the State Department

personnel to pursue multilateral and

bilateral peace processes in Sudan and

seek multilateral pressure on all combatants

in the civil war and urges the

President to use $10 million appropriated

in fiscal year 2001 to assist the

Sudanese opposition, the National

Democratic Alliance, the NDA, for

funding for office space and equipment

and radio and vehicles and computers

and staff and political effectiveness

training.

It asks for continued support for humanitarian

food distribution through

OLS, the Operation Lifeline Sudan. But

it also urges the President to develop

contingency plans should the government

of Sudan obstruct food delivery

as it has done in the past; that we

should have other ways to get food to

people who are in need. It requires all

businesses trading securities in the

U.S. capital markets and operating in

the Sudan to fully disclose the extent

and nature of their operations, particularly

oil operations, and requires the

Secretary of State to collect information

about the war to keep updated information,

including slavery and rape

and aerial bombings of the citizens.

So we are hoping that tomorrow this

bill will come to the floor and be

passed. We hope that this tragedy in

Sudan will finally come to an end.

I am encouraged by the number of

people now who have gotten on board.

I am encouraged by the number of people

who have said enough is enough. I

am encouraged by the Congressional

Black Caucus who have come back to

support this whole question of a change

in the Sudan.

I commend Kweisi Mfume and the

NAACP who has said this practice

must end. I commend Joe Madison, a

radio talk host, who has done an extraordinary

job in bringing to his listening

audience the tragedy of Sudan. I

applaud Reverend Sharpton who has

gone to Sudan with Mr. Madison, and

Reverend Faunteroy and Reverend

Jesse Jackson who intends to visit

Sudan in the near future, and to the

gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF)

who for many, many years has been in

Sudan, probably the leading person

dealing with this tragedy. He has done

an outstanding job, and I have a great

deal of respect for what he has done;

and my colleague, the gentleman from

Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) in the House

and the gentleman from California (Mr.

ROYCE) and the gentleman from New

York (Mr. HOUGHTON), and Senator

BROWNBACK in the U.S. Senate, Senator

FRIST, so many who have said enough

is enough.

The newspapers are finally putting in

its newspapers the truth about what is

going on there. It has taken a long

time. It has taken 50 years to get the

attention it should get but it is getting

that attention now.

Ebony Magazine will have an article

in its August edition. We have schools.

I went to a school in Bergen County,

New Jersey, where they have a curriculum

on the Sudan and it is attempting

to get the board of education

in that town to adopt a policy of teaching

about the tragedy of the Sudan.

So they say if you start me with 10

who are stout-hearted men, I will soon

give you 10,000 more. If I start you with

10 who are stout-hearted men or

women, we should say today I will give

you 10,000 more, and a trip of a thousand

miles must begin with the first

step.

There have been many steps but they

have been quiet steps. The steps that

we are hearing now are louder steps.

They are more steps. They are bigger

steps. They are steps that are making

noise. They are people in high places

who are now saying this place in the

Sudan we have overlooked for so long

now it is time for us to focus on it.

We have people who are saying that

we cannot allow in this new millennium

to have people still enslaved and

children starving to death. We can no

longer allow in this time and place

that we should look the other way as

we did when the tragedy was going on

in Somalia and when the terrible situation

was going on in Sierra Leone and

when we saw civil war in Liberia, and

when we watched dictators in Nigeria

we looked the other way in many of

these instances, but finally we are

coming together on this question of

Sudan.

I will continue to fight for the right

of the people of that nation. I will continue

to fight for those voices, people

who have no voice, those who suffer

daily. We all should be concerned. We

all have a responsibility. We all must

get involved. We all must call our Congress

people and senators, talk to our

church people and school friends to

have our civic organizations and

League of Women Voters put this on

their agendas. The women’s clubs and

the sororities and the fraternities all

must take this battle on. We must win.

We will win. We are on the right side.

No longer can the world run and hide.

The world must now decide that

enough is enough; that this country

needs to be brought into the 21st Century.

I hope that tomorrow will be another

step in that direction.