Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to echo the comments. This is quite a tour de force,

and I think you have a balance that is about right. I would just

like to stress when we look at a perspective, which is awfully difficult,

I know, in issues of this kind, there is a moral issue. Members

of this Committee have defined it rather well. You have defined

it exceptionally. There is a geopolitical issue that is real.

There is a legal issue that isn’t inconsequential.

Here there have been several references to the distinction between

genocide and a crime against humanity. I would just like to

mention one aspect to this, and that is the United States House of

Representatives formally declared this to be a genocide. The Senate

did. The United States Administration did. The implications for

law are that we are parties to the Genocide Convention, and that

obligates every party to do whatever it can to bring this genocide to an end.

I only raise this from two perspectives. One is philosophical, literally

obligates the United States to act unilaterally, although it is

obviously far wiser to operate multilaterally; and so all of your observations

about emphasizing the OAU are well taken. But, secondly,

it implies that the Congress is behind you, if not ahead of

you. And I stress this because you do not have to feel constrained

when you make decisions that are for the good of humanity. Congress

is with you. And I stress this as strongly as I can.

Secondly, and just as an offshoot, you noted as an aside that one

of the leaders of the Southern part of Sudan, one of the great, impressive

leaders of Africa, John Garang, is a graduate of a university

in the United States that happens to be in my State. This, to

me, is very symbolic of another set of issues, and that relates to

how the United States Government deals with visas. By that I

mean we have people around the world in important parts of government

of various societies that have been educated in the United

States. For our Government to take too constrained an approach at

this time of accepting people at our academic institutions can be

very counterproductive of the national security interest of the

United States.

We also look at national security as an implied constraint. But

this is an exceptional example of why it should imply the exact reverse,

and I just ask that you take that perspective back to the Department.

Finally, I was going to ask the question, but you addressed it in

the end of your statement. It relates to the regional dimension of

this particular conflict, particularly as it relates to Uganda and

Khartoum supporting certain Ugandan movements that may be unsettling

to the Southern part of Sudan. I think you have indicated

you have addressed this in your diplomacy, and I want to congratulate

you on that.

Finally, I would echo two thoughts—or one thought of Mr. Lantos

and upgrade it. He indicated that this was a tutorial session, but

it is also reflective of diplomacy that is active, and we appreciate

your leadership.

Thank you.