Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank

you, Mr. Lantos, for calling this very important meeting. I believe

that this is a very timely hearing, because I would like to know

what the United States policy toward Sudan is. Up to now, it

seems very unclear. There is one government that stands out in today’s

world as the most heinous, the most abusive, the most unconscionable

evil regime; that is the former National Islamic Front

(NIF) Government, now called the National Congress Party.

This regime, which came to power through a bloody coup in 1989,

has not ceased to stretch the limits of the mind of the ability to

comprehend a brutality that one human can inflict upon another

human, nor has it ceased to challenge the international community’s

threshold for witnessing human suffering.

Not only did the NIF Government harbor Osama bin Laden—the

Bush Administration’s primary foe in the war on terror, who masterminded

the tragic events of September 11th and the bombing of

the Nairobi and Dar es Salaam Embassies and the assassination

attempt on Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak—the same gen-

tleman who was invited to the United States, Mr. Gosh, was the

one in charge of all those activities. They tell me that leopards don’t change spots.

It turns out the people of the Nuba Mountains, where they had

a well orchestrated campaign to kill, they then went after the

South with the new oil money and viewed the bombardment with the Antonovs——

This government is wrong, and I look forward to your testimony.

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be as succinct as

I can. Let me thank you once again for calling this very important hearing.

I want to make a point or two. First of all, I think it is quite

clear that a comprehensive peace agreement clearly states that we

should continue to provide aid to South Sudan regardless of the situation

in Darfur, and so I hope that the Administration is clear

that we are going to work—I would like to see more attention given

to Darfur, but I don’t think there should be an impact on the support

for Southern Sudan.

Also, I would like to, as Mr. Leach said, this question of genocide

that was declared by the House and the Senate and by Secretary

Powell for the Administration, I was somewhat disturbed at your

2nd of June, 3rd, 4th meeting where you questioned whether genocide

declaration was actually Mr. Powell’s alone and not necessarily

the Administration.

And of course, as Mr. Meeks mentioned, the downplaying of the

number of deaths which, of course, are estimated, because they are

difficult to get accurate numbers. But you are downgrading from

50,000 to 150,000 to from the 300,000 to 400,000 that had been indicated

by NGOs on the ground. I think, in my opinion, that sends

a wrong message.

That happened during World War II where one of our assistant

secretaries testified before Congress, Breckenridge Long, that

520,000 Jews had been let into the United States at that time in

1942. Half of that number were let into the United States as refugees,

and less than half of those were Jews.

So to allude to in one way we escalated numbers and to de-escalate

I think, in my opinion, tends to send a wrong message. The

fact that we have allowed the head of the intelligence organization

from Sudan to come into our country, and now a high-level delegation

is here, seems to me to be downplaying what is happening.

I think that the American people, 80 percent say we should be

doing more. I have children writing books, sending pictures of

where the deaths are happening in Sudan. I am not so sure that

our Administration realizes the importance of this.

Just yesterday in New Jersey, a bill was passed to divest $5 billion

of funds from the pension funds of New Jersey companies

doing business in Sudan, regardless where they are from. The Assemblyman

Payne—I am very proud of my brother—had the bill

pass in the House and Senate, and next week it will be signed by

the Governor of New Jersey.

The United States people are outraged. Even to say that in the

Nuremberg trials in 1948 they said it was simply crimes against

humanity. It is a disgrace that that is what it is allowed to be considered

when the holocaust of 6 million Jews occurred. It should

not have occurred in the first place. But then in the Nuremberg

trials, to say it was just against humanity and therefore we should

perhaps not be so disturbed, that crimes against humanity may be

what we should call this and not really genocide.

I think we are going in the wrong direction. We are going down,

rather than up.

The question of tribalism is, you know, is the genocide—the

Janjaweed were recruited from the North. It had nothing to do

with the neighbors of people who lived in Darfur for years and always

had little squabbles but worked it out. They were recruited,

armed, paid for and encouraged by the Government of Sudan; and

to talk about this long herd-versus-farmer issue, I think we are

sending the wrong message.

I think there should be a special envoy, that it is absolutely impossible

for us to take this seriously without having a special

envoy. The longer we go without a special envoy dealing with this

situation once again proves to me that the Government of this

country is looking to end its policy against Sudan. I think there is

a move to try to normalize—these same people that we are putting

all our faith in were the same ones that allowed Osama bin Laden

to come in, the same ones that helped try to assassinate Mubarak,

the same ones that allowed the terrorist attack on our Embassies

in Dar-es-Salaam and in Nairobi; and these are the same people

that are brought over here with taxpayers money in an executive

jet to come to meet them in the United States.

I think it is wrong. I think the policy is wrong.

I would like to ask, is there going to be a special envoy appointed

for Sudan?

But you disputed the figures. Please.