Thank you so much.

Mr. Secretary, I so appreciate your strong words that you used

this morning, because I do think words matter. And I also think

actions, of course, matter more. We have no Ambassador in Sudan,

and I support that. We should not have an ambassador there. We

don’t have a charge´, and now we don’t have a special envoy. And

so I wonder, as—I’m just going to make a statement—I probably

have two or three little questions, if you could respond—do we have

plans to have a special envoy there?

I appreciate the fact that in the State Department document you

call rape a ‘‘weapon,’’ and clearly it is being used as a weapon. And

what I want to do today, since I agree with everybody who spoke—

I mean, I just don’t take issue with anything that was said here,

Mr. Chairman—I want to try to put a human face on what is going

on, and I take this straight out of Amnesty International. This brutal

crackdown that started in March 2003, which now has been

deemed by our Secretary of State to be a genocide—as Senator

Brownback has said, more than 50,000 killed, 395 villages destroyed,

1.4 million driven from their homes, all in a little more

than a year. And women have been brutalized by the use of rape

as a weapon of war. So let me talk about this, specific cases.

One woman was 5 months pregnant when she was abducted by

the jangaweed with eight other women during an attack on July

24, 2003. Some of the girls abducted with her were as young as 8

years old. She said, ‘‘Five to six men would rape us, one after the

other, for hours during 6 days, every night. My husband couldn’t

forgive me after this. He disowned me.’’

Another Darfuri reports, there was also another rape on a young

single girl, age 17, ‘‘M’’—they disguise her name—‘‘was raped by

six men in front of her house, in front of her mother. M’s brother,

S, was then tied up and thrown into the fire.’’

Another case, a 30-year-old woman recounted the following to

Amnesty delegates, quote, ‘‘Some 15 women and girls who had not

fled quickly enough were raped in different huts in the village. The

jangaweed broke the limbs of some women and girls to prevent

them from escaping. The jangaweed remained in the village for 6

or 7 days. After the rapes, the jangaweed looted the houses.’’

So, clearly, this is beyond our ability to imagine the way we

would feel if we were watching one of our children in this situation.

So we all agree that the world cannot stand by. Everyone is in

agreement. So here’s my question. Have you seen the Washington

Post editorial today? I want to just read from it, and I’d like you

to respond to it. ‘‘Although the United States has been generous financially,

it has not expended the diplomatic capital necessary to

achieve a solution.’’

So I’d like you to respond to that. ‘‘Earlier in the summer, Mr.

Powell argued that the violence against Darfur civilians could be

ended by Sudan’s government, even though that same government

had invented the policy of attacking villagers with helicopter gun

ships, then sending in the jangaweed to burn their houses, kill and

rape inhabitants, and poison wells. This mistaken belief conveniently

absolved outsiders of the moral responsibility to provide

peacekeepers. Sudan’s government, however, showed no indignation

or indication to stop the killings. It also lacked the means to

re-bottle the jangaweed genie, even if it wanted to. Besides, there

was no way that traumatized Darfuri villagers would return home

in the absence of foreign peacekeepers, just as Kosovo’s ethnic Albanians

would never have returned home as long as the surrogates

of Milosevic remained in control.

‘‘Now, U.S. officials have drafted a U.N. Security Council resolution

that calls on Sudan’s government to accept an expanded force

that would probably consist of 3,000 troops and a bit over a thousand

police officers from the African Union. This is a good idea.

But the problem with Mr. Powell’s draft resolution is that Sudan’s

government has little incentive to pay attention to it.‘‘

So I’m hoping you will respond to that fact. What’s the incentive

for them to pay attention to it?

‘‘In its current version, the resolution includes no deadline for

Sudanese compliance.’’ No deadline. ‘‘Its vague threat of sanctions

is undermined by the fact that the U.N. issued the same threat in

July, but seems to have forgotten it. The U.S. must propose a

tougher resolution that delivers on July’s threat of sanctions, and

threatens more if Sudan’s government fails to accept the African

Union force. This sort of resolution would not win easy acceptance

from Sudan sympathizers on the Council, and Mr. Powell would

have to work very hard to secure passage, but at least this approach

might force Sudan to pay attention. The alternative—and

they call it ‘the milk-toast resolution’ that the State Department

has put forward—creates the appearance of action without the substance.’’

So I’m sure you don’t agree with this, I don’t think, but I found

it very compelling, and I wonder if you could respond to that, and

also the issue of a special envoy.

Oh, I agree with it.

Well, we need a high-level person, everybody

knows their name. But that’s OK, let’s—go ahead.

Good.

OK. I’d just conclude and just say this, that you

haven’t answered their issue—and maybe you can just do it in

writing—that there’s little incentive. And they don’t call for more

than a peacekeeping force. They think that’s a great idea. They’re

just calling for more sanctions.

No, that’s fine.