IN THE MATTER OF AN ARBITRATION BEFORE A TRIBUNAL CONSTITUTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 5 OF THE ARBITRATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN AND THE SUDAN PEOPLE'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT/ARMY ON DELIMITING ABYEI AREA

-and-

THE PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION OPTIONAL RULES FOR ARBITRATING DISPUTES BETWEEN TWO PARTIES OF WHICH ONLY ONE IS A STATE Peace Palace, The Hague

Wednesday, 22nd April 2009

Before:

PROFESSOR PIERRE-MARIE DUPUY

JUDGE AWN AL-KHASAWNEH

PROFESSOR DR GERHARD HAFNER

JUDGE STEPHEN M SCHWEBEL

PROFESSOR W MICHAEL REISMAN

BETWEEN:

THE GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN and

THE SUDAN PEOPLE'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT/ARMY

AMBASSADOR MOHAMED AHMED DIRDEIRY of Dirdeiry & Co,
PROFESSOR JAMES CRAWFORD SC of Matrix Chambers,
PROFESSOR ALAIN PELLET of University of Paris Ouest,
MR RODMAN BUNDY and MS LORETTA MALINTOPPI of Eversheds LLP
appeared on behalf of the Government of Sudan.

DR RIEK MACHAR TENY, GARY BORN, WENDY MILES, of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP, PAUL R WILLIAMS and VANESSA JIMÉNEZ of Public International Law & Policy Group appeared on behalf of the SPLM/A.

REGISTRY: JUDITH LEVINE, Registrar and legal counsel, ALOYSIUS LLAMZON, acting Registrar and legal counsel, PAUL-JEAN LE CANNU, legal counsel, appeared for the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

Transcript produced by Trevor McGowan
Tel: +33 (0)6 98 26 34 44
info@TMGreporting.com

09:03 1	Wednesday, 22nd April 2009	09:01	1	of the Kiir.
2	(8.59 am)		2	Again, this does take a degree of what I have
3	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born will finish his presentation.		3	referred to openly as detective work, one has to look at
4	Submissions by MR BORN (continued)		4	the documents, but one can't just pretend that that
5	MR BORN: Yes, Mr President, thank you and good morning.		5	work, that analysis, doesn't need to be done. One does
6	You will recall that I finished yesterday discussing		6	need to do it.
7	one of Wilkinson's treks.		7	The Government, when it engages in the effort,
8	In 1903, going back to the pre-1905 Condominium		8	suggests that Mahon really was an enthusiastic trekker
9	record, Mahon, the Governor of Kordofan, again toured		9	and therefore that he made a big loop to the west of
10	Kordofan, and again in the dry season, of course. His		10	Um Semima, and that therefore when he said he went west
11	record, or the account of his trek, is in Sudan		11	it really meant east. I would suggest to you that that
12	Intelligence Report No. 104 which you can see on the		12	makes no sense.
13 14	screen. This report debunks another one of the Government's earlier claims, namely that Sultan Rob		13	When you look at Mahon's report, he describes quite
15	lived to the south of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab in 1905.		14 15	carefully the directions that he takes. He refers to going southeast, to northeast, to southwest at various
16	You can see on the current slide and I'm sorry		15 16	points in his point. I therefore suggest that when he
17	for the previous misreference the Government's		10 17	described going west to Sultan Rob's village, it is very
18	statement that Sultan Rob was there, the Ngok Dinka's		18	clear that he was going to the new village at Burakol.
19	paramount chief, his village was to the south of the		19	Mahon's report then goes on to describe how he
20	river in Bahr el Ghazal. In the wet season he went		20	arrested an Arab sheikh on his return to Bahr el Homr,
21	south to the River Lol, not north; we have seen that's		21	and this was returning north from Sultan Rob's place.
22	wrong. But the other part of the sentence is also		22	The MENAS report confirms and I think
23	wrong, as we will see.		23	Professor Crawford's reference yesterday to the dominant
24	In his 1903 trek Mahon travelled from Muglad, in the		24	usage of the words "Bahr el Homr" as referring to the
25	north of course, through Turda to Fauwel, which were		25	Ngol makes it fairly clear that in this dry-season
	norm of course, amough 1 man to 1 mm or, which were			1.got mands it tailly blom — time in this dry boulson
	Page 1			Page 3
09:00 1	both, as we know, north of the Ngol. He then turned	09:03	1	visit Mahon arrested the Arab sheikh on the Ngol.
2	west and headed towards what he called Sultan Rob's, and		2	That's the only reference that one could have been
3	he describes his trip as well. Now Sudan Intelligence		3	making if one was going north, the only river that one
4	Report No. 104 is on the screen. He says:		4	could have been referring to if one was going north from
5	"I next went west to Sultan Rob's and was well		5	Burakol on the northern side of the Kiir. The river
6	received"		6	that one come to would be what is today the Ngol, and
7	He presented a second-class robe of honour. He		7	that would be where he found an Arab sheikh and arrested
8	described the Dinka, and at the end he noted, consistent		8	the sheikh; in the dry season, which is exactly
9	with the other things that we have seen, they have large		9	consistent with the evidence we've previously discussed
10	herds of cattle.		10	of the Messiriya coming south during the dry season to
11	When Mahon reports that he travelled west from		11	graze on the Ngol. That makes perfect sense of the
12	Fauwel and Um Semima to Sultan Rob's Sultan Rob's		12	documents.
13	village it's clear that Sultan Rob had to have been		13	The third pre-1905 Condominium report that I'd like
14	located in what's called the village of Burakol. You		14	to look at was by Captain Percival of the Arab Mounted
15	can see that on the current map.		15	Infantry, also called the Camel Corps. The full account
16	When you leave Um Semima, Sultan Rob's old village		16	of this report, it's a dry season December 1904 trek,
17	at Mathiang, south of the Kiir, is at least due south		17	and you can find the full account of his trek in
18	and frankly southeast from where you began. In		18	Gleichen's 1905 compendium.
19	contrast, Sultan Rob's new village at Burakol is to the		19 20	This report provides very clear evidence of
20 21	southwest, clearly to the southwest of Fauwel and Um Semima.		20 21	substantial numbers of Ngok Dinka settlements well to the north of the Kiir, as well as indirect but I would
21 22	Mahon's description of Sultan Rob's village being to		21 22	suggest powerful evidence of Ngok Dinka to the north of
23	the west is thus much more consistent with Sultan Rob		23	the Ngol.
23	being where he had been reported to be before namely at		23 24	You can see on the current slide an excerpt of
25	Burakol, north of the Kiir, and not at Mathiang, south		2 4 25	Percival's trek notes, which are arranged on a daily
23	2 manos, norm of the thir, and not at maintaing, south			2 2.2.7 m 5 dok notes, which are aranged on a dairy
	Page 2			Page 4

09:04 1	basis. He would describe what it was he encountered,	09:07 1	going to see explicit reference to how that occurred.
2	typically, as you can see, in very short, terse accounts	2	Indeed, when we read Percival's notes with care
3	but what he encountered each day of his trip.	3	and the Government prefers not to; it prefers to pluck
4	When you look on the trek notes what you see is that	4	out snippets, soundbites if you will, and say,
5	a few days' journey from Lake Keilak up in the north he	5	"Uninhabited, therefore no Ngok" but Percival goes on
6	struck "what I take to be the Bahr el Arab". In fact	6	and only a few miles from where he had described the
7	and it is, I think, now agreed by everyone the only	7	area as uninhabited he says he encountered some
8	river that Percival could have struck here was the Ngol,	8	Ngok Dinka. He wrote:
9	not the Kiir. When he referred to the Bahr el Arab	9	"I surprised them and they thought we were Arabs
10	here, it's common ground that this was not the	10	raiding"
11	Kiir/Bahr el Arab in today's parlance, but rather the	11	That's not surprising; it was the Arab Mounted
12	Ngol.	12	Infantry, and there was a history of slave raiding and
13	That's confirmed in the MENAS report and I think it	13	cattle raiding in that area. It's not surprising that
14	was confirmed yesterday by Mr MacDonald. I would	14	the way that he found the Ngok Dinka was by surprising
15	underscore that that's different from the Government's	15	them. If they knew he was coming, they would hide.
16	initial submissions, as well as its submissions before	16	
17	the ABC.	17	" but I found them friendly and obtained
18	It's not surprising, of course, that Percival would	18	
19	have had this view; it's exactly the view that Wilkinson	19	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
20	had the previous year. We need to read Percival's	20	
21	report with some care, and I'll try to do that and I'll	21	early Condominium reports such as they are and there
22	work through it with you, but when you do read it and	22	
23	you read it with care, I think it provides powerful	23	particular areas is that the Ngok hid, for very good
24	evidence of where the Ngok were to the north of the Kiir	24	
25	and inferential and indirect but nonetheless powerful	25	Second, it could well be it's not clear because
	Page 5		Page 7
	C		Ç
09:06 1	evidence of where the Ngok were north of the Ngol.	09:08 1	this is a terse and fragmentary report that when
2	When he reached the Ngol, Percival noted:	2	Percival described the river as being uninhabited, he
3	"I have been some miles up and down the river but	3	meant the banks of the river rather than the areas set
4	can find no trace of inhabitants. The country between	4	slightly back from the river.
5	here and the jebels would appear to be uninhabited"	5	Indeed that's consistent with the environmental
6	And Professor Crawford and the Government of course	6	evidence, which indicates that the Ngok would not build
7	seized on that.	7	permanent settlements right on the river. Why wouldn't
8	The fact that Percival found the banks of the Ngol	8	they do that? Because, as we saw previously, there's
9	uninhabited during the dry season is in some tension, of	9	seasonal flooding. If you build your houses on the
10	course, with the reports from Mahon and Wilkinson, who	10	* *
11	had said they had encountered villagers coming south	11	
12	from the Ngol, between the Ngol and the Kiir.	12	
13	There are various explanations for that. One can't	13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
14	be positive based on these somewhat fragmentary reports,	14	•
15	but one has to think about it and try to explain it.	15	
16	One explanation is that Percival was leading, as we've	16	
17	seen, the Arab Mounted Infantry.	17	
18 19	It was a substantial contingent, 40 men or so with rifles on camels and horses and mules. It was	18 19	* * *
20	a formidable force for rural villagers in small villages	20	
20	when the major part of the population not all of	20	you go on and read two other aspects of his reports
22	them, but a major part of the population, the males	21 22	
23	were to the south with their cattle herds. It would not	23	•
	were to the south with their cathe herus. It would not		
2/	he surprising if local villagers were afraid of that	7/1	First Percival reports seeing a fire not for from
24 25	be surprising if local villagers were afraid of that Arab Mounted Infantry and chose not and indeed we're	24 25	
24 25	be surprising if local villagers were afraid of that Arab Mounted Infantry and chose not and indeed we're	25	

09:09 1	an element of detective work, but it's common ground	09:12 1	encountering, more accurately Dinkas who were driving
2	I think on both sides that the fire, during this time of	2	cattle south, as hard as they could. This is at a place
3	the year, when there were no clouds, no thunderstorms,	3	called Amakok, not far from the Ngol river.
4	would have had human origins.	4	That's very important. It explains who made the
5	The question therefore is: what caused the fire?	5	cattle tracks: the Ngok Dinka cattle made the cattle
6	It's not a question one should dismiss as speculation;	6	tracks. The Government's speculation that maybe it was
7	it's a question that has to be answered. That's one of	7	the Messiriya cattle is completely unsupported. There's
8	the reasons ABC experts were selected, scientific	8	no reference to any Messiriya, much less any Messiriya
9	experts.	9	cattle in Percival's description here.
10	The answer to the question of what caused the	10	He described Messiriya much further up in the north
11	fire and this is a question that one does indeed have	11	when he began his trek, but not here. The reason is
12	to answer. If one is going to rely on these documents,	12	obvious: they hadn't gotten here because this wasn't the
13	one has to understand why it is that Percival saw	13	time that their seasonal migration would have gotten
14	a fire. The reason that Percival saw a fire is because	14	them to this particular area. Precisely consistent with
15	the Ngok Dinka back-burn their crops at the end of the	15	that, Percival describes seeing Dinka driving their
16	growing season.	16	cattle south as hard as they could.
17	There is the description of that sort of	17	That tells us something else, though, when we think
18	agricultural practice. It's one of the reasons that	18	about it in the context of the environmental evidence.
19	I spent a lot of time on environmental evidence, which	19	If the Dinka were driving their cattle south as hard as
20	might have seemed a little bit esoteric, but one of the	20	they could, where were they coming from? They were
21	reasons I spent the time with that evidence is because	21	headed south. That means they were coming from the
22	it is necessary in order to explain an otherwise	22	north. What does that mean? That means there were
23	lifeless and abstract written record.	23	Dinka up there in the north.
24	So when Percival describes the fire, he must be	24	I can't tell you exactly where the Dinka were, but
25	referring to Ngok Dinka engaging in their traditional	25	I can tell you that driving their cattle south as hard
	Page 9		Page 11
			•
09:10 1	agricultural practice of burning the harvested crops off	09:13 1	as they could puts their permanent villages, from which
2	their fields.	2	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above
2 3	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire	2 3	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the
2 3 4	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It	2 3 4	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as
2 3 4 5	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the	2 3 4 5	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more
2 3 4 5 6	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's	2 3 4 5 6	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits
2 3 4 5 6 7	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields.	2 3 4 5 6 7	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make sense of what Percival actually reported.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol. Percival then continued southwest, and he reached
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make sense of what Percival actually reported. Percival cited cattle tracks on the Ngol river. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol. Percival then continued southwest, and he reached a village that he called Achak. He said he reached it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make sense of what Percival actually reported. Percival cited cattle tracks on the Ngol river. The Government says: those cattle tracks could have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol. Percival then continued southwest, and he reached a village that he called Achak. He said he reached it after passing through cattle grazing country; Ngok
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make sense of what Percival actually reported. Percival cited cattle tracks on the Ngol river. The Government says: those cattle tracks could have been either Messiriya or Ngok cattle. It's important though	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol. Percival then continued southwest, and he reached a village that he called Achak. He said he reached it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make sense of what Percival actually reported. Percival cited cattle tracks on the Ngol river. The Government says: those cattle tracks could have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol. Percival then continued southwest, and he reached a village that he called Achak. He said he reached it after passing through cattle grazing country; Ngok cattle grazing country. That's part of where those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make sense of what Percival actually reported. Percival cited cattle tracks on the Ngol river. The Government says: those cattle tracks could have been either Messiriya or Ngok cattle. It's important though to look at what Percival actually reported, and this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol. Percival then continued southwest, and he reached a village that he called Achak. He said he reached it after passing through cattle grazing country; Ngok cattle grazing country. That's part of where those 60,000 cows we heard reference to would be grazing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make sense of what Percival actually reported. Percival cited cattle tracks on the Ngol river. The Government says: those cattle tracks could have been either Messiriya or Ngok cattle. It's important though to look at what Percival actually reported, and this is just next to the area that he described as uninhabited. He described encountering or one of his parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol. Percival then continued southwest, and he reached a village that he called Achak. He said he reached it after passing through cattle grazing country; Ngok cattle grazing country. That's part of where those 60,000 cows we heard reference to would be grazing. It's part of what Mahon referred to as "large herds of cattle"; that's where they would be grazing. Again,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their fields. The Government suggests that: well, maybe this fire was caused by the Messiriya. It doesn't work. It doesn't work at all. Why doesn't it work? Because the Messiriya farm up in the north above the goz. That's where they would back-burn their fields. It therefore makes no sense at all to suggest that the Messiriya, who hadn't even begun their trek south out of the goz to this part of the Bahr at that time of the year, would be burning their fields, which don't even exist in this area at that time of the year. What had to be happening was that the Ngok Dinka were back-burning their fields. The same evidence, the same report, compels that conclusion when you look at cattle tracks. Again, the Government will no doubt say that I'm engaged in undue detective work. But one has to make sense of what Percival actually reported. Percival cited cattle tracks on the Ngol river. The Government says: those cattle tracks could have been either Messiriya or Ngok cattle. It's important though to look at what Percival actually reported, and this is just next to the area that he described as uninhabited.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they were coming on their seasonal migrations, up above the Ngol; which is why Percival saw cattle tracks on the Ngol. Those were Dinka cattle tracks coming south as hard as they could to get down to where there was more water. That is a consistent explanation that fits precisely with the environmental evidence, and it's one of the reasons that I took you to the environmental evidence. I would suggest also that it is the first in a number of rather clear documentary indications that, contrary to what Professor Crawford told you, there's no evidence at all of the Ngok being around the Ngol, much less to the north of the Ngol. Here, when you actually read the record with some sensitivity, in light of what the environmental evidence shows about these people's lifestyles, there were Ngok not just on the Ngol, but coming hard south from above the Ngol. Percival then continued southwest, and he reached a village that he called Achak. He said he reached it after passing through cattle grazing country; Ngok cattle grazing country. That's part of where those 60,000 cows we heard reference to would be grazing. It's part of what Mahon referred to as "large herds of

09:14 1	this is well to the north of the Kiir, it's 11 miles	09:17 1	already seen that. So what Sultan Rob is doing is
2	north of the Kiir at this point. And he describes	2	saying to Percival, "The place where you saw the Ngok
3	Achak, a Ngok village, as a "biggish" village.	3	driving their cattle south, and where you saw the fires,
4	He then proceeded south from Achak another 11 miles	4	that's really uninhabited." And the Government seizes
5	until he reached the Kiir. Then he headed northwest to	5	on that and says, "Ah ha, look, there are only Arabs
6	its junction with the Yamoi, also called the Nyamora,	6	living around the Ngol".
7	and proceeded up the Yamoi through what he called	7	Let's look carefully at why Sultan Rob would have
8	"another village" and I've lost track of quite how	8	said that. The Government criticised him to
9	many Ngok villages he's gone through, but it's a number	9	an extent or criticised us, frankly for us putting
10	here and proceeded via Bongo to village Burakol to	10	forward a Ngok witness who was dissembling. Let's look
11	where Sultan Rob is at present living.	11	at why he did that.
12	This again is Percival in 1904, which fits precisely	12	In March 1906 Huntley Walsh gave a lengthy
13	with Mahon in the previous year, and with Wilkinson in	13	description of an encounter with Sultan Rob. He said:
14	the year before. And that is a consistent pattern of	14	"For some reason Sultan Rob did all he could do to
15	citing Sultan Rob three times to the north of the Kiir	15	prevent my going up the Kiir."
16	in a short period of time in the same years before 1905.	16	Sultan Rob's efforts to prevent Huntley-Walsh from
17	The Government makes the argument that I confess	17	exploring his territory continued, and I think it's
18	I've never fully understood that Burakol isn't the same	18	worth your reading it on the slide, and then me
19	as Abyei, and that it wasn't in the same place. It says	19	emphasising some points:
20	instead: well, actually there are two or three places	20	"Among other things he told me that none of his men
21	that are two and a half or three and a half miles apart.	21	knew the river, which afterwards they proved to know
22	I think in fact, when you look at all the various	22	very well."
23	distances, it's a much smaller area. And this indicates	23	He then sent a man to guide Huntley Walsh. The man
24	where Percival found Sultan Rob: you can see the places	24	pretended not to know anything and then guided him up
25	on the map, and Ms Miles nicely took Mr MacDonald	25	a false canyon into a dead end. Then at the end
	Page 13		Page 15
09:16 1	through this.	09:19 1	Huntley-Walsh drew a conclusion:
2	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was	2	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have
2 3	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If	2 3	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi,
2 3 4	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no	2 3 4	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and
2 3 4 5	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental	2 3 4 5	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit]
2 3 4 5 6	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre	2 3 4 5 6	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead
2 3 4 5 6 7	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount	2 3 4 5 6 7	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his people spread out in a large band to the north	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular places, he probably meant the opposite. He wanted to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his people spread out in a large band to the north throughout the Bahr region, which was precisely suited	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular places, he probably meant the opposite. He wanted to direct the Condominium officials, who were with the Arab
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his people spread out in a large band to the north throughout the Bahr region, which was precisely suited to their culture.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular places, he probably meant the opposite. He wanted to direct the Condominium officials, who were with the Arab Mounted Infantry, with the history of slave raiding in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his people spread out in a large band to the north throughout the Bahr region, which was precisely suited to their culture. Percival also recounts and the Government put some emphasis on this yesterday that Sultan Rob told him that the Bahr el Arab is uninhabited, except for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular places, he probably meant the opposite. He wanted to direct the Condominium officials, who were with the Arab Mounted Infantry, with the history of slave raiding in the region, away from his people. He did it to protect his people. It was a noble statement even if he dissembled.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his people spread out in a large band to the north throughout the Bahr region, which was precisely suited to their culture. Percival also recounts and the Government put some emphasis on this yesterday that Sultan Rob told him that the Bahr el Arab is uninhabited, except for occasional parties of wandered Arabs. As we know, when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular places, he probably meant the opposite. He wanted to direct the Condominium officials, who were with the Arab Mounted Infantry, with the history of slave raiding in the region, away from his people. He did it to protect his people. It was a noble statement even if he dissembled. It is important to understand that, though, because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his people spread out in a large band to the north throughout the Bahr region, which was precisely suited to their culture. Percival also recounts and the Government put some emphasis on this yesterday that Sultan Rob told him that the Bahr el Arab is uninhabited, except for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular places, he probably meant the opposite. He wanted to direct the Condominium officials, who were with the Arab Mounted Infantry, with the history of slave raiding in the region, away from his people. He did it to protect his people. It was a noble statement even if he dissembled.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his people spread out in a large band to the north throughout the Bahr region, which was precisely suited to their culture. Percival also recounts and the Government put some emphasis on this yesterday that Sultan Rob told him that the Bahr el Arab is uninhabited, except for occasional parties of wandered Arabs. As we know, when he referred to the Bahr el Arab he meant the Ngol; we've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular places, he probably meant the opposite. He wanted to direct the Condominium officials, who were with the Arab Mounted Infantry, with the history of slave raiding in the region, away from his people. He did it to protect his people. It was a noble statement even if he dissembled. It is important to understand that, though, because when you seek to rely on statements from him that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But it frankly doesn't matter whether Burakol was one mile or two miles from present-day Abyei Town. If you tried to locate the heart of Rome or Paris, it no doubt has moved a mile or two miles. The fundamental point is: this was a rural agrarian people; the centre of their culture at that point, where their paramount chief was located, was in a little cluster of villages. The people were spread out widely throughout the Bahr, as we've seen from the evidence from the environmental evidence, from Percival, and from the other evidence, and as we're going to see from Cunnison. But where their paramount chief had his seat, and where the trade centre was, was in this cluster above the Kiir. The fact that it might have moved a mile this way or that way is neither here nor there. That was where the paramount chief had his seat at the time, with his people spread out in a large band to the north throughout the Bahr region, which was precisely suited to their culture. Percival also recounts and the Government put some emphasis on this yesterday that Sultan Rob told him that the Bahr el Arab is uninhabited, except for occasional parties of wandered Arabs. As we know, when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"I fancy that the latter [Sultan Rob] must have given him [the guide] orders to do so. Both Bimbashi, Bayldon and I have proved that Sultan Rob is a liar, and we have both found that [and this is the important bit] he does all that he can to hinder and mislead expeditions sent to discover facts concerning this part of the country." I would suggest, contrary to the Government's insinuations that there was something wrong with this, this was entirely understandable. It made perfect sense. Of course Sultan Rob wanted to protect his people. I won't sit here and judge I know you won't either his motives for doing that. What's important is that when he told things to the Condominium officials, that in no way means that they are true. When he said Ngok weren't in particular places, he probably meant the opposite. He wanted to direct the Condominium officials, who were with the Arab Mounted Infantry, with the history of slave raiding in the region, away from his people. He did it to protect his people. It was a noble statement even if he dissembled. It is important to understand that, though, because

09:20 1 were only wandered parties of Arabs somewhere, it in no 2 way reflects where the Ngok really were. On the 3 contrary, it suggests that they were exactly there, and 4 just like he told the guide to lead the Condominium 5 officials away from where the Ngok were, that statement 6 in all likelihood was meant to conceal where the Ngok were located. 8 It's also important to look at the maps that 9 Percival produced. The Government just to disclose just 10 one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took 11 a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down 12 to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he 13 started. 14 The Government has only disclosed part of that full 15 sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, 16 in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes 17 further south. What the Government discloses, 18 therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of 19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of 20 the Abyei Area that the Government says didn't have any 19:20 and 19:20 to Mar MacDonald through those and to. Ms Miles took Mr MacDonald through those and to. Ms Miles took Mr MacDonald through those and to. Ms Miles took Mr MacDonald through those and to to. Ms Miles took Mr MacDonald through those and to and all able to deny that those are very likely depictions of Ngok villages clustered in that region. 1 would also say that the fact and not that there are very few very, very few Ngok villages south of the Kiir on this map; even though it is a map that is focused on the Kiir going south, very few Ngok 10 willages. The reason I would suggest is on the next 11 slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the 12 this region: the Twic live south of the Kiir. 13 Another fundamental problem with the Government 14 Case is: if it's the Ngok who really live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the 15 Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live south of the Kiir on the Government's case gets mighty crowded
3 contrary, it suggests that they were exactly there, and 4 just like he told the guide to lead the Condominium 5 officials away from where the Ngok were, that statement 6 in all likelihood was meant to conceal where the Ngok 7 were located. 7 south of the Kiir on this map; even though it is a map 8 It's also important to look at the maps that 9 Percival produced. The Government just to disclose just 10 one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took 11 a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down 12 to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he 13 started. 14 The Government has only disclosed part of that full 15 sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, 16 in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes 17 further south. What the Government discloses, 18 therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of 19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of
4 just like he told the guide to lead the Condominium 5 officials away from where the Ngok were, that statement 6 in all likelihood was meant to conceal where the Ngok 7 were located. 8 It's also important to look at the maps that 9 Percival produced. The Government just to disclose just 10 one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took 11 a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down 12 to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he 13 started. 14 The Government has only disclosed part of that full 15 sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, 16 in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes 17 further south. What the Government discloses, 18 therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of 19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of
5 officials away from where the Ngok were, that statement 6 in all likelihood was meant to conceal where the Ngok 7 were located. 8 It's also important to look at the maps that 9 Percival produced. The Government just to disclose just 10 one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took 11 a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down 12 to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he 13 started. 14 The Government has only disclosed part of that full 15 sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, 16 in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes 17 further south. What the Government discloses, 18 therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of 19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of
in all likelihood was meant to conceal where the Ngok were located. It's also important to look at the maps that Percival produced. The Government just to disclose just one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he The Government has only disclosed part of that full The Government has only disclosed part of that full sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes further south. What the Government discloses, there are very few very, very few Ngok villages south of the Kiir on this map; even though it is a map that is focused on the Kiir on the Kiir on the Kiir down that is focused on the Kiir on this map; even though it is a map that is focused on the Kiir on this map; even though it is a map villages. Percival produced. The Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the slide. It is a slide from the
were located. It's also important to look at the maps that Percival produced. The Government just to disclose just one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took look at the maps that one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took look at the maps that one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took look at the maps that villages. The reason I would suggest is on the next slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look aren't alone in to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he started. The Government has only disclosed part of that full The Government has only disclosed part of that full sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes further south. What the Government discloses, therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of south of the Kiir on this map; even though it is a map that is focused on the Kiir going south, very few Ngok villages. The reason I would suggest is on the next look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the look slide. It is a slide fr
8 It's also important to look at the maps that 9 Percival produced. The Government just to disclose just 10 one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took 11 a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down 12 to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he 13 started. 14 The Government has only disclosed part of that full 15 sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, 16 in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes 17 further south. What the Government discloses, 18 therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of 19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of 8 that is focused on the Kiir going south, very few Ngok 9 villages. The reason I would suggest is on the next 10 slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the 11 area of the Twic. Remember the Ngok aren't alone in 12 this region: the Twic live south of the Kiir. 13 Another fundamental problem with the Government 14 case is: if it's the Ngok who really live only south of 15 the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the 16 Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live south of the Kiir 17 south of the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir 18 on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's full 19 of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
Percival produced. The Government just to disclose just one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he started. The Government has only disclosed part of that full sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes further south. What the Government discloses, the reason I would suggest is on the next slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the area of the Twic. Remember the Ngok aren't alone in this region: the Twic live south of the Kiir. Another fundamental problem with the Government case is: if it's the Ngok who really live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live south of the Kiir. Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live south of the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's full the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of
one part of Percival's full sketch map. Percival took 11 a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down 12 to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he 13 started. 14 The Government has only disclosed part of that full 15 sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, 16 in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes 17 further south. What the Government discloses, 18 therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of 19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of 10 slide. It is a slide from the Government that shows the 11 area of the Twic. Remember the Ngok aren't alone in 12 this region: the Twic live south of the Kiir. 13 Another fundamental problem with the Government 14 case is: if it's the Ngok who really live only south of 15 the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the 16 Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live 17 south of the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir 18 on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's full 19 of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
a long trek, as we've seen, coming from Lake Keilak down to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he started. The Government has only disclosed part of that full sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes further south. What the Government discloses, therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of area of the Twic. Remember the Ngok aren't alone in this region: the Twic live south of the Kiir. Another fundamental problem with the Government case is: if it's the Ngok who really live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live south of the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's ful of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
to Sultan Rob and then going back up to where he started. The Government has only disclosed part of that full sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes further south. What the Government discloses, therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of this region: the Twic live south of the Kiir. Another fundamental problem with the Government taken and the Twic live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live south of the Kiir. The Government has only disclosed part of that full the Kiir region: the Twic live south of the Kiir. The Government and the Government of the Kiir and Ngok who really live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the The Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live the Kiir, be not of the Kiir. The Government has only disclosed part of that full the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the The Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the The Government tells you where the Twic live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the The Government tells you where the Twic live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the The Government tells you where the Twic live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the The Government tells you where the Twic live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the The Government tells you where the Twic live only south of the Kiir, on the Government tells you where the Twic live? The Government
13 Another fundamental problem with the Government 14 The Government has only disclosed part of that full 15 sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, 16 in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes 17 further south. What the Government discloses, 18 therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of 19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of 13 Another fundamental problem with the Government 14 case is: if it's the Ngok who really live only south of 15 the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the 16 Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live 17 south of the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir 18 on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's ful 19 of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
The Government has only disclosed part of that full sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes further south. What the Government discloses, therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of 14 case is: if it's the Ngok who really live only south of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic li south of the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's ful of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
sketch map, and that is the part that begins at Burakol, in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes further south. What the Government discloses, therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of the Kiir, where do the Twic live? Actually the Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twic live is on the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's ful of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
in the southern part of where Percival trekked, and goes further south. What the Government discloses, therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of Government tells you where the Twic live: the Twi
further south. What the Government discloses, 17 south of the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir 18 therefore, omits the sketch map for the area north of 19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of 17 south of the Kiir. Frankly, the area south of the Kiir 18 on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's ful 19 of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of 18 on the Government's case gets mighty crowded, it's ful 19 of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
19 the Kiir, north of Burakol, up to Keilak; the part of 19 of Twic and Ngok, while the area north of the Kiir is
20 the Abyei Area that the Government says didn't have any 20 dead empty.
y and the second and
21 Ngok in it. 21 I would suggest to you that both of those
The Government has not disclosed those parts of the 22 propositions are completely improbable. The Twic and
23 sketch map, notwithstanding our requests and 23 the Ngok Dinka don't live cheek-to-jowl in Condomini
24 notwithstanding your order; notably those parts of the 24 high-rises south of the Kiir, nor is the area north of
25 sketch map which show what it was that Percival reported 25 the Kiir dead empty.
Page 17 Page 19
Tage 17
09:22 1 in those areas. Look at what the Government did: it 09:24 1 It's rather just as the environmental evidence
2 disclosed the part of the sketch map beneath the Kiir 2 suggests: the Ngok lived predominantly north of the
3 and said, "Ah ha, there are Ngok beneath the Kiir". It 3 Kiir. There are few villages, as the maps showed, just
4 did not disclose the part of the sketch map above the 4 south of the Kiir, and then the Twic occupied the major
5 Kiir and it now argues that there is no evidence that 5 area between the Kiir and the Lol, while the Ngok occ
6 the Ngok were above the Kiir. 6 the area of the Bahr extending up to the goz.
7 I would suggest that that use of the document, 7 Let's go on to the next trek by Percival in
8 submission of part of the document and not the whole 8 March 1905. He went from Wau to Taufikia in Upper
9 document, does not provide a basis for concluding that 9 and that trek included a lot of areas not in the Abyei
there weren't Ngok up there. I would suggest, on the 10 Area but some that are, and it's reported in Sudan
11 contrary, that it provides a very powerful negative 11 Intelligence Report No. 130. He described, and this is
12 inference that just as Percival reported that he 12 just briefly, that:
encountered Ngok driving cattle just south of the Ngol 13 "Sultan Rob appears to exercise a certain amount of
14 and cattle tracks from Ngok cattle on the Ngol, that 14 authority over a large area of country, extending from
those sketch maps which the Government and you can the Shilluk's boundary in the east to the Chak Chak
16 see it listed on the Government's own index that 16 boundary in the west, with the Bahr el Arab as his Ara
17 those sketch maps which were taken and which existed 17 frontier on the north and the Lol River both banks and
18 showed the Ngok in exactly those places. 18 the Bahr el Ghazal in the south."
19 I'd like to move on. Even the partial sketch map 19 It's clear that when Percival referred to the
that the Government does disclose clearly identifies 20 Ngol/Ragaba ez Zarga, he did so by reference to the te
21 a number of villages. Note this is just the bottom part 21 Bahr el Arab, and that is both confirmed by the MENA
22 of Percival's sketch map, just the southern part, but 22 report and acknowledged by the Government. Thus w
23 even that part shows a whole cluster of villages to 24 event had part shows a whole cluster of villages to 25 Percival surmised that the Bahr el Arab is Sultan Rob's
24 north of the Kiir. 24 Arab frontier he is referring to the Ngol, not the
25 It's a little difficult to note on the slides, but 25 Kiir/Bahr el Arab.
Page 18 Page 20

,			
09:26 1	It's again essential to note here and I've said	09:28 1	the tableland where good grazing and pastureland
2	that one has to view these documents with care that	2	terminate."
3	this was a dry-season observation. This was not	3	Based on that quotation, which is in a chapter
4	a wet-season observation. The Condominium officials	4	describing the Bahr el Ghazal region, the Government
5	never went there in the wet season.	5	claimed: no Dinkas are mentioned living in the province
6	So what he's saying is that there are Ngok Dinka	6	of Kordofan, ie to the north of the Bahr el Arab. You
7	going up to the Bahr el Arab, the Ngol, which is	7	can see the citations on your slide. I would suggest
8	precisely consistent with his reporting not that this	8	that is completely misleading. When you look carefully
9	territory is uninhabited but that he encountered lots of	9	at Gleichen, which was a compendium of what had been
10	Ngok villages between the Kiir and the Ngol and that he	10	produced in the preceding seven years since 1898, it
11	encountered Ngok cattle herders driving their cattle	11	powerfully supports everything that I have just been
12	south as hard as they could from the Ngol.	12	saying.
13	What does that mean about the wet season? What it	13	The passage that the Government cites is firstly
14 15	means by the wet season is that the Ngok were to the	14 15	a general reference to the Dinka. But more importantly,
15 16	north of the Ngol during the wet season, where he didn't go and which he couldn't know about.	16	it is a geographical and environmental reference there. The reference to the southern limit, the reference to
17	So his reference to the boundary as a dry-season	17	
17	boundary is precisely consistent with the environmental	18	where good grazing and pastureland terminate, is a reference to geographical and environmental features,
19	evidence and precisely contrary to the Government's	19	and it is precisely consistent with what Cunnison
20	case.	20	described and what was described in all the
20	It's also useful to note that Percival and this	20	environmental evidence.
22	is a little more general refers to Sultan Rob's	22	It describes the Dinka extending up to where good
23	territory as a large area of country; he doesn't refer	23	pastureland and grazing stop, and that is the Bahr
24	to it as a 14-mile strip squeezed in along the southern	24	region. It's an area that is well watered, where the
25	bank of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab. He also refers to it	25	soil is fertile. That is the area that the Gleichen
23		23	
	Page 21		Page 23
09:27 1	extending far to the east and far to the west. Frankly,	09:30 1	compendium, in the very quotation that the Government
2	the boundaries that he describes go beyond those	2	relies on, refers to.
3	identified by the ABC experts in both the east and the	3	More importantly, what the Government doesn't refer
4	west.	4	you to in Gleichen is even more important. Gleichen's
5	Finally, note that I have spent time going through	5	compendium also describes specifically the Ngok Dinka.
6	the entire pre-1905 Condominium record. It is basically	6	It says, and this is in 1905:
7	three people: Mahon, Percival and Wilkinson. Those	7	"Sultan Rob and Dar Jange belonging to Kordofan,
8	sources require careful attention. When you give them	8	with the southern boundary of Kordofan extending
9	careful attention I would suggest that they lead to	9	southwards to the Bahr el Arab, leaving the Maalia and
10	a relatively strong conclusion which is precisely	10	the Rizeigat to Darfur, and the Homr and Dar Jange to
11	consistent with what the ABC experts found and what the	11	Kordofan."
12	environmental evidence shows.	12	What that does is it puts the southern boundary of
13	But I would like to go on to one further document	13	Dar Jange on the Bahr el Arab. That is precisely
14	which the Government omitted from its discussion. This	14	consistent with all the evidence we've been discussing.
15	is Gleichen's 1905 compendium, which I think qualifies	15	It has the Dar Jange, the Ngok Dinka, living in the Bahr
16	pretty much as a pre-1905 document.	16	region, to the north of the Bahr el Arab. Their
17	You will recall at the Tribunal's first procedural	17	southern boundary here in Gleichen, in the passage that
18	meeting that Professor Crawford spent some time talking	18	specifically refers to them, is put on the Bahr el Arab.
19	to you about Gleichen's 1905 compendium. He emphasised	19	The Government has it exactly backwards, and that's
20	its importance. It seemed to have lost importance in	20	why I talked to you about the Twic. The Government has
21	the Government's presentation. Their memorial recited	21	it backwards: the Ngok lived down to the Kiir and
22	a passage that refers to the Bahr el Ghazal region, and	22	a little bit south; the Twic lived south of the Kiir.
23	they in particular relied on a passage that said:	23	That is what Gleichen said in 1905 in the one
24 25	"The Dinkas occupy the lowlands in the north of Bahr el Ghazal, their southern limit being the edge of	24 25	pre-1905 document that the Government doesn't want to talk to you about. Again, that's precisely consistent
23	Dani Ci Onazai, inch southern mint being the eage of	23	taik to you about. Again, that's precisely consistent
	Page 22		Page 24

,			
09:31 1	with what Professor Cunnison and Professor Allan told	09:34 1	The phrase "Dar Jange" does not mean "the territory of
2	you about the environmental evidence.	2	the Ngok"; it means "the territory of the Dinka".
3	The Gleichen compendium also included a map, and we	3	It's a general phrase.
4	can see that here, and we're going to blow it up.	4	MR BORN: Mr Chairman, I never once interrupted the
5	You'll remember we looked at this with Mr MacDonald.	5	Government's presentations
6	The map has descriptions of the Dar Jange; you can see	6	PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Well, I will on this occasion because
7	it down there. The Bahr el Arab is of course the	7	that's an outrageous remark.
8	Kiir I'm sorry, is of course the Ngol; I've committed	8	MR BORN: and I would appreciate not being interrupted.
9	Wilkinson's mistake. The map again shows Sultan Rob	9	THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Born, go on.
10	extending up to the Ngol; it shows the Messiriya far to	10	
11	the north above the goz.	11	These two areas point towards the territory, as
12	That is it, members of the Tribunal, for the	12	I said, of the Ngok Dinka, and they're both well up in
13	pre-1905 record. As I've said, it's fairly limited, but	13	the north, well above the Abyei Area, and they point
14	it nonetheless allows us to draw a number of important	14	towards Ngok Dinka territory.
15	conclusions.	15	Lloyd also cites a report that says the southern
16	It places the Ngok with permanent villages,	16	boundary of Dar Homr is between the Bahr el Arab and the
17	prosperous agricultural fields, scattered throughout the	17	River Kiir, the latter being occupied by the Dinkas
18	Bahr region. It doesn't tell us exactly where they are;	18	under Sultan Rob. It's clear here, when he referred to
19	it's impossible given the nature of the record. But it	19	the Bahr el Arab, that he meant the Ngol, as we have
20	does tell you that they're definitely between the Ngol	20	seen, and not the Kiir, which he called the
21	and the Kiir, and it provides strong inferential	21	"River Kiir". That's the same terminology that
22	evidence that they're well to the north of the Ngol.	22	Wilkinson, Percival and Gleichen had all used in the
23	That's exactly the area that the Ngok had migrated	23	preceding years.
24	into; and the Government claims, without any support,	24	Thus what we have from Lloyd is the Messiriya going
25	they'd moved out of. The Condominium evidence shows you	25	no further south he talks about the Dar Homr's
	D 25		D 05
	Page 25		Page 27
09:33 1	that in fact they hadn't moved out of it; they were	09:35 1	grazing territory coming south no further south into
2	still there. Gleichen's compendium, which sums up what	2	
3	we know about the pre-1905 record, puts their southern	3	
4	boundary on the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, which makes perfect	4	
5	sense. It also puts Sultan Rob to the north of the	5	
6	Kiir/Bahr el Arab, in Burakol, from 1902 to 1905.	6	, ,
7	The pre-1905 Condominium records don't let us	7	·
8	identify every Ngok village, or all the Ngok territory,	8	
9	with precision. They couldn't; that's in the nature of	9	
10	the record. But they give us powerful evidence to	10	
11	support the SPLM/A's claim, and to completely contradict	11	
12	the Government's suggestion that the Ngok were either	12	
13	entirely or predominantly south of the Kiir. That makes	13	
14	no sense at all.	14	
15	As we will see, the post-1905 evidence, which we're	15	
16	now going to turn to, does that even more emphatically.	16	through Hallam's report. It's another instance where
17	What the post-1905 evidence shows is that the Ngok were	17	the Government has only provided partial copies of maps,
18	scattered widely throughout the Bahr, extending up to	18	
19	the goz.	19	reports. I would suggest in these circumstances it's
20	Let's start with Lloyd, who prepared a map in 1907	20	very difficult to draw conclusions about where the Ngok
21	which is on the current slide. It shows and it will	21	were not.
22	be highlighted for you that there were two references	22	I would also point out though that Hallam's map,
23	to Dar Jange, which means the territory of the Ngok.	23	
24	Again, these are limited references	24	
25	PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I'm sorry, sir, this is repeated.	25	Kuol Arop, was in Burakol, to the north of the river.
	Page 26		Page 28
	Page 26		rage 20

09:36 1	As we've seen, that's exactly what Percival and Mahon	09:39 1	First, if you look on the left, you will see something
2	had previously reported.	2	marked "cult", cultivation. That is a cultivated area.
3	The Government suggests that there are Arab	3	It is to the north of Koak, in the region of Nyama, to
4	settlements shown to the north of the Kiir here. That	4	the north of the Ngol. A cultivated area, and that's
5	is completely wrong. When you read the route report by	5	another reason that I spent so much time on the
6	Hallam he talks about not settlements, but Arab "camps"	6	environmental evidence.
7	in the dry season, Arab "camping ground" in dry season.	7	Who cultivates in the Bahr? We know who cultivates
8	These are not villages.	8	in the Bahr, and you can see on that map cultivated area
9	That's another one of the reasons that I spent so	9	up there in the north. That is Ngok Dinka agricultural
10	much time with the environmental evidence. These are	10	lands. It's not Messiriya agricultural lands because
11	seasonal nomadic camping grounds. When the Messiriya	11	(a) as we saw, the Messiriya don't like farming, and (b)
12	came south from their area above the Muglad, they would	12	when the Messiriya do farm, they do it with millet up in
13	spend six days or so at particular camps; not villages.	13	the north in the goz, where their crops grow. They
14	Again, that's precisely consistent with the	14	don't do it in the Bahr down here.
15	environmental evidence.	15	That is Ngok Dinka, and that is one of the reasons
16	The Government goes on and makes much of a sketch	16	that the Government I would suggest did not disclose
17	map and a letter by Whittingham, a British officer who	17	that map, because that map provides clear evidence of
18	toured the area in 1909. These materials support not	18	Ngok Dinka cultivation well to the north.
19	the Government's case but our case. The Government once	19	The map also shows something else: it shows a Dinka
20	more only provides selective portions of Whittingham's	20	dugdug on the south bank of the Ngol in the region of
21	map.	21	Bara, to the east of the Abyei Area. As we've seen,
22	Whittingham trekked through several areas: (1) the	22	dugdugs are characteristic of the Ngok Dinka and not of
23	country north of Turda and south to Dawas and Abyei; (2)	23	the Messiriya.
24	Turda to Koak, and Bara to Mellum; and (3) Abut off Bari	24	Finally, there are repeated uses of Ngok Dinka
25	to Wul.	25	terminology here. One can scoff at toponymy, as
	Page 29		Dage 21
	rage 29		Page 31
09:38 1	The Government only disclosed a partial sketch map	09:41 1	Professor Crawford did, but the repeated use of
09:38 1 2	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not	09:41 1 2	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is,
	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the		Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative.
2 3 4	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was	2	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't
2 3	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced.	2 3	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead
2 3 4 5 6	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark	2 3 4 5 6	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest
2 3 4 5 6 7	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at	2 3 4 5 6 7	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course	2 3 4 5 6	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the area between Turda and Koak to Bara and Mellum. This	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south, watering at the various rain pools to the Arab or Gurf
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the area between Turda and Koak to Bara and Mellum. This was what the Government did not disclose, including	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south, watering at the various rain pools to the Arab or Gurf river [that's the Kiir], along the banks of which they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the area between Turda and Koak to Bara and Mellum. This was what the Government did not disclose, including after the Tribunal's order. I apologise very much for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south, watering at the various rain pools to the Arab or Gurf river [that's the Kiir], along the banks of which they form innumerable small settlements of two or three huts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the area between Turda and Koak to Bara and Mellum. This was what the Government did not disclose, including after the Tribunal's order. I apologise very much for the poor copying that is there, but that is all that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south, watering at the various rain pools to the Arab or Gurf river [that's the Kiir], along the banks of which they form innumerable small settlements of two or three huts each."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the area between Turda and Koak to Bara and Mellum. This was what the Government did not disclose, including after the Tribunal's order. I apologise very much for the poor copying that is there, but that is all that we were given access to in the Survey Department.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south, watering at the various rain pools to the Arab or Gurf river [that's the Kiir], along the banks of which they form innumerable small settlements of two or three huts each." We have seen those descriptions before. This is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the area between Turda and Koak to Bara and Mellum. This was what the Government did not disclose, including after the Tribunal's order. I apologise very much for the poor copying that is there, but that is all that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south, watering at the various rain pools to the Arab or Gurf river [that's the Kiir], along the banks of which they form innumerable small settlements of two or three huts each."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the area between Turda and Koak to Bara and Mellum. This was what the Government did not disclose, including after the Tribunal's order. I apologise very much for the poor copying that is there, but that is all that we were given access to in the Survey Department. This sketch map identifies some important points.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south, watering at the various rain pools to the Arab or Gurf river [that's the Kiir], along the banks of which they form innumerable small settlements of two or three huts each." We have seen those descriptions before. This is exactly consistent with the environmental evidence. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the first section of Whittingham's trek; it did not disclose anything else. We made requests for it, the Tribunal ordered production of it, and nothing was produced. The focus of Whittingham's trek was to mark locations of watering spots. This has been scoffed at in previous discussions, saying: "Oh, of course everything would be noted." But when you look at Whittingham's map it omits numerous villages in places we know from other sources there had to be villages. Therefore the fact that Whittingham's map doesn't show particular things doesn't mean they weren't there; it means he was making a drawing for other purposes. Finally, perhaps the most important point: although the Government didn't disclose it, when we got the very limited access that we did to the Survey Department records, we obtained pretty much by chance, frankly part of the Whittingham sketch map for the area between Turda and Koak to Bara and Mellum. This was what the Government did not disclose, including after the Tribunal's order. I apologise very much for the poor copying that is there, but that is all that we were given access to in the Survey Department.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ngok Dinka names in this area I would suggest is, together with the other evidence, fairly probative. Again, it's important to note the Government didn't disclose this part of the trek report and instead disclosed other parts to the south, and I would suggest that one can draw a powerful inference from that. I'd like to move on to a 1912 publication by the Sudan Intelligence Department. This was an exhaustive book-length study of the Kordofan, it's titled Kordofan and the Region to the West of the White Nile, and it's an important work which summarised the existing Condominium knowledge at the time. It described the relevant parts of Kordofan as follows, and you can see it on the slide: "To the south of Dar Nuba and living in the open plains which extend to the Bahr el Arab there is a considerable Dinka population. As the country dries up and the mosquitoes disappear they move slowly south, watering at the various rain pools to the Arab or Gurf river [that's the Kiir], along the banks of which they form innumerable small settlements of two or three huts each." We have seen those descriptions before. This is

00 40				
09:42	1	shows the Ngok living throughout the Bahr region, the	09:45 1	occupy an area and you can see this on the slide
	2	plains, and moving south to around the rivers during the	2	on the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main
	3	dry season.	3	watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba
	4	There's then a reference in the next slide to the	4	Umm Biero; that's the Nyamora. Again, focusing on the
	5	Ngok Dinka, specifically under Sultan Rob, and then	5	Ngok living to the north of the Kiir, not to the south
	6	another reference to the fact that it was very difficult	6	of the Kiir.
	7	for the administrators to go to this region. We have	7	It's important to recall also going back to
	8	seen that quote previously and I won't read it out.	8	Professor Crawford's statements about the documentary
	9	As with pre-1905 reports, this account by the Sudan	9	record the 1965 and 1966 Abyei Agreements which were
	10	Intelligence Department places the Ngok entirely north	10	between the Messiriya and the Ngok. In those agreements
	11	of the Kiir, not to the south of it. It describes	11	the Messiriya provided, the Messiriya themselves agreed
	12	a considerable Ngok population living throughout the	12	to the fact that the Ngok could return to their
	13	plains of the Bahr, north of the Kiir and the Ngol and	13	homesteads at Ragaba ez Zarga and other places where
	14	northeast towards Lake Abyad.	14	they used to live.
	15	That population moves south to the Kiir in the dry	15	This is an agreement by the Messiriya referring
	16	season, which would be expected, and it lived in	16	specifically to the Ragaba ez Zarga, to the Ngol.
	17	characteristic Ngok villages. That's consistent with	17	Again, recall Professor Crawford's statement that there
	18	what Professor Cunnison described, it's consistent with	18	was no documentary evidence of the Ngok living around or
	19	the environmental evidence and it's another powerful	19	to the north of the Ngol. That is simply not true.
	20	documentary indication, contrary to what	20	There is documentary evidence both here, and the things
	21	Professor Crawford said, of the Ngok living throughout	21	we looked at previously.
	22	the Bahr region.	22	It is difficult documentary evidence to be sure, but
	23	There is a map that accompanied the Kordofan land	23	that's because it's a difficult documentary record and
	24	book; it's dated 1913 and it's a Survey Office map. It	24	a sparse one. But when you look carefully at all the
	25	places the Dinka and you can see on this slide	25	pieces, it provides a consistent set of observations of
		Page 33		Page 35
09:43	1	referred to parenthetically as Dar Jange, and we can go	09:46 1	the Ngok: virtually always to the north of the Kiir,
09.43	2	back to Professor Crawford's interruption of me it	2	sometimes to the north of the Ngol; always
	3	places the Ngok Dinka squarely in the area between and	3	consistently consistently between the Kiir and the
	4	above the Kiir and the Ngol.	4	
	5			Nool and a significant number of references to the Nook
		It extends up to around 10°20' latitude, and it is		Ngol and a significant number of references to the Ngok
		It extends up to around 10°20' latitude, and it is	5	north of the Ngol.
	6	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and	5 6	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which
	6 7	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at	5 6 7	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet
	6 7 8	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the	5 6 7 8	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in
	6 7 8 9	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the	5 6 7 8 9	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see
	6 7 8	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described.	5 6 7 8	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And
	6 7 8 9 10	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the	5 6 7 8 9	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see
	6 7 8 9 10 11	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows	5 6 7 8 9 10	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year.
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record:
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails to identify Ngok villages elsewhere, but again this is	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record: Professor Cunnison. Professor Cunnison lived for two
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails to identify Ngok villages elsewhere, but again this is based on dry-season observations and one wouldn't expect	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record: Professor Cunnison. Professor Cunnison lived for two years with the Messiriya. He was put forward by the
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails to identify Ngok villages elsewhere, but again this is based on dry-season observations and one wouldn't expect it to do so.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record: Professor Cunnison. Professor Cunnison lived for two years with the Messiriya. He was put forward by the Government as their only fact witness accompanying their
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails to identify Ngok villages elsewhere, but again this is based on dry-season observations and one wouldn't expect it to do so. I'd like to move on now. We are up to 1951. Howell	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record: Professor Cunnison. Professor Cunnison lived for two years with the Messiriya. He was put forward by the Government as their only fact witness accompanying their first memorial. What he has to say is very important,
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails to identify Ngok villages elsewhere, but again this is based on dry-season observations and one wouldn't expect it to do so. I'd like to move on now. We are up to 1951. Howell wrote in 1951 that the Ngok lived along the rivers north	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record: Professor Cunnison. Professor Cunnison lived for two years with the Messiriya. He was put forward by the Government as their only fact witness accompanying their first memorial. What he has to say is very important, and I think it is telling that of all their fact
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails to identify Ngok villages elsewhere, but again this is based on dry-season observations and one wouldn't expect it to do so. I'd like to move on now. We are up to 1951. Howell	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record: Professor Cunnison. Professor Cunnison lived for two years with the Messiriya. He was put forward by the Government as their only fact witness accompanying their first memorial. What he has to say is very important,
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	precisely consistent with the environmental evidence and what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails to identify Ngok villages elsewhere, but again this is based on dry-season observations and one wouldn't expect it to do so. I'd like to move on now. We are up to 1951. Howell wrote in 1951 that the Ngok lived along the rivers north	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record: Professor Cunnison. Professor Cunnison lived for two years with the Messiriya. He was put forward by the Government as their only fact witness accompanying their first memorial. What he has to say is very important, and I think it is telling that of all their fact
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what we've otherwise described. It extends barely at all beneath the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and it puts the Messiriya far up in the north, just the way the environmental evidence and Professor Cunnison described. I am going to skip the next slide, which shows a number of Ngok Dinka villages that you can look at, but I'd like to move on to the next slide. This is Dupuis's map, which shows a substantial number of Ngok Dinka dugdugs in a number of locations throughout the region; you can see them called out there. The dugdugs again are the Ngok Dinka characteristic cattle camps and luaks. The Government argues that Dupuis's sketch map fails to identify Ngok villages elsewhere, but again this is based on dry-season observations and one wouldn't expect it to do so. I'd like to move on now. We are up to 1951. Howell wrote in 1951 that the Ngok lived along the rivers north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab. He observed that the Ngok	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	north of the Ngol. That is based on a limited set of observations which necessarily could not include the Ngok during the wet season. It's a little bit like saying, "I went out in July and didn't see any snow". Of course you don't see any snow in July, because it doesn't snow in July. And you don't see any Ngok Dinka in particular areas because that's the wrong season of the year. When you think about it, the fact that the Condominium administrators never went during the wet season provides powerful indications of why there wouldn't be any observations of where the Ngok Dinka were during the wet season. Finally I'd like to move on and spend some time with one of the most important witnesses in the record: Professor Cunnison. Professor Cunnison lived for two years with the Messiriya. He was put forward by the Government as their only fact witness accompanying their first memorial. What he has to say is very important, and I think it is telling that of all their fact witnesses Professor Cunnison was the one who was not

09:48 1	identified to be brought here.	09:50 1	Kiir. It is the black clay soil where the Ngok built
2	He has written extensively on the area, and I would	2	their culture.
3	refer you to his books. His books don't put you to	3	When we move on from that, we can see that
4	sleep, his books are actually riveting. I find them	4	Cunnison's description of the goz continues in other of
5	exciting. If you read and the names are on the	5	his works. He also defines more specifically a part of
6	screen, but he is a learned man. He wrote The Homr and	6	the goz as the Bahr el Arab, and he distinguishes that
7	their Land, The Social Role of Cattle, Baggara Arabs,	7	from the Bahr itself. The Bahr el Arab itself, as part
8	Some Social Aspects of Nomadism in a Baggara Tribe, and	8	of the Bahr generally, is the area between the Kiir and
9	one of my favourite is on giraffe hunting by the	9	the Ragaba ez Zarga; it's that strip between the Ngol
10	Messiriya in the region, which is a particular specialty	10	and the Kiir/Bahr el Arab.
11	of his apparently. But he knows this area quite well.	11	When we look at a 1953 article he wrote on the Homr
12	He describes the region, geographically first of	12	and their land, he quotes:
13	all, in a way that is quite consistent with what	13	"The river system is known to the Arabs as the Bahr,
14	Professor Allan did. He divides the region, this entire	14	although they subdivide the area into the Ragaba,
15	area, into four zones.	15	consisting of the Ragaba ez Zarga and the
16	First there's the Babanusa, which he describes as	16	Ragaba Umm Biero, and the Bahr, or the Bahr el Arab,
17	a sandy area in the north and northwest of the country	17	which consists of all riverbeds between the
18	which is used by the Messiriya for grazing during the	18	Ragaba ez Zarga and the main river. The nomenclature of
19	rains.	19	the rivers is confusing", he says.
20	Second, he describes the Muglad, which stretches	20	He is clear that the Bahr el Arab is not just the
21	from Babanusa in the north to the goz, the sandy, arid	21	Kiir/Bahr el Arab down at the southern boundary of the
22	strip. He describes that as the headquarters of the	22	Ngok Dinka territory, but instead it's the waterways
23	Messiriya.	23	between the Kiir and the Ngol.
24	Third, he refers to the goz. He describes it as	24	He repeats this description of the term Bahr el Arab
25	being between Muglad and Wadi el Ghalla in the north and	25	in his giraffe hunting article. He says:
	Page 37		Page 39
09:49 1	the river system, the Bahr, in the south. He describes	09:52 1	"Giraffe move from Upper Nile province in the early
09.49 1	the goz as a transit stage between Muglad and the Bahr.	09.32 1	rains and distribute themselves over the wide area known
3	Finally, of most importance to the Ngok, he	3	as the Bahr el Arab, penetrate north over the
4	describes, south of the goz, the Bahr itself. He	4	Ragaba ez Zarga and Ragaba Umm Biero and enter the goz
5	describes, south of the goz, the Bahr hasen. The describes it as the area which I previously referred	5	district between there and Muglad"
6	to of dark, deeply cracking clays and numerous	6	We can make light of the fact the Government no
7	winding watercourses, all connected eventually with the	7	doubt will that this is an article about giraffe
8	Bahr el Arab. It contains also two permanent lakes:	8	hunting. What's important about it is that it tells you
9	Keilak, which lies slightly southeast from the Muglad,	9	about the region, and what it says is that the region of
10	and Abyad in the southeast corner of the country.	10	the Bahr is the region that extends south from the goz
11	Cunnison notes that north of the Bahr is the goz.	11	down to the Kiir.
12	Recall this is exactly what Professor Allan	12	That makes perfect sense because that is a region
13	described and showed you on the satellite imagery. It	13	that is defined environmentally as the black clay
14	shows starting at the southern boundary of the goz the	14	fertile soils that are damp and subject to seasonal
15	Bahr begins. The Bahr is the dark, rich, deeply	15	flooding. You can see it from the satellite imagery.
16	cracking clay soil that extends down to the Kiir. That	16	Professor Allan, whose evidence has not been challenged,
17	is how Professor Cunnison described the region. It is	17	explained it to you: the goz starts to the north, the
18	the description that Professor Crawford you will	18	Bahr starts to south. Cunnison and Allan agree. Nobody
19	remember stumbled on; that's because they didn't have	19	disagrees.
20	an expert on this topic and because they didn't want to	20	Cunnison goes on and then repeatedly describes the
21	focus on Professor Cunnison.	21	existence of numerous permanent Ngok Dinka settlements
22	When you look at the evidence which you see on the	22	throughout the Bahr region. This squarely supports the
23	slide in front of you now and when you look at what	23	SPLM/A's case and squarely contradicts the Government's
24	their own fact witness said, the Bahr is the region that	24	case, which I would suggest is why Professor Cunnison
25	starts from the goz; it stops when it goes down to the	25	isn't here. His 1962 article is titled "Some Social
	Page 38		Page 40

09:53 1	Aspects of Nomadism in a Baggara Tribe". It said:	09:55 1	the bush for two years, explained this. He said: the
2	"The Nuer and the Dinka have permanent homes from	2	Ngok Dinka have permanent homes, that's their
3	which they move part of the year."	3	traditional land, there are settled farms throughout
4	This is a recognition of the permanent nature of the	4	that land. That is Ngok Dinka land, it's not the
5	Ngok settlements.	5	Government's land. The Government case in this
6	In his 1966 book, Baggara Arabs, Cunnison goes on	6	proceeding is essentially to take that land away, the
7	and says:	7	way their own witness said they shouldn't do 20 years
8	"Much of the Bahr has permanent Dinka settlements,	8	ago.
9	although during most of the time that the Homr occupy	9	Cunnison's witness statement is to the same effect.
10	it"	10	He says:
11	Recall he spent his time with the Messiriya:	11	"During the wet season the Homr lived in settled
12	" the Dinka are with their cattle south of the	12	camps to the north in Babanusa. As the dry season came,
13	Bahr el Arab."	13	the Homr moved first briefly to the Muglad, where the
14	Cunnison explicitly concludes that permanent	14	cattle grazed on the remains of the millet harvest"
15	Ngok Dinka villages were located throughout what he	15	That's where the back-burning is that the Messiriya
16	repeatedly calls "much of the Bahr". Again, this was	16	did, not down in the Bahr:
17	the area extending south of the goz.	17	" then they moved south through the extensive
18	In his article on "The Social Role of Cattle"	18	sandy goz to the area called the Bahr."
19	Cunnison specifically addressed the question of whether	19	Of course, the Bahr starts when the goz stops:
20	it would make sense to try to encourage the Messiriya to	20	"This is the area around the Bahr el Arab and the
21	cultivate in the Bahr. The Messiriya has a proud	21	Ragaba ez Zarga."
22	culture, as we saw, that did not include agriculture.	22	One wonders how exactly that particular formulation
23	They were cattle herders and they were proud of it;	23	got in there. What the Bahr is, as we have seen
24	rightfully so. But he answered a Government suggestion	24	emphatically, is the area that starts south of the goz
25	that they be settled in the Bahr, and he said to this:	25	and it goes down to the Kiir. It's defined by the soil.
23	that they be settled in the Bain, and he said to this.	23	and it goes down to the ixin. It's defined by the son.
	Page 41		Page 43
09:54 1	"It might be possible but [and I emphasise this	09:56 1	Then at the end:
2	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who	2	"For part of the year they shared the area with the
2 3	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains."	2 3	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but
2 3 4	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the	2 3 4	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of
2 3 4 5	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's	2 3 4 5	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season
2 3 4 5 6	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land.	2 3 4 5 6	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas."
2 3 4 5 6 7	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that	2 3 4 5 6 7	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be preferable."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to avoid sending back to the Muglad for one's own grain or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be preferable." Look at it again: "settled farms throughout much of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to avoid sending back to the Muglad for one's own grain or buy wild honey or use their houses [the Ngok houses] for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be preferable." Look at it again: "settled farms throughout much of the land"; that's the Bahr. You saw what the Bahr was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to avoid sending back to the Muglad for one's own grain or buy wild honey or use their houses [the Ngok houses] for leaving baggage if occasion should arise to go on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be preferable." Look at it again: "settled farms throughout much of the land"; that's the Bahr. You saw what the Bahr was from Professor Allan. He wasn't cross-examined on that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to avoid sending back to the Muglad for one's own grain or buy wild honey or use their houses [the Ngok houses] for leaving baggage if occasion should arise to go on a visit elsewhere."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be preferable." Look at it again: "settled farms throughout much of the land"; that's the Bahr. You saw what the Bahr was from Professor Allan. He wasn't cross-examined on that, he wasn't challenged on that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to avoid sending back to the Muglad for one's own grain or buy wild honey or use their houses [the Ngok houses] for leaving baggage if occasion should arise to go on a visit elsewhere." Think about the Government's case: this can't be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be preferable." Look at it again: "settled farms throughout much of the land"; that's the Bahr. You saw what the Bahr was from Professor Allan. He wasn't cross-examined on that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to avoid sending back to the Muglad for one's own grain or buy wild honey or use their houses [the Ngok houses] for leaving baggage if occasion should arise to go on a visit elsewhere."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quote you can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be preferable." Look at it again: "settled farms throughout much of the land"; that's the Bahr. You saw what the Bahr was from Professor Allan. He wasn't cross-examined on that, he wasn't challenged on that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to avoid sending back to the Muglad for one's own grain or buy wild honey or use their houses [the Ngok houses] for leaving baggage if occasion should arise to go on a visit elsewhere." Think about the Government's case: this can't be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	language] this is the traditional land of the Dinka, who return there and cultivate during the rains." That tells you who was in the Bahr. This is the Government's own witness in response to the Government's proposal to put the Messiriya in the Ngok Dinka's land. Cunnison, their witness, said: no, you can't do that because it is traditional Ngok agricultural lands. That is precisely consistent with the Whittingham map, which showed the cultivation, that the Government didn't give to us. He went on and said the same thing in another paper. This was called "Settlement of Nomads in the Sudan: A Critique of Present Plans". He said and I quoteyou can see it on the slide: "There are settled farms throughout much of the land [that's the Bahr] and all areas are used for grazing by nomad herds. It could be argued that Babanusa, bordering the Hamar people in the north, might be preferable." Look at it again: "settled farms throughout much of the land"; that's the Bahr. You saw what the Bahr was from Professor Allan. He wasn't cross-examined on that, he wasn't challenged on that. Professor Cunnison, their expert who lived there in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"For part of the year they shared the area with the Dinka, whose permanent homes were dotted around, but shortly after the arrival of the Homr sections, most of the Dinka would decamp further south to their dry season areas." As with his published views, Cunnison is very clearly acknowledging the existence of the Ngok Dinka throughout the Bahr region; they migrate south in the dry season. Not all of them migrate south; most of them did, Cunnison describes, but some of them would stay, and we are going to see why they stayed. He goes on in the next slide to explain how: "It would be useful for the Messiriya to camp regularly near a Dinka settlement, with whose members one might become friendly and even make brotherhood." Recall the witness testimony about how the Ngok and the Dinka are brothers: "One can then exchange milk for grain from them to avoid sending back to the Muglad for one's own grain or buy wild honey or use their houses [the Ngok houses] for leaving baggage if occasion should arise to go on a visit elsewhere." Think about the Government's case: this can't be true, Cunnison is wrong; there are no Ngok houses there,

		40	
09:58 1	there are no Ngok people there, they are all south of	10:00 1	environmental evidence, and it's exactly consistent with
2	the Kiir.	2	the SPLM/A case.
3 4	This is why the witnesses talk about a brotherhood. This is why the Ngok have to be in this area: because	3 4	There's one point on which Cunnison disagrees with both the ABC experts and the SPLM/A, and it's
5	when the Messiriya come south into the Bahr, they camp	5	a disagreement that was created by the Government and
6	next to the Ngok Dinka permanent houses; they leave	6	which is wrong. Cunnison says that he was:
7	their belongings in those houses; they get food from the	7	" informed that the effect of the ABC's decision
8	Ngok. That's why they're brothers: because they live	8	would be to exclude the Homr from the summer grazing and
9	together during part of the year.	9	living areas in the Bahr."
10	If, on the Government's case, as Professor Crawford	10	And that he believed that that would be
11	would have you believe, that can't be because there	11	"fundamentally unjust".
12	aren't Ngok there, that's just not true. And Cunnison,	12	It would be. It would be fundamentally unjust.
13	their own witness, who they didn't bring here, tells you	13	That should not happen. And that's what the experts
14	it's not true.	14	held: it would not happen.
15	Let's look at the Abyei Protocol; it tells you the	15	We looked at what they said. They said that the
16	same thing. If you look in the Abyei Protocol, Abyei	16	Messiriya, precisely consistent with Article 1.1.3 of
17	and I showed you this before is the bridge between	17	the Abyei Protocol, would retain their traditional
18	the people. It's not a bridge that stops in mid-air	18	grazing rights in the Bahr, in the Abyei Area.
19	with nobody on it; it's a bridge that has both people on	19	The parties foresaw this. Professor Cunnison was
20	it together. That's why it's a brotherhood.	20	misinformed by the Government. He was told what the
21	It's the same thing in the other provisions of the	21	effect of the ABC decision would be. In fact, what the
22	Abyei Protocol that the parties agreed to, contrary to	22	experts said and you can read this; this comes from
23	what Professor Crawford told you. You look at it and	23	their report:
24	you see in Article 1.1.3 that:	24	"The experts want to stress that the boundary that
25	"The Messiriya are nomads and they will be entitled	25	is defined and demarcated will not be a barrier to the
	Page 45		Page 47
09:59 1	to exercise their traditional grazing rights in the	10:01 1	interaction between the Messiriya and the Ngok
2	area."	2	communities. The decision should have no practical
3	That's what the experts said and that's what the	3	effect on the traditional grazing patterns and the two
4	Abyei Protocol says.	4	communities."
5	Third, Cunnison also describes and I'll go	5	That goes back to the notion of brotherhood, to the
6	through this quickly the nomadic character of the	6	notion of a bridge, and to Article 1.1.3 of the
7	Messiriya's life. You can see the slides that describe	7	Abyei Protocol, which preserves those traditional
8	this. It describes how nomadism is the only way of	ō	
		8	grazing rights.
9	life, a proud way of life to which they are attuned, how	8 9	grazing rights. Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this
9 10	life, a proud way of life to which they are attuned, how the tribesmen are continually on the move.		
10 11	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the	9 10 11	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government.
10 11 12	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says:	9 10 11 12	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness
10 11 12 13	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home.	9 10 11 12 13	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly
10 11 12 13 14	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is	9 10 11 12 13 14	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the
10 11 12 13 14 15	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the
10 11 12 13 14 15	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their grain, as their forefathers did. If people are away,	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful conclusions from that record.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their grain, as their forefathers did. If people are away, they want to return to it."	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful conclusions from that record. He describes the Messiriya as coming south into that
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their grain, as their forefathers did. If people are away, they want to return to it." "It", Muglad, up in the north, above the goz.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful conclusions from that record. He describes the Messiriya as coming south into that region to live as brothers with the Ngok Dinka. They
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their grain, as their forefathers did. If people are away, they want to return to it." "It", Muglad, up in the north, above the goz. Similarly he wrote elsewhere that nearly all	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful conclusions from that record. He describes the Messiriya as coming south into that region to live as brothers with the Ngok Dinka. They couldn't live as brothers if the Ngok Dinka weren't
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their grain, as their forefathers did. If people are away, they want to return to it." "It", Muglad, up in the north, above the goz. Similarly he wrote elsewhere that nearly all Messiriya cultivation is in the Muglad; their	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful conclusions from that record. He describes the Messiriya as coming south into that region to live as brothers with the Ngok Dinka. They couldn't live as brothers if the Ngok Dinka weren't there, like the Government tells you.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their grain, as their forefathers did. If people are away, they want to return to it." "It", Muglad, up in the north, above the goz. Similarly he wrote elsewhere that nearly all	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful conclusions from that record. He describes the Messiriya as coming south into that region to live as brothers with the Ngok Dinka. They couldn't live as brothers if the Ngok Dinka weren't
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their grain, as their forefathers did. If people are away, they want to return to it." "It", Muglad, up in the north, above the goz. Similarly he wrote elsewhere that nearly all Messiriya cultivation is in the Muglad; their cultivation is otherwise in Babanusa, further north. Once more, this is exactly consistent with the	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful conclusions from that record. He describes the Messiriya as coming south into that region to live as brothers with the Ngok Dinka. They couldn't live as brothers if the Ngok Dinka weren't there, like the Government tells you. Cunnison isn't here for a reason. His evidence, though, is extraordinary powerful, and I would suggest
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the tribesmen are continually on the move. He goes on and in the next slide describes where the Messiriya have their home. He says: "The Muglad is regarded by the Homr as their home. Their arrival there from the Bahr ['from the Bahr'] is the occasion for great rejoicing and anticipation. This is almost the only place where the people have anything like permanent homes. It is where they cultivate [where they cultivate: not down in the Bahr] and store their grain, as their forefathers did. If people are away, they want to return to it." "It", Muglad, up in the north, above the goz. Similarly he wrote elsewhere that nearly all Messiriya cultivation is in the Muglad; their cultivation is otherwise in Babanusa, further north.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Professor Cunnison's only disagreement was on this point. It was a legal point, as to which he was given a legal conclusion which was wrong, by the Government. Taken together, Cunnison's writings, his witness statement and his other statements, are frankly devastating for the Government's case. He describes the existence of permanent Ngok Dinka homes throughout the Bahr region. That is precisely consistent with the environmental evidence. It is consistent with the documentary record, so far as one can elicit useful conclusions from that record. He describes the Messiriya as coming south into that region to live as brothers with the Ngok Dinka. They couldn't live as brothers if the Ngok Dinka weren't there, like the Government tells you. Cunnison isn't here for a reason. His evidence,

100.5 1 His yosipey obea attention to it. His evidence is also appeared by Mr. Michael Tibbs, so methody who the Government has not referred to in the sightest. Looking at the next side. Mr Tibbs refers to the fact that in the west the Ngol want all the way. The Ngols cattle camps congregate in the immediate vicinity of Abyes. By the height of the dry season to the boundary with Darfur: The Ngols cattle camps congregate in the immediate vicinity of Abyes. By the height of the dry season in the point of Abyes and the surprise of the Ngols and the way to the boundary with Darfur: The Ngols cattle camps congregate in the immediate vicinity of Abyes. By the height of the dry season in the point of the Ngols in the way to the boundary with Darfur: The Ngols cattle camps congregate in the immediate vicinity of Abyes. By the height of the dry season in the point of the Ngols in the way to the Ngols and the head of the Ngols and the head of the Ngols in the head of the season that the way that the head of the Ngols in the head of the Ngols was the head grows weter, the herds can move up into the same and prove season that the head area not heyels whether pare are they the same the head grows weter, the herds can move up into the same area on heyels whether pare are they is used as the land grows weter, the herds can move up into the same area of head of the head and the same through the same and the same through the castern part of the Ngols hands, as more area to head of the point of the Ngols and the head of the Ngols and the Ngols bear the Ngols more than the head of the Ngols and the Ngols bear the Ngols where the pare they are they is used to the part of the Ngols and the Ngols where the pare they are they is used to the head of the Ngols and th					
18. Ex evidence is also supported by Mr Michael Tibbs, as superfixed to in the salightest. Looking at the next side, Mr Tibbs refers to in the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to according to the Ngok and the Messirya and the Messirya in the north. Alrey was the centre of the Page 49 10.00 I a Ngok a Muglad was the headquarters of the Messirya. I always considered the area south from Antila popular in the west as an extended almin, I would see Ngok and the Messirya in the north. Alrey was the centre of the Page 49 10.00 I a Ngok, a Muglad was the headquarters of the Messirya. I always considered the area south from Antila popular in the north. Alrey was the centre of the Page 49 10.00 I a Ngok, a Muglad was the headquarters of the Messirya. I always considered the area south from Antila popular in the north. Alrey was the centre of the Page 49 10.00 I a Ngok, a Muglad was the headquarters of the Messirya. I always considered the area south from Antila popular in the north. Alrey was the centre of the Messirya. I always considered the area south from Antila popular in the north and the Messirya in the north. Alrey was the centre of the Messirya. I always considered the area south from Antila popular in the north of the Ngol I always to say, this is what he saw the north of the Ngol I always to say, this is what he saw the north of the Ngol I always to say, this is what he saw the north of the Ngol I was the centre of the Ngol Always the north of the Ngol I was the centre of	10:02 1	that you pay close attention to it.	10:05 1	report and these are people who spent time out in the	
somehody who the Government has not referred to in the 4 sightest. Looking at the next side, Mr Tibbs refers 5 to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way 6 to the bondary with Darfur. 7 "As I note in Stadau Sunset, Grinti, I believe, 8 though I'm not sure, is on the north bank of the Kiir 9 River [is within the Ngok territoris]. Truvelling from 10 Abyet Town to Grinti I would see Ngok villages, just 11 clusters of two or there tuisely pour I members that] 12 and tuaks [you'll remember that] 13 the watercourse we travelled along. I find myself 14 unable to give an eastern boundary to the Ngok's lands, 15 as my travels throughout the district did not take me 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands. 17 I should apologise: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Stadan Sunser (Grinti, I believe, 20 there must have been as a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 19 the menust have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But let's neutra to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 3 Talways considered the area south from Antilia 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Magdad to Abyet, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we rescribered to a dragdugs, and 1000 I Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya. 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Magdad to Abyet, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we rescribered and adage Ngok, and 6 road, as soon as we rescribed and as dragdugs, and 7 always considered the area south from Antilia 8 the the beach chero-ter-circred to as dragdugs, and 8 to the road the waster eleverated about. 9 The Ngok as Magdad and the sear of the Messiriya. 1000 I Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya. 1000 I Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya. 1000 I Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya. 1000 I Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya. 1000 I Ngok, as Muglad was the head					
sightest. Looking at the next slide, Mr Tibbs refers to the boundary with Durfur: for the boundary with Durfur: 7 "As I note in Sudan Sunset, Crimit, I believe, the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back, towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders and the heading rowards Abyei. As the horders of Nuer territory. As soon as it begins to rain a bit, the herders can turn back towards Abyei. As the borders of Nuer territory. As soon as tract the back of wards was well as the said. I clusters of two or three teals by byeil and he body are said and be the body area? We know where the sandy are assumed to a said and sandy are assumed to a said and sandy are assumed to the body area? We know where the sandy are assumed to a said and assumed are assumed to a said and assumed are assumed to a said and assumed are assume					
to the fact that to the west the Ngok went all the way to to the footneday with Darfur: "As I note in Sudan Sumset, Grinti, I believe, a though I'm not sure, is on the north bank of the Kiir and the Ngok I morth of the Ngok I martines, I Travelling from 10 Abyei Town to Grinti I would see Ngok villages, just classers of two or three thuds I youll remember that also plot the north of the watercourse we travelled adong. I find myself and thusk plottly the restriction, As some water					
the boundary with Darfur: 7		-			
8 though Thm ost sure, is on the north band of the Kiir 8 River [is within the Ngok territories]. Travelling from 10 Abyet Town to Grinti I Yould see Ngok villages, just 11 clusters of two or three thads [your I member that also] to the north of 13 and husks [your I remember that also] to the north of 14 unable to give an eastern boundary to the Ngok slands, 15 as my travels throughout the district did not take me 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands, 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands, 17 I should apologise: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Sudan Sumet that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 reference to Sudan Sumet that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 reference to Sudan Sumet that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 reference to Sudan Sumet that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 reference to Sudan Sumet that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through the eastern part of the Ngok 18 throughout 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that the Ngok 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 18 through 19 that the Ngok 19 that 19 th					
8 though I'm not sure, is on the north bank of the Kiir 9 River [is within the Ngok territories]. Travelling from 10 Abyei Town to Grinfi I would see Ngok villages, just 11 clusters of two or three tukuls [you'll remember that] 12 and huks [you'll remember that] 13 the watercourse we travelled along. I find myself 14 unable to give an eastern boundary to the Ngok Is ands. 15 as my travels throughout the district did not take me 16 through the castern part of the Nguks Lands. 17 I should apologise: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Sudan Sumest that there was a reference to 19 the book being self-published by Thibs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 persentation. 22 But let's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 26 Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 1 Essaid: 3 Talways considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct mal from 19 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 2 [which is meth of the Ngol], on our direct mal from 2 [which is meth of the Ngol], on our direct mal from 3 the were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 3 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 4 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 4 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 5 the the and provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 6 catcle hers, chortewise relevant to a Wigudgus, and 9 typical Ngok villages doted about." 4 the went cut his was fur were; you just 4 the land grows wetter, the beards was and able to got a north synch it that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok with the Messirya. 8 the land grows wetter, the beand was and was reference in that gover the got and the sandy areas renow because we pent so much time look and use are from the Ngok undersore the sandy areas renow because work of the Ngok and what the s					
9 River Jis within the Ngok territories]. Travelling from 10 Abyei Town to Grint I would see Ngok villages, just 11 clusters of two or three takuls Jyou'll remember that J 12 and luaks Jyou'll remember that also J to the north of 13 the watercourse we travelled along. I find myself 14 unable to give an eastern boundary to the Ngok's lands, 15 as my travels throughout the district did not take me 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands, 17 I should applogise: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Studie Susset that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But lef's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 26 Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "Talways considered the area south from Antila 4 I Joshich is north of the Ngol, on our direct road from 24 I Josh All Special Ngok Villages dotted throughout 25 Page 30 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya. 4 I Josh All Special Ngok Villages dotted dhroughout 4 Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya. 5 Mughad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I vould see Ngok 10 He went out of his way to say; this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasnit able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 going to see, the Ngok propet hemselves as a reference to 26 didn't know was not from the Harvard Development 27 going to see, the Ngok propet hemselves as a reference to 28 going to see, the Ngok propet hemselves as a reference to 29 didn't know was not from the Harvard Dev	8		8		
10 Abyei Town to Grinti I would see Ngok villages, just clusters of two or three tukuls (you'll remember that also) to the north of 12 it. Cumison told us where they are: they're the gov. 13 the watercourse we travelled along. I find myself use watercourse we find the watercourse was a reference to the find the water was a reference to the find the water was a reference to the find the water to be find the water was a reference to the find the water was a reference to find the find the water was a reference to find the find the water was a reference to the find the water was a reference to do the find the water was a refer		-			
11 closters of two or three tukuls [you'll remember that] 12 and tasks [you'll remember that also] to the north of 13 the watercourse we travelled along. I find myself 14 unable to give an eastern boundary to the Ngok's lands. 15 as my travels throughout the district did not take me 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands." 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands." 17 Ishould apologise: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Studia Sunset that there was reference to 19 that book heing self-published by Tibbs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But lef's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 26 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 27 "I always considered the area south from Antila 28 "I always considered the area south from Antila 30 "I always considered the area south from Antila 40 [which is north of the Ngol,] on our direct road from 41 [which is north of the Ngol,] on our direct road from 42 [which is north of the Ngol,] on our direct road from 43 [which is north of the Ngol,] on our direct road from 44 [which is north of the Ngol,] on our direct road from 45 [which is north of the Ngol,] on our direct road from 46 [road, as soon as we rached Antila, I would see Ngok 47 [luaks, which were permanent round cattle byers for Ngok 48 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dagdugs', and 49 [vipical Ngok villages dotted about." 40 [Page 49] 10:00 1				·	
12 and luaks (you'll remember that also) to the north of 13 the watercourse we travelled along. I find myself 14 unable to give an eastern boundary to the Ngok's lands, 15 as my travels throughout the district did not take me 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands, 17 I should apologise: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Sudan Sunset that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But lef's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 26 Page 49 27 Page 51 28 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 29 to Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 29 to Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 29 to Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 29 to Muglad to Abyei, to she with the Ngok 20 tale herrs, otherwise referred to as dugdugs, and 21 typical Ngok villages dotted abour." 22 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would saw Ngok 23 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 24 the wave full to the north of the Ngol. 25 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 26 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 27 the that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 28 cattle herrs, otherwise referred to as dugdugs, and 29 typical Ngok villages dotted abour." 30 He were that of the Ngol. 31 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 32 the return to the Tibb's and the same from the road; the wasn't able to go to other areas: he 33 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 34 the return to the Ngol of the Ngol. 35 that that also provides powerful evidence to the the Ngok 36 the return to the Ngol of the Ngol					
13 the watercourse we ravelled along. I find myself 14 unable to give an eastern boundary to the Ngok's lands, 15 as my travels throughout the district did not take me 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands." 17 I should apologies: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Sudan Sunset that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But let's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 26 "A laway considered the area south from Antila 27 He said: 28 "A laway considered the area south from Antila 29 "I always considered the area south from Antila 30 "I always considered the area south from Antila 41 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 42 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 43 [which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 45 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dagdags', and 46 [which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 47 [lauks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 48 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dagdags', and 49 [typical Ngok villages dotted about." 40 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 41 from the road; be wasn't able to go to other areas; he 42 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 43 that that also provides powerfule viclence that the Ngok 44 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 45 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 46 there. This is an area de size of Belgium. 47 I used the example previously of driving on the 48 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 49 either side of the road; this was far worse; you just 40 didn't know what existed on the other wide. Each of the Ngol 41 were well to the north of the Ngol. 42 We have the 1913 Kordofan handbook, which describes 43 the Albany as ound from Brussels, and seei				•	
the goz. We saw from the satellite imagery: they're on the goz. That's where the Ngok went the goz. That's where the Ngok ment for the Ngok Salnds." 1 I should apologise: I recall now as I read the reference to that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But let's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained ithat: 23 explained ithat: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 10:004 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 24 We have Professor Cunnison's detailed firsthand description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout Page 51 10:004 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 25 He said: 26 Talways considered the area south from Antila 10 the Ngol, on our direct road from 10 the Ngol, 10 the Ngol, on our direct road from 10 the Ngol, 10 the Ngol		•			
15 as my travels throughout be district did not take me 16 through the eastern part of the Ngok Isands." 17 I should applogise: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Sudan Sunser that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But let's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Alsyei was the centre of the 26 Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 29 He said: 30 "I always considered the area south from Antila 41 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 42 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 43 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 44 can also tell from the Aurison of the Ngol, will ages dotted about." 45 Muglad was the vesseson. I would suggest 46 the were well to the north of the Ngol about and were well to the north of the Ngol about and were well to the north of the Ngol, and that that also provises powerful evidence that the Ngok 46 where the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern — not the northern — be boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map. Dar apidentifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiri. 47 Used the example previously of driving on the either side of the road; this was far worse; you just didn't son what existed on the other side. But you can on either side of the road; this was far worse; you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can on either side of the road; this was far worse; you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can on either side of the road; this was far worse; you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can on either side of the road; this was far worse; you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can on either side of the road; this was far					
through the eastern part of the Ngok's lands." 15 Ishould apologise: I recall now as I read the reference to Sudan Sunset that there was a reference to that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think there must have been some reference in the Government's presentation. 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's presentation. 21 presentation. 22 But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 10-04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila I which is north of the Ngol, no our direct road from Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok terniory. From that for road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok I hask, which were permanent round cattle byers for Ngok actitle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and y typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say; this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse; you just 19 either side of the road; this was far worse; you just 20 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok pole pote hemselves asy. 4 We can also tell from the environmental evidence from Cunnison, who 19 either side of the road; this was far worse; you just 19 either side of the road; this was far worse; you just 20 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves asy. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 10 the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged					
17 Is bould apologise: I recall now as I read the 18 reference to Sudan Sunset that there was a reference to 19 that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But let's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 26 Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyel, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, Twould see Ryok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs,' and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in he wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 cither side of the road; this was far worse; you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cumrison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Nogok popel themselves aw, 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 26 the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the 27 Me have the 1916 And as the southern — not the northern — 28 Mark the wasn't able to go to other areas; he 29 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 29 lived out there for two years					
that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think there must have been some reference in the Government's presentation. But let's return to the Tibbs description. He coplained that: There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 The said: The s	17		17		
that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think 20 there must have been some reference in the Government's 21 presentation. 22 But lefs return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 26 Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 28 He said: 30 "I always considered the area south from Antila 41 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 42 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 43 [which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 44 [ausks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 45 [auther that John Shang and the Shang and villages dotted about." 46 [We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages will north of the Kiir. 47 [10:06 1] We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern — not the northern— in the morth of the Ngol. We don't know exactly how far north because people simply didn't go extend from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he lighway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse; you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can on either side of the road; this was far worse; you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can on either side of the road; possibly of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; possibly of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the Royal Royal Emselves say. 4 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 4 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 5 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 6 Prosesor Crawford's statement that the record showing that the Ngok and the Messiriya. 6 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 7 We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook,	18		18		
there must have been some reference in the Government's presentation. But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He explained that: But let's return to the Tibbs description. He Ryok will ages dotted throughout description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout Page 51 But let's return to the Tibbs description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout description of permanent Ngok villages of the Kiir, well north of the Ngok in the Bahr, based on two years of living with the Messriya. But let's return to the Tibbs description of permanent Ngok villages of the Ngok living on duffered the reason. I we have the Tibbs's firsthand description of permanent Ngok villages 51 miles north of the Kiir, well north of the Ngok in the Bahr, based on two years of living with the Messriya. But let's explained that: But let's add the vession and the side Ngok living on the Ngok under and the side of the Ngok living on the Ngok living and which shows, in the accompanying map. Dar Jange	19	that book being self-published by Tibbs, so I think	19		
22 But let's return to the Tibbs description. He 23 explained that: 24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and 25 the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the 26 Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of this way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 Lused the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse; you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; track But you can 22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 26 diver a surface of the Ngol, knich description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout 25 description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout 4 description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout 4 description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout 4 description of permanent Ngok villages of living with the 4 Messiriya. 10:06 1 the Bahr, based on two years of living with the 4 Messiriya. 10:06 1 the Bahr, based on two years of living with the 4 Messiriya. 10:06 1 the Bahr, based on two	20		20		
explained that: "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Messiriya." 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila (Pwhich is north of the Ngol. no our direct road from Miglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 1 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 2 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 2 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok were well to the north of the Ngol. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern — not the northerm— boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20 latitude. 15 Evactly how far north because people simply didn't go there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 16 I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can tell from the environmental evidence: from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 2 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 25 the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the 1970. The project 25 the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the 1980 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in wh	21	presentation.	21	documentary evidence or other evidence in the record	
24 "There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 1 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 2 tartle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 2 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 3 We have the 1912 Rordofan handbook, which describes that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 2 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 4 I used the example previously of driving on the 1 piether side of the road; this was far worse: you just 2 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 2 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 1 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 2 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 4 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 25 We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 25 We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 25 we have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya. 10 We have the 1912 Kordofan map, which dientifies the Ngok population of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok population of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok population of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the 2 more than the project which studied the region	22	But let's return to the Tibbs description. He	22	showing that the Ngok were up to the Ngol, much less	
the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the Page 49 10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila (which is north of the Ngol), on our direct road from Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 1 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 2 attle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 1 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 4 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 1 the Bahr, based on two years of living with the Messiriya. We have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well north of the Ngol at Antila. We have Whittingham's recently discovered map showing cultivation north of the Ngol. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northen boundary of the Ngok Confan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northen boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20′ laittude. 15 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the eason of the Missing throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Urmm Biero.	23	explained that:	23	north of the Ngol.	
10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse; you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the eroxire most sidence in the Mgok poople themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 2 Messiriya. 2 Mesairiya. 3 We have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of 4 permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well 5 morth of the Ngol at Antila. 4 We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. 4 We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern — not the northern — boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accordinate of the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 4 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 5 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 6 We have Unquis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to	24	"There was no defined boundary between the Ngok and	24	We have Professor Cunnison's detailed firsthand	
10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from Messiriya. 10:06 1 the Bahr, based on two years of living with the Messiriya. 2 Mes have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well north of the Ngol at Antila. 3 We have Whittingham's recently discovered map showing cultivation north of the Ngol. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern—not the northern—boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20 latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near t	25	the Messiriya in the north. Abyei was the centre of the	25	description of permanent Ngok villages dotted throughout	
10:04 1 Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya." 2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from Messiriya. 10:06 1 the Bahr, based on two years of living with the Messiriya. 2 Mes have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well north of the Ngol at Antila. 3 We have Whittingham's recently discovered map showing cultivation north of the Ngol. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern—not the northern—boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20 latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near t		Page /10		Paga 51	
2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 26 Mes have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of 4 permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well 5 north of the Ngol at Antila. 3 We have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of 5 permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well 6 We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Ngol. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located alm		1450 17		Tuge 31	
2 He said: 3 "I always considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 26 Mes have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of 4 permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well 5 north of the Ngol at Antila. 3 We have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of 5 permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well 6 We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Ngol. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located alm					
3 "I always considered the area south from Antila 4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 3 We have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of 4 permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir. 4 De Have Whittingham's recently discovered map 5 showing cultivation north of the Ngol. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs 8 and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes 11 the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northen 12 boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the 13 accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up 14 to 10°20 latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending 16 northwards along the main watercourses, of which the 17 We have Howell's 1951 observation describing	10:04 1	Ngok, as Muglad was the headquarters of the Messiriya."	10:06 1	the Bahr, based on two years of living with the	
4 [which is north of the Ngol], on our direct road from 5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 4 permanent Ngok villages 25 miles north of the Kiir, well 5 north of the Ngol at Antila. 6 We have Whittingham's recently discovered map 5 showing cultivation north of the Ngol. We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern — not the northen — to the north saccompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs and villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir up to 10°20' latitude. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along th	2	He said:	2	Messiriya.	
5 Muglad to Abyei, to be within Ngok territory. From that 6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 9 and villages well north of the Ngol. 8 We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Ngir. 9 and villages well north of the Kiir. 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know exactly how far north because people simply didn't go there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 10 Lused the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 10 We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the Subraba has boarden and subraba has boarden and subraba has b	3	-	3	We have Mr Tibbs's firsthand description of	
6 road, as soon as we reached Antila, I would see Ngok 7 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 6 We have Whittingham's recently discovered map 7 showing cultivation north of the Ngol. 8 We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs 9 and villages well north of the Kiir. 10 We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes 11 the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northen toot the northen Yogok Dinka; and which shows, in the 12 accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up 13 to 10°20' latitude. 14 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the 15 Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 17 We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok 28 dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north 29 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 20 We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the 21 Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending 22 northwards along the main watercourses, of which the 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We ca	4		4		
1 luaks, which were permanent round cattle byres for Ngok 2 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 3 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 7 showing cultivation north of the Ngol. 8 We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern both enorthern both enorthern both enorthern oth the northern oth the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20 latitude. 18 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 19 We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, when the string and the north of the Kiir up to 10°20 latitude. 19 We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ng	5		5	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	
8 cattle herds, otherwise referred to as 'dugdugs', and 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 9 typical Ngok villages dotted about." 10 He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw 11 from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he 12 didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest 13 that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok 14 were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know 15 exactly how far north because people simply didn't go 16 there. This is an area the size of Belgium. 17 I used the example previously of driving on the 18 highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on 19 either side of the road; this was far worse: you just 20 didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can 21 tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who 22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 8 We have the 1910 Hasoba map identifying Ngok dugdugs and villages well north of the Kiir. 10 We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern 12 boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' laitude. 15 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 16 Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 17 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 18 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 19 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. 10 We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' laitude. 18 We have the		_	6		
typical Ngok villages dotted about." He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know exactly how far north because people simply didn't go there. This is an area the size of Belgium. I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern to the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Houvell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1915 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern to the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok as living throughout the location to the north of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Ko	7	-	7	-	
He went out of his way to say: this is what he saw from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know exactly how far north because people simply didn't go there. This is an area the size of Belgium. I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can either for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northen northe northe northen north exiting map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1912 Kordofan handbook, which describes the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern the Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which					
from the road; he wasn't able to go to other areas; he didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know exactly how far north because people simply didn't go there. This is an area the size of Belgium. I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We can also tell from the Harvard Development Project which studied the region in 1970. The project The Bahr el Arab as the southern not the northern boundary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
didn't go anywhere in the wet season. I would suggest that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know exactly how far north because people simply didn't go there. This is an area the size of Belgium. I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We can also tell from the Harvard Development Project which studied the region in 1970. The project Daudary of the Ngok Dinka; and which shows, in the accompanying map, Dar Jange extending from the Kiir up to 10°20' latitude. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
that that also provides powerful evidence that the Ngok were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know there. This is an area the size of Belgium. I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
were well to the north of the Ngol. We don't know there. This is an area the size of Belgium. I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
there. This is an area the size of Belgium. I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We have the 1913 Kordofan map, which identifies the Ngok Dinka as located almost entirely north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
there. This is an area the size of Belgium. I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We can also tell from the Harvard Development Project which studied the region in 1970. The project Project which studied the region in 1970. The project I used the example previously of driving on the We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir. We have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
I used the example previously of driving on the highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We can also tell from the Harvard Development Project which studied the region in 1970. The project He have Dupuis's 1921 sketch map showing Ngok dugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the				•	
highway south from Brussels, and seeing what you can on either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We can also tell from the Harvard Development Project which studied the region in 1970. The project Had ugdugs in villages throughout the location to the north of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
either side of the road; this was far worse: you just didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We can also tell from the Harvard Development Project which studied the region in 1970. The project of the Kiir, extending up to Bok, which is near the goz. We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
didn't know what existed on the other side. But you can tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We can also tell from the Harvard Development Project which studied the region in 1970. The project We have Howell's 1951 observation describing the Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
tell from the environmental evidence; from Cunnison, who lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. We can also tell from the Harvard Development Project which studied the region in 1970. The project Ngok as living throughout the Bahr el Arab, extending northwards along the main watercourses, of which the largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
22 lived out there for two years; and from what, as we're 23 going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 26 northwards along the main watercourses, of which the 27 largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. 28 We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which 29 the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
going to see, the Ngok people themselves say. 23 largest is the Ragaba Umm Biero. 24 We can also tell from the Harvard Development 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 26 Use have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
We can also tell from the Harvard Development 24 We have the 1965 and 1966 Abyei agreements, in which 25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 26 the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the					
25 Project which studied the region in 1970. The project 25 the Messiriya acknowledged the Ngok living on the				-	
Page 50 Page 52	2.5	110,000 which studied the region in 1770. The project	23	and the sound in the death of the sound in the sound in the	
		Page 50		Page 52	

10:08	1	Ragaba ez Zarga.	10:10	1	conclusions that they drew from the witness testimony
	2	And we have the Harvard Development Report		2	are powerful.
	3	describing the Ngok living up to where the sandy regions		3	They were educated, smart people. Their work, their
	4	stop.		4	efforts, demand respect; and not, as I said before,
	5	Professor Crawford is just wrong. When you actually		5	contempt. We should show humility towards what they
	6	look at the record and try to think about it, when you		6	did. Think about it if you could spend six days with
	7	don't just pull soundbites out of it that suit you, what		7	witnesses from all these areas. Wouldn't that tell you
	8	the record shows you is, undeniably, the Ngok living		8	a lot more than those snippets of testimony that you got
	9	throughout the entire Bahr region.		9	yesterday? I think we all saw the quality of the
	10	It's also not surprising that the more time people		10	interpretation. We saw that, right?
	11	spent out in the field, the more detailed and the		11	The experts didn't complain about that. They had
	12	further north their descriptions of the Ngok go. Think		12	immediate access to all those witnesses. I think the
	13	about it: who tells you most about the Ngok?		13	judgments that they drew are entitled to the greatest of
	14	Professor Cunnison, the Harvard Development Report,		14	respect. We should approach those with humility and not
	15	Mr Tibbs; people who actually lived there.		15	with contempt.
	16	Who doesn't tell you much? People like Henderson,		16	I'm not going to spend a lot of time because I've
	17	who Professor Crawford relies on, who rode in a truck		17	used too much time already on going through the
	18	from Muglad down to Abyei. The people that actually		18	witness testimony. It's on the slides, and if we can
	19	lived there are the ones that can tell you most.		19	just quickly show those.
	20	With that I suggest we turn to the people who lived	2	20	There are a number of specific descriptions from
	21	there most, the Ngok Dinka themselves. Contrary to what		21	different of the Ngok Dinka elders in the chiefdoms
	22	Professor Crawford would tell you, this is not evidence		22	about particular events in their lives. You can
	23	that we ought to look at from the perspective of		23	conclude, as I think Professor Crawford tries to
	24	Rudyard Kipling. I'm sure there was no intended irony,	2	24	insinuate, that it's all made up. I wouldn't do that.
	25	but Rudyard Kipling isn't necessarily the best source to	2	25	These witnesses are honest, they told the truth there,
		Page 53			Page 55
		-			-
10:09	1	choose in either evaluating oral evidence or looking at	10:12	1	they told the truth in the proceedings before the ABC
	2	a colonial people, a tribal people.		2	experts, and the ABC experts believed them.
	3	I would suggest that the views of the Canadian		3	With that I think I would like to move on to the one
	4	Supreme Court, which we've referred to in our written		4	witness that we will present, Deng Chier.
	5	submissions, which underscore the importance of paying		5	(10.13 am)
	6	respect to the testimony of indigenous people, is a lot		6	MR DENG CHIER AGOTH (affirmed)
	7	more useful than Rudyard Kipling's poem in the late		7	(Evidence interpreted)
	8	19th century. The Canadian Supreme Court has moved on		8	Examination-in-chief by MR LINDSAY
	9	a fair bit since Rudyard Kipling's views in the late		9	Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal that you have in
	10	19th century.		10	front of you the witness statement that you have made in
	11	Again, you can see on the current slide the faces of		11	this arbitral proceedings?
	12	the various Ngok Dinka who have given testimony here.		12	A. Honourable court, we have come here, it is a very far
	13	I'm going to move on relatively quickly through that.		13	distance, and nobody can move such a long distance if he
	14	I would note that we have seen some difficulty in		14 15	is not moving with the facts. So I'm coming with real facts.
	15 16	the formalities of this particular proceeding of having oral testimony. I would suggest that that doesn't in			Q. I want to ask you some questions about the places of
	16 17	the slightest devalue oral testimony. I would suggest		16 17	Q. I want to ask you some questions about the places of your people during the time of paramount chief
	18	that it instead underscores the wisdom of the parties		17	Arop Biong. Before we get to that can you please tell
	19	agreeing to the ABC experts' means of procedure.		10 19	the members of the Tribunal which of the nine Ngok Dinka
	20	You will recall that the ABC experts spent six days.		20	chiefdoms you belong to.
	21	You got six minutes; they spent six days in the Abyei		20	A. I belong to Abyior sub-tribe.
	22	Area. They met with 100 people; you'll have seen one or		22	Q. Can you please tell the Tribunal where you were born?
	23	two. They met with 100 people in open meetings, with		23	A. I can tell them where I was born; even where my
	24	lots of interpreters. They were able to ask whatever		23 24	grandfathers were born.
	25	questions they want. I would suggest that the		25	Q. Can you please tell the Tribunal where you were born?
		Page 54			Page 56

10:16 1	A. I was born in Abyei.	10:23 1	the Ngok lived during the time of your father's father;
10:16 1	Q. Do you know how old you are?	10:23 1	how do you know that?
3	A. I'm 75 years old.	3	A. Well, we came to know those places. We are in Abyei,
4	Q. Would you be able to tell the members of the Tribunal	4	and when we are children we move along with cattle and
5	where your father was born?	5	we as we go to those areas we will be told, "These
6	A. I can tell them.	6	are the places where we were staying here". We were
7	Q. Can you please tell the members of the Tribunal where	7	herding cattle and we had a continuous movement.
8	your father was born by specific reference to the	8	Q. So which of the places would you take your cattle?
9	village or place where he was born?	9	A. Those days, when things were normal, no conflicts, no
10	A. My father was born in Wun Bial, a place called Wun	10	disputes, we used to go as far as the north. We graze
11	Ameth, between the river and the village Wun Bial.	11	alongside we graze in the areas of the Arabs during
12	Q. Can you please, if you're able, describe for the	12	the rainy season, and in the dry season the Arabs also
13	Tribunal how far that place is from Abyei Town?	13	come down to our areas. But when things went wrong,
14	A. In actual fact Wun Bial and Wun Ameth are practically	14	there were conflicts, we shifted the pattern of herding
15	part of Abyei; it is the same. It is just the names of	15	southwards. We go up to Rek.
16	small further locations.	16	MR LINDSAY: Thank you. That's all we've got time for
17	Q. Could you please tell the Tribunal where your father's	17	today. So thank you very much, Deng-dit, you may
18	father was born?	18	return to your seat.
19	A. I will tell them. My grandfather, the father of my	19	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Government?
20	father, was born in a place called Kol Arouth.	20	MR BUNDY: We have no questions, Mr Chairman.
21	Q. And where is Kol Arouth?	21	THE CHAIRMAN: Questions from the Tribunal? There are no
22	A. This is a place the Arabs refer to as Mellum in the dry	22	questions, thank you.
23	land, but we call it Kol Arouth, beside the river.	23	MR BORN: Thank you for coming from so far.
24	Q. Does the name Kol Arouth have any meaning in the Dinka	24	(The witness withdrew)
25	language?	25	MR BORN: Mr Chairman, in terms of organisation, how am
	D 57		D 50
	Page 57		Page 59
10.19 1	A The Dinka referred to a number of hippopotamus. When	10:26 1	Lidoing on time? I think I've used 90 minutes now
10:19 1	A. The Dinka referred to a number of hippopotamus. When there are many we call them "routh" and when there is	10:26 1	I doing on time? I think I've used 90 minutes now. THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes
2	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is	2	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes.
2 3	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou".	2 3	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point?
2 3 4	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference	2 3 4	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.
2 3 4 5	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area?	2 3 4 5	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you.
2 3 4 5 6	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area	2 3 4 5 6	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those places you just spoke of, Deng, is the furthest north?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from Ngok Dinka chiefs, elders, the paramount chief, women,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those places you just spoke of, Deng, is the furthest north? Can you please confirm which of the places you referred	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from Ngok Dinka chiefs, elders, the paramount chief, women, others, in the record before you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those places you just spoke of, Deng, is the furthest north? Can you please confirm which of the places you referred to, Deng, is the furthest north, the most farthest away	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from Ngok Dinka chiefs, elders, the paramount chief, women, others, in the record before you. The nature of these proceedings doesn't give you the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those places you just spoke of, Deng, is the furthest north? Can you please confirm which of the places you referred to, Deng, is the furthest north, the most farthest away from Kol Arouth?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from Ngok Dinka chiefs, elders, the paramount chief, women, others, in the record before you. The nature of these proceedings doesn't give you the chance, the way the ABC experts had the opportunity, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those places you just spoke of, Deng, is the furthest north? Can you please confirm which of the places you referred to, Deng, is the furthest north, the most farthest away from Kol Arouth? A. They are not very far. They are places where you can go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from Ngok Dinka chiefs, elders, the paramount chief, women, others, in the record before you. The nature of these proceedings doesn't give you the chance, the way the ABC experts had the opportunity, to see or hear all of those people, but I would like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those places you just spoke of, Deng, is the furthest north? Can you please confirm which of the places you referred to, Deng, is the furthest north, the most farthest away from Kol Arouth? A. They are not very far. They are places where you can go in morning, you spend the day, and if you intend to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from Ngok Dinka chiefs, elders, the paramount chief, women, others, in the record before you. The nature of these proceedings doesn't give you the chance, the way the ABC experts had the opportunity, to see or hear all of those people, but I would like to walk you through a few of the things that they say, with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those places you just spoke of, Deng, is the furthest north? Can you please confirm which of the places you referred to, Deng, is the furthest north, the most farthest away from Kol Arouth? A. They are not very far. They are places where you can go in morning, you spend the day, and if you intend to return by the evening, you can do so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from Ngok Dinka chiefs, elders, the paramount chief, women, others, in the record before you. The nature of these proceedings doesn't give you the chance, the way the ABC experts had the opportunity, to see or hear all of those people, but I would like to walk you through a few of the things that they say, with a little less haste than I used before the break.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there are many we call them "routh" and when there is one we call it "rou". Q. Just so the Tribunal is clear, is Kol Arouth a reference to a village or a wider area? A. Kol Arouth is an open area. It is in the same area where a railway station has been built, and after that the name Mellum came. Q. During the time of your father's father, did the Ngok Dinka have any villages or settlements north of Kol Arouth? A. Yes. North of Kol Arouth you would be confronted with Awol Beth and Dhony Dhoul Beth, and furthermore there is Mienway and Malith. And in fact those days we were just bordering the Maalia and Rizeigat tribes. Q. Can you please confirm for the Tribunal which of those places you just spoke of, Deng, is the furthest north? Can you please confirm which of the places you referred to, Deng, is the furthest north, the most farthest away from Kol Arouth? A. They are not very far. They are places where you can go in morning, you spend the day, and if you intend to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIRMAN: You have used 90 minutes. MR BORN: Should we take a break at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. MR BORN: Very well, thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: We will be back in 25 minutes. (10.27 am) (A short break) (10.54 am) THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born. MR BORN: Thank you., Mr President. Perhaps I will use 30 seconds of my time to allow the people of the region to return. I think they've had their chance. I'd like to go back and look then, as I say, at the people of the region in a little bit more detail. As you know, there are 26 witness statements from Ngok Dinka chiefs, elders, the paramount chief, women, others, in the record before you. The nature of these proceedings doesn't give you the chance, the way the ABC experts had the opportunity, to see or hear all of those people, but I would like to walk you through a few of the things that they say, with

10:55 1	just ride in a truck through it or lead a contingent of	10:58 1	we had reference to Noong yesterday from one of the
2	40 Arab cavalry men through it where the Ngok Dinka	2	government's witnesses to Riet, Kol-Lang, Dagak,
3	people were.	3	Awol, and other places. There are further references to
4	I'd like to look first at what the chief of the	4	the Ngok along the river; that's the Ngol of course.
5	Abyior, Kuol Alor Makuac Biong, says. You can see on	5	North of the Alei, the Achueng had more settlements,
6	the current slide he describes the Abyior lands	6	and there are references there, and then there's
7	extending as far as Wun Deng Awak in the northwest and	7	a description of what the biggest village is.
8	Rumthil or Antila you will recall Antila is where	8	The current slide is what I promised you previously:
9	Mr Tibbs had first seen, on the road coming down from	9	this is a base map of the Abyei Area and it shows in red
10	Muglad, Ngok Dinka homes, and that insofar as the Abyior	10	various locations. The villages that are above the
11	one just one of the nine subsections or chiefdoms	11	Ngol, you can see they're shown on the current slide,
12	of the Ngok Dinka is concerned.	12	and I apologise for the quality of it.
13	I'd like to move on and look just briefly at what	13	These are the locations that are identified in the
14	an Abyei Area resident and elder of the Alei says. He	14	various witness statements that are before you. I'm
15	described how the Alei moved to Thuur, which is Turda,	15	going to bring you back to another map, a community
16	far in the north, and also to Nyama, also far in the	16	mapping map; this is just the witness statement
17	north. The Alei made this move during the time of	17	references to the villages above the Ngol that we've
18	Paramount Chief Arop Biong and when Chol Lual was the	18	already talked about.
19	paramount chief of the Alei. He described how it was a	19	The Government has challenged the evidence before
20	good life because there was lots of water, good crops	20	you in the Ngok witness testimony on the basis that it
21	and fishing.	21	was taken for the purpose of this litigation. That's
22	An Achak elder this is another one of the nine	22	hardly surprising; it was taken for the purpose of this
23	chiefdoms it took me, I have to say, as I became	23	litigation.
24	familiar with it, some time to understand and come to	24	Litigations around the world are conducted on the
25	terms with the nine separate chiefdoms. I suppose it's	25	basis of witness testimony, on the basis of witnesses
	Page 61		Page 63
	1 age 01		1 age 03
10:57 1			
10.57	a little bit like one of the people from the Abyei	11:00 1	coming and providing evidence about the current
2	a little bit like one of the people from the Abyei region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19	11:00 1 2	coming and providing evidence about the current proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that
2	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19	2	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that
2 3	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they	2 3	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the
2 3 4	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate	2 3 4	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at
2 3 4 5	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms.	2 3 4 5	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length.
2 3 4 5 6	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British	2 3 4 5 6	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses said that show you where the places are.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the paramount chief of the Ngok Dinka, from 1906 to 1945.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses said that show you where the places are. The same witness describes how in his grandfather's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the paramount chief of the Ngok Dinka, from 1906 to 1945. He explained how:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses said that show you where the places are. The same witness describes how in his grandfather's time, in the time of Arop Biong and the Mahdiyya, there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the paramount chief of the Ngok Dinka, from 1906 to 1945. He explained how: "We would graze to Nyama"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses said that show you where the places are. The same witness describes how in his grandfather's time, in the time of Arop Biong and the Mahdiyya, there had been certain movements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the paramount chief of the Ngok Dinka, from 1906 to 1945. He explained how: "We would graze to Nyama" Which was a permanent Ngok settlement of the Mareng,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses said that show you where the places are. The same witness describes how in his grandfather's time, in the time of Arop Biong and the Mahdiyya, there had been certain movements. Then if we can go on to the chief of the Achueng, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the paramount chief of the Ngok Dinka, from 1906 to 1945. He explained how: "We would graze to Nyama" Which was a permanent Ngok settlement of the Mareng, Manyuar, Achak and Bongo:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses said that show you where the places are. The same witness describes how in his grandfather's time, in the time of Arop Biong and the Mahdiyya, there had been certain movements. Then if we can go on to the chief of the Achueng, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the paramount chief of the Ngok Dinka, from 1906 to 1945. He explained how: "We would graze to Nyama" Which was a permanent Ngok settlement of the Mareng,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses said that show you where the places are. The same witness describes how in his grandfather's time, in the time of Arop Biong and the Mahdiyya, there had been certain movements. Then if we can go on to the chief of the Achueng, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the paramount chief of the Ngok Dinka, from 1906 to 1945. He explained how: "We would graze to Nyama" Which was a permanent Ngok settlement of the Mareng, Manyuar, Achak and Bongo:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	region coming to Europe and coming to terms with the 19 or 27 or however many states there are here, but they have their own separate areas, their own separate cultures, their chiefdoms. But an Achak elder describes how when the British came the Achak were at Nyama, Ruba, Kol Lang and other place, and recites when that was. There's also in the other witness evidence further descriptions of other villages that you can see on the current slide. The Bongo chief and we've heard reference to the Bongo in the Percival and Wilkinson descriptions were in settlements such as Mabek, Ahany, which is near Nyama, again far to the north Amiet, Miyen, Todac and other permanent settlements. Again, I won't read out the names because in some sense it's not so meaningful to you, it's just a number of names on a list, but I'm going to show you a map at the end of this review of what the witnesses said that show you where the places are. The same witness describes how in his grandfather's time, in the time of Arop Biong and the Mahdiyya, there had been certain movements. Then if we can go on to the chief of the Achueng, he says going further north and the northwest of Noong	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	proceedings. There's no reason to disbelieve that evidence, and I would recall for you the fact that the ABC experts had a chance to consider that testimony at some length. I'd like to move on and look at some of the Government's specific criticisms of the witness testimony. The Government describes that testimony as lacking specific details, and has complained about the existence of vague and generic terms. If in fact you look at the witness testimony, it does no such thing. It contains a number of specific descriptions of particular places we've already seen some previews of that and personal recollections about doing particular things in particular places. We can look first at the slide describing the testimony of an Abyior elder. He was born in 1914 or 1915, he was Sultan Rob's grandson, and he explains how he was born in Abyei Town, his father was Kuol Arop, the paramount chief of the Ngok Dinka, from 1906 to 1945. He explained how: "We would graze to Nyama" Which was a permanent Ngok settlement of the Mareng, Manyuar, Achak and Bongo: " and then further northwest to Wun Deng Awak and

,			
11:01 1	then to Meiram. The Abyior of my father's age and my	11:04 1	remained in the north.
2	grandfather's age would also use this grazing route and	2	I won't read out the rest of the slide, but he gives
3	meet the same settlements of the Ngok."	3	a detailed description of what he has been told by his
4	An Achueng chief, Ajak Malual Beliu, who was born in	4	family, what he knows, what he learned from the tribal
5	the mid-1930s, recalls the birthplaces of his father and	5	elders, and that is the way that information was
6	grandfather. He says:	6	conveyed. They didn't have written records. One can
7	"The following are some of the Achueng permanent	7	criticise them perhaps in the sense that that doesn't
8	settlements that I know of and have been told by my	8	provide a sort of documentary record the way that
9	father and grandfather. Mading and Agany were permanent	9	Percival or Wilkinson might, had we had a full access to
10	settlements southeast of Abyei Town and north of the	10	it, but it is the way they record their history.
11	River Kiir. North of Abyei Town, Noong [which we heard	11	As we have seen from the Supreme Court of Canada in
12	reference to previously] was a village of the Achueng."	12	the Inter-American decisions that we've referred to in
13	An elder of the Mareng chiefdom, Malual Alei Deng,	13	our written submission, there is not any basis for
14	who was born in 1940, recounts:	14	devaluing those oral traditions and this sort of oral
15	"The lands of the Mareng chiefdom have traditionally	15	testimony.
16	been centred in the place called Nyama, in the north,	16	One has to look at it with care, of course. One has
17	and further south of Nyama towards Abyei Town. I lived	17	to recognise that these statements were prepared for
18	in Nyama and so did my Mareng from my father's and	18	a litigation, of course. On the other hand, one can't
19	grandfather's time."	19	simply dismiss it because that was what was done. This
20	As we've seen, Nyama is well to the north of the	20	is how those people, who we must respect and show
21	Ngol.	21	humility towards, record their past, record their
22	Adol Kwot Mual, a Manyuar elder, testified:	22	present. That is how they live. It is their land,
23	"I was born in the 1940s My grandfather was	23	those people, their land that you must decide about, and
24	born in Thuba and lived there until he was a man.	24	in doing that taking into account how they describe
25	I have been told that my grandfather was initiated in	25	their history is among the paramount tasks before you.
	There even total and my grandrania. Was inflanced in	23	aren instory is among the paramount tasks before you.
	Page 65		Page 67
11:02 1	Thuba."	11:05 1	We have put in significant numbers of witness
2	Again, all of these statements and the reason	2	statements which coincide exactly with what the ABC
3	I take you through them, and I realise to some extent	3	experts themselves five impartial men, three of them
4	it's tiresome, but I take you through them to point out	4	African, two of them African experts, the three picked
5	the specific details that these witnesses testified to.	5	by IGAD, chosen by the parties, congratulated by the
6	One can challenge their recollection, one can	6	parties, including the Government, at the end of the
7	challenge where places are and so forth I'm going to	7	proceedings for being impartial and doing the
8	show you a map that puts everything together, I just	8	proceedings right they looked at this witness
9	showed you a small selection of places that were	9	evidence and reached the same conclusions that we say
10	referred to in the first witness statements that	10	you should reach, and I would suggest that that judgment
11	I referred to; I will show you a map that puts all these	11	is entitled to the greatest of respect.
12	places on a single map but the notion that these are	12	I could go on through more witness statements, but
13	unspecific or that they are unreliable I think is simply	13	I suspect that that would not be enormously helpful for
14 15	speculation. I think when you look at what the	14 15	you. I would urge, though, that you read the witness
15	witnesses who describe their territory and you've	15	statements and give deference to the fact that that is
16 17	seen these are straightforward people, they're people	16 17	the way that these people speak. They didn't keep
17	who tell you what they know, and that's what their	17	documentary records, they didn't do trek reports; that's not how they did it. Instead they have oral traditions
18			not now mey did it. Histeau mey have oral traditions
10	witness statements do.		
19 20	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel	19	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken
20	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel Chol Akuei Deng, who is the chief of the Alei, describes	19 20	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken into account.
20 21	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel Chol Akuei Deng, who is the chief of the Alei, describes how during the chieftaincy of Chol Lual in the	19 20 21	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken into account. If we could look at a map, though, that tries to
20 21 22	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel Chol Akuei Deng, who is the chief of the Alei, describes how during the chieftaincy of Chol Lual in the mid-1800s and again this is reporting what he hears	19 20 21 22	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken into account. If we could look at a map, though, that tries to give modern description to what is on the witness
20 21 22 23	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel Chol Akuei Deng, who is the chief of the Alei, describes how during the chieftaincy of Chol Lual in the mid-1800s and again this is reporting what he hears from his father, his grandfather, the people, the elders	19 20 21 22 23	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken into account. If we could look at a map, though, that tries to give modern description to what is on the witness statements. Here is a map that shows the locations of
20 21 22 23 24	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel Chol Akuei Deng, who is the chief of the Alei, describes how during the chieftaincy of Chol Lual in the mid-1800s and again this is reporting what he hears from his father, his grandfather, the people, the elders of his tribe the chief's family settled further south	19 20 21 22 23 24	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken into account. If we could look at a map, though, that tries to give modern description to what is on the witness statements. Here is a map that shows the locations of the towns that are referred to in the witness
20 21 22 23	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel Chol Akuei Deng, who is the chief of the Alei, describes how during the chieftaincy of Chol Lual in the mid-1800s and again this is reporting what he hears from his father, his grandfather, the people, the elders	19 20 21 22 23	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken into account. If we could look at a map, though, that tries to give modern description to what is on the witness statements. Here is a map that shows the locations of
20 21 22 23 24	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel Chol Akuei Deng, who is the chief of the Alei, describes how during the chieftaincy of Chol Lual in the mid-1800s and again this is reporting what he hears from his father, his grandfather, the people, the elders of his tribe the chief's family settled further south	19 20 21 22 23 24	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken into account. If we could look at a map, though, that tries to give modern description to what is on the witness statements. Here is a map that shows the locations of the towns that are referred to in the witness
20 21 22 23 24	If we can move on to the next slide, Belbel Chol Akuei Deng, who is the chief of the Alei, describes how during the chieftaincy of Chol Lual in the mid-1800s and again this is reporting what he hears from his father, his grandfather, the people, the elders of his tribe the chief's family settled further south in Thuba, among Alei settlements, and other settlements	19 20 21 22 23 24	that must be taken into account and deserve to be taken into account. If we could look at a map, though, that tries to give modern description to what is on the witness statements. Here is a map that shows the locations of the towns that are referred to in the witness statements. The black dots that you see on the map are

,			
11:06 1	the towns that are referred to in the various witness	11:10 1	That's consistent with what I said prior to the break
2	statements. That's also included in our materials.	2	about how the Messiriya and the Ngok would be in similar
3	This is not vague or generalised testimony. There	3	areas. It's inaccurate because it so sort of crudely
4	are a number of specific villages and settlements that	4	segregates the two peoples when in fact, as we know from
5	are referred to. Consistent with Cunnison and	5	all the evidence, they in truth overlapped.
6	consistent with the Harvard Development Report and	6	Importantly, what the map doesn't show is what
7	consistent with everything else that we've seen, these	7	happened in the wet season. And for all the reasons we
8	are villages dotted throughout the Bahr. They are north	8	talked about [before] the break, we know that if the
9	of the Ngol, south of the Ngol; there are very few of	9	dry-season grazing was in the south, then the wet-season
10	them beneath the Kiir.	10	home areas and permanent settlements that Cunnison
11	What I'd like to do next is to briefly address the	11	described so graphically were in the north, scattered
12	so-called "Civsec map" which was referred to by	12	throughout the Bahr. That, I would suggest, is the true
13	Professor Crawford at some length. You'll recall this	13	value of this map, whatever its provenance.
14	was a 1933 sort of cartoon sketch. It looked something	14	The idea, though, that you can from a dry-season
15	like this, and it's in the arbitrators' daily bundle,	15	grazing area in the south deduce what the territory of
16	and much was made of it by the Government.	16	the Ngok Dinka was is childish. That map does nothing
17	First, it's somewhat curious in that the Government	17	of the sort. It is a dry-season reflection of uncertain
18	submitted this twice. It was submitted first with their	18	provenance that has no bearing at all on where the Ngok
19	counter-memorial at Annex 39, and it was called "Civsec	19	themselves lived for most of the year.
20	66/4/35, minutes of the meeting 28th October 1933".	20	I'd also like to turn on, though, to a map that does
21	Then it was submitted again at Annex 40 of the	21	have more value. We were mindful of the Government's
22	counter-memorial, and it was described as "An agreement	22	criticisms of the witness evidence which, because it was
23	made at Wunrog, 7th March 1935".	23	only 26 witnesses and because it was prepared to some
24	Obviously the SPLM/A and the Ngok don't know what	24	extent under the time pressures of this case, couldn't
25	the provenance of the meeting was or the map was, but	25	fully capture we would have liked to fully capture
23	the provenance of the meeting was of the map was, but	23	runy capture we would have fixed to fully capture
	Page 69		Page 71
11:08 1	it's somewhat peculiar that the Government would have	11:11 1	all the Ngok Dinka villages that one could; we couldn't
11:08 1 2	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way.	11:11 1 2	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted,
2 3	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the	2 3	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map.
2 3 4	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these	2 3 4	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community
2 3 4 5	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings.	2 3 4 5	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of
2 3 4 5 6	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes:	2 3 4 5 6	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is
2 3 4 5 6 7	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study. We are fortunate to have with us today
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	submitted it twice, describing it in a different way. Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That, Cunnison tells us and all the environmental evidence tells us, is where the Messiriya would come in the dry	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study. We are fortunate to have with us today Dr Peter Poole. Dr Poole is one of the world's leading
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That, Cunnison tells us and all the environmental evidence tells us, is where the Messiriya would come in the dry season.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study. We are fortunate to have with us today Dr Peter Poole. Dr Poole is one of the world's leading community mapping experts. He in fact, I'm told,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That, Cunnison tells us and all the environmental evidence tells us, is where the Messiriya would come in the dry season. Therefore, to show, as that map did, the Ngok in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study. We are fortunate to have with us today Dr Peter Poole. Dr Poole is one of the world's leading community mapping experts. He in fact, I'm told, prepared the world's first community map. There is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That, Cunnison tells us and all the environmental evidence tells us, is where the Messiriya would come in the dry season. Therefore, to show, as that map did, the Ngok in a particular area of the south, basically in the same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study. We are fortunate to have with us today Dr Peter Poole. Dr Poole is one of the world's leading community mapping experts. He in fact, I'm told, prepared the world's first community map. There is a recognised methodology and technique for preparing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That, Cunnison tells us and all the environmental evidence tells us, is where the Messiriya would come in the dry season. Therefore, to show, as that map did, the Ngok in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study. We are fortunate to have with us today Dr Peter Poole. Dr Poole is one of the world's leading community mapping experts. He in fact, I'm told, prepared the world's first community map. There is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That, Cunnison tells us and all the environmental evidence tells us, is where the Messiriya would come in the dry season. Therefore, to show, as that map did, the Ngok in a particular area of the south, basically in the same latitude as the Messiriya, is not at all surprising.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study. We are fortunate to have with us today Dr Peter Poole. Dr Poole is one of the world's leading community mapping experts. He in fact, I'm told, prepared the world's first community map. There is a recognised methodology and technique for preparing community maps. It is a technique that has been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Be that as it may, the map shows nothing about the territory of the Ngok Dinka that has any value for these proceedings. First, it concerned disputes between other tribes: the Malwal, the Rizeigat and the Homr. It didn't involve discussions with the Ngok in the slightest. Therefore, whoever it was and, as the Government says, they have no idea who drew it whoever it was didn't have information from or, so far as the record indicates, about the Ngok that has the slightest veracity. Second, it is completely obvious from the map and Professor Crawford at the end of the day couldn't and didn't really try to deny that that it shows dry-season grazing areas. The reason you know it shows dry-season grazing areas is, when you look at it, it has the Homr substantially down in the south. That, Cunnison tells us and all the environmental evidence tells us, is where the Messiriya would come in the dry season. Therefore, to show, as that map did, the Ngok in a particular area of the south, basically in the same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	do that in the time allowed. So we also have submitted, for the Tribunal's assistance, a community map. The Government has scoffed at this, but community mapping is a recognised and sophisticated means of trying, in a scientific manner, to identify where it is that people live. One can criticise the methodology of this, one can question the way that it was conducted; that's fair enough, that's litigation. One should examine this evidence like the other evidence in the record with care and discretion, and try to assess where it's stronger and where it's weaker; we don't dispute that in the slightest. What one can't do, though, is just dismiss it. One has to look at it and try to understand what it shows. What this shows, I would suggest, is a very powerful picture of Ngok Dinka villages scattered throughout the area that the community mapping group was able to study. We are fortunate to have with us today Dr Peter Poole. Dr Poole is one of the world's leading community mapping experts. He in fact, I'm told, prepared the world's first community map. There is a recognised methodology and technique for preparing

11:13 1			
11.15 1	developed to address exactly the evidentiary problem	11:16 1	conscience that my statement will be in accordance
2	that the Canadian Supreme Court and the Inter-American	2	with my sincere belief.
3	Court identified in their judgments. It is the problem	3	Presentation by DR POOLE
4	of: how do you determine where a people that do not have	4	THE WITNESS: On the slide you are going to see the topics
5	written records, and who do not have the sorts of	5	that I'm going to address one by one over the next
6	technological instruments for record-keeping that we do,	6	10 minutes or so. I'm going to spend a little more
7	where they live, where they lived in the past? How does	7	time on community mapping, that's item 2, because
8	one do that?	8	there's quite a lot of unfamiliarity with it, and
9	What Dr Poole and numerous other experts of this	9	there are people doing it in different ways in
10	sort around the world have done is to harness modern	10	different places. So I'm going to take care to
11	technology with pre-modern knowledge of an area. It	11	describe the methodology that myself and my colleagues
12	puts the members of a community, community mapping,	12	developed in the early 90s.
13	together with modern mapping techniques, the community	13	My academic background: the last item there doesn't
14	mapping project, and attempts to identify as precisely	14	have a date on it. I actually got the PhD in 1980, and
15	and carefully as possible where it is that people live,	15	I spent the preceding six or seven years as the director
16	and where they describe their ancestors as having lived.	16	of national parks planning for the Canadian Arctic.
17	Again, one can challenge how this is done; the	17	During that time I spent pretty well six months of every
18	Government is free to cross-examine Dr Poole. But it	18	year visiting Inuit in their communities, and Dene,
19	provides a way to respond to the Government's criticisms	19	Gwitchen and other peoples of the Canadian Arctic,
20	of the witness testimony.	20	talking about conservation, talking about their issues.
21	Unfortunately Dr Poole, given the exigencies of this	21	In fact I wrote my thesis on relationships between
22	arbitration process, didn't have time to spend the same	22	indigenous peoples and conservation, good and bad.
23	period that he might ordinarily have done. One might	23	After that I spent the rest of the 1980s working on
24	ordinarily spend a year to study an area three-quarters	24	a series of projects, again with indigenous peoples, not
25	of the size of Belgium. He nonetheless was able to	25	just in Canada but then throughout Central and South
	Page 73		Page 75
11:14 1	spend a significant period of time in the region, with	11:18 1	American. Towards the end of that decade I, by a series
2	a significant number of Ngok Dinka people, aimed at	2	of chances, was asked to conduct an experiment in the
3	recording permanent villages and other sites which would	3	Arctic with a new form of search-and-rescue device,
4	be of assistance to the Tribunal.	4	which had been invented by a Canadian company.
5	All told he came up, in a study area with a radius	5	I had just heard about GPS from one of the research
6	of some 40 miles, with 150 permanent settlements,	6	scientists. So I managed to get hold of one of the
7	56 burial sites, 74 grazing sites, 35 cultivation sites,		
		7	
8	45 community meeting and court locations, and 11 sacred	7 8	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available.
8 9	45 community meeting and court locations, and 11 sacred sites.		first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung
		8	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers
9	sites.	8 9	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung
9 10	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and	8 9 10	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue
9 10 11	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial	8 9 10 11	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well.
9 10 11 12	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony	8 9 10 11 12	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was
9 10 11 12 13	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we	8 9 10 11 12 13	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures
9 10 11 12 13 14	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that Dr Poole conducted that particular study. The best	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of airborne search and rescue in the Arctic at that time.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that Dr Poole conducted that particular study. The best person in the world to answer that is, Dr Poole who	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of airborne search and rescue in the Arctic at that time. So about a year or so later the price had dropped
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that Dr Poole conducted that particular study. The best person in the world to answer that is, Dr Poole who I would now like to invite to address you. Thank you.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of airborne search and rescue in the Arctic at that time. So about a year or so later the price had dropped from 30,000 to less than 1,000 and I was invited to work
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that Dr Poole conducted that particular study. The best person in the world to answer that is, Dr Poole who I would now like to invite to address you. Thank you. (11.16 am)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of airborne search and rescue in the Arctic at that time. So about a year or so later the price had dropped from 30,000 to less than 1,000 and I was invited to work with the Ye'kuana people of the Cunucunuma in the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that Dr Poole conducted that particular study. The best person in the world to answer that is, Dr Poole who I would now like to invite to address you. Thank you. (11.16 am) DR PETER POOLE (called)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of airborne search and rescue in the Arctic at that time. So about a year or so later the price had dropped from 30,000 to less than 1,000 and I was invited to work with the Ye'kuana people of the Cunucunuma in the Venezuelan Amazon. I wasn't sure what it was about, but
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that Dr Poole conducted that particular study. The best person in the world to answer that is, Dr Poole who I would now like to invite to address you. Thank you. (11.16 am) DR PETER POOLE (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I welcome Dr Poole. Please read the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of airborne search and rescue in the Arctic at that time. So about a year or so later the price had dropped from 30,000 to less than 1,000 and I was invited to work with the Ye'kuana people of the Cunucunuma in the Venezuelan Amazon. I wasn't sure what it was about, but I went down and said "So, what's the plan?"
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that Dr Poole conducted that particular study. The best person in the world to answer that is, Dr Poole who I would now like to invite to address you. Thank you. (11.16 am) DR PETER POOLE (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I welcome Dr Poole. Please read the affirmation. THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of airborne search and rescue in the Arctic at that time. So about a year or so later the price had dropped from 30,000 to less than 1,000 and I was invited to work with the Ye'kuana people of the Cunucunuma in the Venezuelan Amazon. I wasn't sure what it was about, but I went down and said "So, what's the plan?" They said, "We're going to unilaterally demarcate our territory, and then the Government will start paying
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sites. Again, the Government can cross-examine him and challenge those various points, but it is a substantial and more detailed picture than the witness testimony itself was able to present. That's not surprising: we could only put in 26 witness statements; he was able to draw on a much broader range of material. The Government has challenged both the entire concept of community mapping, but also the way that Dr Poole conducted that particular study. The best person in the world to answer that is, Dr Poole who I would now like to invite to address you. Thank you. (11.16 am) DR PETER POOLE (called) THE CHAIRMAN: I welcome Dr Poole. Please read the affirmation.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	first civilian GPS units that were becoming available. And I spent a year or so in the community of Pangnirtung in Baffin Island with the Hunters and Trappers Association, who'd set up their own search-and-rescue system, and they did very well. The whole complex we were dealing with was a Russian-American rescue satellite, rescue procedures in Canada, and the GPS itself, radio communications, and so forth. And within a year they had developed a very efficient methodology for doing community-based search and rescue, which cost about 100th of the cost of airborne search and rescue in the Arctic at that time. So about a year or so later the price had dropped from 30,000 to less than 1,000 and I was invited to work with the Ye'kuana people of the Cunucunuma in the Venezuelan Amazon. I wasn't sure what it was about, but I went down and said "So, what's the plan?" They said, "We're going to unilaterally demarcate

11:20 1			
11.20 I	attention to us and we will negotiate with them". It	11:23 1	that is communities mobilising to gather information
2	was quite a smart move because there was no law for	2	from elders, other authorities and from the environment
3	indigenous peoples in Venezuela at the time. So I said,	3	and to compile themselves, to compile maps which depict
4	"Well, what do you want me to do?" And they said,	4	their forms of resource use and enable them to deal on
5	"Well, we want you to make the white man's map, because	5	an equal footing with outside interests or competing
6	if we make our map the Government won't pay any	6	interests.
7	attention to it".	7	These are not all originally a lot of what we
8	So I had one of these new units with me and I said,	8	call tenure mapping was about land claims, but as these
9	"Look, I can teach you to make your own white man's	9	methodologies became more varied and commonplace they
10	map". They said, "Well, let's do the demarcation	10	started to address other issues.
11	first", so we did that and mapped that, and then they	11	Like, for example, last year in the Democratic
12	took the GPS and I spent about three weeks training	12	Republic of Congo, the Rainforest Foundation from London
13	a group of about 12 Ye'kuana who didn't have any	13	coordinated a very large project involving more than 100
14	concepts of north/south, our familiar concepts of	14	communities to do mapping of their resources, and the
15	orientation, and within that period they were fully	15	express purpose of this project was to persuade the
16	conversant with using a GPS unit.	16	Congo Government to change the laws and policies
17	I had made them a huge map of their territory which	17	regarding forestry in order to accommodate indigenous
18	I had stripped off all the names, everything except the	18	interests and community possibilities for doing their
19	rivers, and the rivers are people's way of it's their	19	own forestry.
20	latitude and longitude, the rivers. So all they had was	20	I just made a short list here of the four main
21	a big, blank, no-name map with latitude and longitude	21	characteristics that spring to mind.
22	and the rivers on it, and I left them with that for	22	We always did the training within the community, and
23	a year, and when I came back they had the whole map	23	what was interesting about the training process is that
24	covered with their names, their resources.	24	that process, which would take anything from two to
25	This was basically a method that myself and my	25	three or four weeks, started a process of reflection
	7		T. 50
	Page 77		Page 79
11:21 1	colleagues worked on over the next few years, and we	11:25 1	within the communities that we were passing through as
2	worked on about well, I was involved in about ten	2	we did the training. That in itself generated a lot
3	projects in Venezuela, Colombia, Guyana and Surinam.	3	more interest.
4	The last project in Surinam, which I think was	4	They were saying such things as, "Look, this is for
5	finished in 2001, was very successful insomuch that the	5	our land claim, but when we've done it we can start
6	NGO that I was working with, the Forest Peoples	6	doing forestry or we can start doing water or fisheries
7	Programme in England, successfully took it to the	7	management". A lot of them have done that in fact,
8	Inter-American Court human rights tribunal.	8	because they owned the map, they had the capacity; they
9	After about five years of back and forth, during	9	
	and the Libert to a content of the Tailboard and the state of the stat		didn't rely on somebody else outside to make the map for
10	which I had to go to the Tribunal myself with the two	10	didn't rely on somebody else outside to make the map for them.
10 11	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made,	10 11	
	•		them.
11	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made,	11	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and
11 12	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their	11 12	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of
11 12 13	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago.	11 12 13	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time
11 12 13 14	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised,	11 12 13 14	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say
11 12 13 14 15	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other	11 12 13 14 15	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or
11 12 13 14 15 16	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of	11 12 13 14 15	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are
11 12 13 14 15 16	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that	11 12 13 14 15 16	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that we were. It was very encouraging.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from gathering the data to printing the final map.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that we were. It was very encouraging. There's a list of projects on the board, which	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from gathering the data to printing the final map. So these are the four major attributes.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that we were. It was very encouraging. There's a list of projects on the board, which I won't go into detail now because it will simply take	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from gathering the data to printing the final map. So these are the four major attributes. The information comes more or less exclusively from community informants. We localised the technology as much as possible.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that we were. It was very encouraging. There's a list of projects on the board, which I won't go into detail now because it will simply take too long, but I think you could say that even though in	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from gathering the data to printing the final map. So these are the four major attributes. The information comes more or less exclusively from community informants.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that we were. It was very encouraging. There's a list of projects on the board, which I won't go into detail now because it will simply take too long, but I think you could say that even though in each of these cases, and other cases, the political legal situation differed from country to country, as well as the propensity or readiness of the government to	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from gathering the data to printing the final map. So these are the four major attributes. The information comes more or less exclusively from community informants. We localised the technology as much as possible. Sometimes there are choices between tracing on huge sheets versus digitising, which requires a digitising
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that we were. It was very encouraging. There's a list of projects on the board, which I won't go into detail now because it will simply take too long, but I think you could say that even though in each of these cases, and other cases, the political legal situation differed from country to country, as	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from gathering the data to printing the final map. So these are the four major attributes. The information comes more or less exclusively from community informants. We localised the technology as much as possible. Sometimes there are choices between tracing on huge
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that we were. It was very encouraging. There's a list of projects on the board, which I won't go into detail now because it will simply take too long, but I think you could say that even though in each of these cases, and other cases, the political legal situation differed from country to country, as well as the propensity or readiness of the government to recognise land rights, they all had a common theme, and	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from gathering the data to printing the final map. So these are the four major attributes. The information comes more or less exclusively from community informants. We localised the technology as much as possible. Sometimes there are choices between tracing on huge sheets versus digitising, which requires a digitising table and lot of money, so we do tracing. Tracing is
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	maps I had made of Saramaka territory, or they had made, they were successful. They got a judgment in their favour about two years ago. During the 1990s community mapping got globalised, and I was glad to see that a lot of people in other countries were sort of getting the same sort of technology and putting it to the same sort of uses that we were. It was very encouraging. There's a list of projects on the board, which I won't go into detail now because it will simply take too long, but I think you could say that even though in each of these cases, and other cases, the political legal situation differed from country to country, as well as the propensity or readiness of the government to	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	them. Even if they did some of them do rely on me and still ask me to help out with the computer side of things, but they control the content. Every time I change something, I send it back to them. I would say over the years that of all the groups I've trained or worked with, 80% now have their own little they are in complete control of the whole mapping process, from gathering the data to printing the final map. So these are the four major attributes. The information comes more or less exclusively from community informants. We localised the technology as much as possible. Sometimes there are choices between tracing on huge sheets versus digitising, which requires a digitising

11:26 1	just as accurate as digitising because you are still	11:30 1	12 young men well, medium-sized men, some young, some
2	following a line with a modem or a pencil.	2	older and we started off with the GPS units and
3	Finally, community ownership: they own the map, and	3	within about three or four days some of them already
4	that makes a tremendous amount of difference to the way	4	had used a GPS unit and after I sort of checked
5	they use it and the confidence with which they use it.	5	everybody's sort of way they approached it and the way
6	So coming to the Abyei mapping project, as Gary has	6	used it, it was very clear to me that they were going to
7	just mentioned, he has mentioned the general purposes of	7	move quite fast.
8	the project.	8	So on the third or fourth day we went out on one of
9	I should point out that my remit on this was to	9	our first exercises, which entailed driving just 20 or
10	collaborate with International Mapping, who were going	10	30 kilometres down the road from Agok to Abyei, and
11	to produce the maps, the community maps and all the	11	maybe now and then I would stop and say, "Take a point
12	other maps related to the project. My remit was not to	12	here", and there was an appropriate legend symbol, we'd
13	frame the mapping process so it led towards a boundary	13	already worked on the legend, and we simply recorded
14		14 15	a dozen points.
15 16	towards collecting evidence of presence, and having that presence go back to 1905. That was my remit.	16	When we went back I asked them to place those points on the topographic base map, which had latitude and
17	There are two more points here which I should point	17	longitude lines on it, and they did that and they
18	out. In this methodology that we use, even though you	18	discovered that the road between Agok and Abyei was in
19	can localise GPS it's a perfectly obvious and simple	19	fact, as depicted on the map, inaccurate by up to
20	thing to do you can't necessarily localise the other	20	9 kilometres in one case. So the line of crosses that
21	bits, the computer and the printer, especially in places	21	the trainees plotted went this way and the road went
22	like humid tropics.	22	that way (indicates).
23	So the community mapping process evolved into a kind	23	So that told us something about the accuracy of that
24	of complementary form of organisation in many places	24	map, and it became another factor which we had to take
25	where the community teams would actually be the ones	25	into account in: how can we plan field trips when we are
	·		
	Page 81		Page 83
11:28 1	going out and getting the information and recording it	11:31 1	not absolutely sure that we can get from this point to
2	on logbooks, and then a community association or	2	that point without having to go around?
3	a support NGO, or me, would take that information and	3	So that was another delaying factor that obliged us
4	just put it on the final map. All we did was to	4	to think: well, maybe we should concentrate on a smaller
5	regularise it and digitise it, really. But the actual	5	area that we know we can cover, or we feel confident we
6	collection, the design of the legend, was all within the	6	can cover, without assuming that we can go long
7	community.	7	distances and assume that the roads as shown on the map
8	Coming to this project specifically, the first step	8	would be there.
9	always is to look for the best source map, and from that	9	So along with that field training and classroom
10	source map we will derive whatever we need as	10	training we went into logbooks. Now, the logbook is the
11	a background upon which the trainees will place their	11	key. In the logbook the trainee will register the
12	information.	12	number, the date, the names and the people of that
13	It was not easy here because the satellite images of	13	group. We had 12 people divided into three teams, 1, 2,
14	the area tend to be rather low scale or extremely	14	3.
15	expensive. I think we calculated it would cost more	15	So each page of the logbook had: team 2, trip 1,
16	than 100,000 if we were to get high-resolution imagery	16	from here going to there, and then there was
17	of the whole area.	17	an observation number, with its latitude and longitude,
18	The other option was a medium-scale map, 1:250,000,	18	the legend symbol, the number of the photograph or
19	from that area made by the United Nations and a Swiss	19	photographs that were taken and some comments.
20	agency. So International Mapping produced a topographic	20	So every single observation that the mapping teams
21	map and we brought satellite images anyway in the event	21	made is traceable. It can be checked by anybody who
22 23	that they might prove useful. So I'm now going to go through the other four items	22 23	takes a GPS unit and keys in those coordinates; it will take him to that point. So in that sense the mapping
23	on the slide there, the methodology.	23 24	process was quite transparent.
25	The first step was to train the mappers. There were	24 25	The community meetings had been arranged for us, and
23	The first step was to dain the mappers. There were	2.5	The community incomings had been arranged for us, and
	Page 82		Page 84

11:33 1	there were nine of them, each one with 25 elders who had	11:36 1	radius from Abyei.
2	been invited on the basis of previous involvement in the	2	As my colleague has already pointed out, the list of
3	case or the fact that they were local authorities who	3	settlements, which I would say, from all the mapping
4	had something to contribute.	4	projects I've done, this is pretty good.
5	During those meetings the trainees and Kwol Biong,	5	The first one or the second and third one I ever did
6	who was sort of the lead trainee, had a list that had	6	took people a year, a solid year, and they came up with
7	been drawn from various sources, a sort of working list	7	4,000 observations, but that's never been equalled since
8	of potential sites in that area, in that chiefdom, and	8	in my experience. Some of the people who do community
9	simply went through them.	9	mapping come back with like 20 observations. In Africa
10	This sort of generated a discussion which lasted	10	and Bolivia I've seen examples where the data is fairly
11	anything from five to six or seven hours, and it was	11	skimpy.
12	a long, thorough discussion. You could tell there was	12	Now, on that kind of continuum I would say this is
13	a tremendous amount of interest and response to the	13	in the upper half, quite good, and I have the strong
14	points that were made: no, it's not here, it's there,	14	impression that if we hadn't had the problems of access
15	and: it should be there, and so forth.	15	and mobility that a lot more sites would have been
16	So by the end of the community meeting we had	16	recorded; but that is speculation, of course.
17	a pretty good idea where the sites were that needed	17	Finally we come to the map. One of these we've
18	visiting, and at the end of the meeting three or four	18	already gone over. The second one was the quality of
19	elders came forward or were selected to accompany the	19	the data.
20	mappers.	20	Now, my point of comparison for this is other
21	So what happened next was the mappers went to that	21	projects that I've worked on, and a very strong
22	area, and in each case they made two visits. One was	22	indicator is how disciplined the mappers are in filling
23	a sort of reconnaissance visit to find out how	23	out their logbooks. The whole thing has to be focused
24	accessible the sites were; because the elders couldn't	24	on the record, which has to be transparent and has to be
25	put them on a map because we weren't sure whether the	25	something that they can come back to later, or somebody
	Page 85		Page 87
11:34 1	map was accurate, so they said, "Well, we will take you	11:38 1	else can inspect if they wish.
11:34 1	map was accurate, so they said, "Well, we will take you there by this road and that road".	11:38 1 2	else can inspect if they wish. So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the
2	there by this road and that road".	2	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the
2 3	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most		So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put
2 3 4	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks	2 3 4	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect
2 3	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or	2 3	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say.
2 3 4 5	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone	2 3 4 5	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect
2 3 4 5 6 7	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was	2 3 4 5 6	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees
2 3 4 5 6	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders'	2 3 4 5 6 7	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders'	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it was completely the opposite in terms of access. Then there were problems of visibility. The burning hadn't taken place in some areas where we expected it to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in the meetings, which were extraordinarily lively; they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it was completely the opposite in terms of access. Then there were problems of visibility. The burning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in the meetings, which were extraordinarily lively; they were lively, but at the same time people listened to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it was completely the opposite in terms of access. Then there were problems of visibility. The burning hadn't taken place in some areas where we expected it to have taken [place], so there was not good visibility, and there were the problems of the roads, the rivers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in the meetings, which were extraordinarily lively; they were lively, but at the same time people listened to each other, and that was always interesting. The other one was that during the trips itself there was a continual conversation going on about what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it was completely the opposite in terms of access. Then there were problems of visibility. The burning hadn't taken place in some areas where we expected it to have taken [place], so there was not good visibility, and there were the problems of the roads, the rivers being flooded and not passable.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in the meetings, which were extraordinarily lively; they were lively, but at the same time people listened to each other, and that was always interesting. The other one was that during the trips itself there was a continual conversation going on about what happened here, what used to happen there. It's very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it was completely the opposite in terms of access. Then there were problems of visibility. The burning hadn't taken place in some areas where we expected it to have taken [place], so there was not good visibility, and there were the problems of the roads, the rivers being flooded and not passable. So all of these factors combined led to the decision	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in the meetings, which were extraordinarily lively; they were lively, but at the same time people listened to each other, and that was always interesting. The other one was that during the trips itself there was a continual conversation going on about what happened here, what used to happen there. It's very much like the conversations I alluded to earlier: one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it was completely the opposite in terms of access. Then there were problems of visibility. The burning hadn't taken place in some areas where we expected it to have taken [place], so there was not good visibility, and there were the problems of the roads, the rivers being flooded and not passable.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in the meetings, which were extraordinarily lively; they were lively, but at the same time people listened to each other, and that was always interesting. The other one was that during the trips itself there was a continual conversation going on about what happened here, what used to happen there. It's very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it was completely the opposite in terms of access. Then there were problems of visibility. The burning hadn't taken place in some areas where we expected it to have taken [place], so there was not good visibility, and there were the problems of the roads, the rivers being flooded and not passable. So all of these factors combined led to the decision	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in the meetings, which were extraordinarily lively; they were lively, but at the same time people listened to each other, and that was always interesting. The other one was that during the trips itself there was a continual conversation going on about what happened here, what used to happen there. It's very much like the conversations I alluded to earlier: one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there by this road and that road". So they took us there, and I would say that in most cases the sites that were registered in the logbooks were sites that had already been talked about or discussed. There were only a few cases where someone said, "Oh, there is also a grave", or there was a village that we missed. But by and large the elders' meetings covered pretty well a large proportion of the data that was eventually mapped, so in that sense they were very, very useful. I think the next slide refers back to the decision, based partly on the fact that we couldn't depend upon the maps being reliable, based on the fact that it wasn't possible to say, "All these points we've talked about are here, here and here" it's easy in the Amazon, you're always on a river, but in this case it was completely the opposite in terms of access. Then there were problems of visibility. The burning hadn't taken place in some areas where we expected it to have taken [place], so there was not good visibility, and there were the problems of the roads, the rivers being flooded and not passable. So all of these factors combined led to the decision to concentrate on a limited area of 40 kilometres'	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So in that sense I looked really hard at the way the people filled out their logbooks, the things they put in, the diligence and the care, and in that respect I thought that they were very good, I would say. The methodology they didn't really this is one of the first times that I'd used cameras, or trainees had used cameras, and we set the cameras at a very low resolution so that the whole I thought, "Well, you're not going to take more than 2,000 photographs", so each camera was set at a resolution where they could get 2,000 photographs without having to change the disk or anything else like that, which made it a lot easier to record the photographs because it went from one to several hundred. I think that the contribution of the elders was really interesting. It came in two batches. One was in the meetings, which were extraordinarily lively; they were lively, but at the same time people listened to each other, and that was always interesting. The other one was that during the trips itself there was a continual conversation going on about what happened here, what used to happen there. It's very much like the conversations I alluded to earlier: one would be in one place for a while and people would start

11:40	1	talking about all the kinds of things they would like to	11:43	1	and the time for gathering the data, it's been up to
	2	do with their territory if they could. This happened in		2	a year, in the Ye'kuana case, but it could be as short
	3	the vehicles. If you spend all day in a vehicle,		3	as three months.
	4	there's a lot of information flying back and forth.		4	The time after that for the compilation of
	5	So that convinced me that the people with whom we		5	a provisional final map, going back to the community so
	6	were travelling had a deep knowledge and familiarity		6	they can review it and make sure it's exactly what they
	7	with their landscape, not just their personal from		7	want, and then the final printing, you could add about
	8	their lives, but from their ancestors' lives and what		8	a couple of months, simply because of the problems of
	9	their fathers had told them.		9	getting big packages back to remote places, back and
	10	As I said, I thought that the team did very well.	1	10	forth.
	11	It was a great advantage that some of them speak	1	11	So I think six months is a good period, but it
	12	English, or most of them spoke English, and we had the		12	wouldn't be six months of continual activity.
	13	languages split between the teams, so the trainees who		13	Q. You say in page 7 of your report:
	14	spoke Arabic only, or Arabic Dinka but not English, were		14	" I would ordinarily expect a project of this
	15	not disadvantaged in any way.		15	type to require at least a year of work."
	16	I think the results are consistent. I am very		16	What you've said in effect confirms that that's what
	17	satisfied with the results. I am, in fact, surprised		17	your expectation was.
	18	because, given the obstacles that were confronting us in		18	A. Yes, that was before I got on the plane.
	19	terms of access and bad base maps and so forth, I was		19	Q. Right. What was the total period of time from the
	20	not optimistic, and having seen the results that they		20	beginning of training to the completion of the report?
					A. The completion of the report? Well, it started in
	21	achieved, I think they were excellent.		21	* *
	22	Thank you.		22	November
	23	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you.		23	Q. The report is dated February.
	24	Questions from the part of the Government?		24	A. Yes, so it would be four months.
	25	PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, sir.	2	25	Q. Thank you.
		Page 89			Page 91
					C
11:42	1	(11.42 am)	11:45	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11:42	1 2	(11.42 am) Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD		1 2	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites
11:42		Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD	2		
11:42	2	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce		2	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No.
11:42	2 3 4	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am	:	2 3 4	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you
11:42	2 3 4 5	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few		2 3 4 5	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous,
11:42	2 3 4 5 6	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you.	:	2 3 4	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the	:	2 3 4 5 6 7	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government?
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan?		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes.
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before.	:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing	: : : : : :	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation?
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in?	1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm.
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the	1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects	1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report?
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before.	1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as	1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining.
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability?	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case?
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability? A. It's a bit like saying, "How long is a piece of string?"	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case? A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I don't believe they
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability? A. It's a bit like saying, "How long is a piece of string?" I know that's not perhaps a very good answer. But my	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case? A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I don't believe they are.
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability? A. It's a bit like saying, "How long is a piece of string?" I know that's not perhaps a very good answer. But my estimate that I was asked to give before coming out to	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case? A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I don't believe they are. Q. The mapping team coordinator is Kwol Biong?
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability? A. It's a bit like saying, "How long is a piece of string?" I know that's not perhaps a very good answer. But my estimate that I was asked to give before coming out to the Sudan and getting a sense of how large the area was	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case? A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I don't believe they are. Q. The mapping team coordinator is Kwol Biong? A. Yes.
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability? A. It's a bit like saying, "How long is a piece of string?" I know that's not perhaps a very good answer. But my estimate that I was asked to give before coming out to the Sudan and getting a sense of how large the area was and not having too many ideas about how much access	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case? A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I don't believe they are. Q. The mapping team coordinator is Kwol Biong? A. Yes. Q. Is he a witness in this case?
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability? A. It's a bit like saying, "How long is a piece of string?" I know that's not perhaps a very good answer. But my estimate that I was asked to give before coming out to the Sudan and getting a sense of how large the area was and not having too many ideas about how much access there was, I said a year, it could take up to a year for	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case? A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I don't believe they are. Q. The mapping team coordinator is Kwol Biong? A. Yes. Q. Is he a witness in this case? A. I don't think so, because I got an email from him
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability? A. It's a bit like saying, "How long is a piece of string?" I know that's not perhaps a very good answer. But my estimate that I was asked to give before coming out to the Sudan and getting a sense of how large the area was and not having too many ideas about how much access there was, I said a year, it could take up to a year for an area that size.	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case? A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I don't believe they are. Q. The mapping team coordinator is Kwol Biong? A. Yes. Q. Is he a witness in this case? A. I don't think so, because I got an email from him yesterday.
11:42	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD Q. Dr Poole, we met informally yesterday; I now introduce myself formally. My name is James Crawford and I am counsel for the Government in this matter. I have a few questions to ask you. What's your extent of previous experience of the Sudan? A. I haven't been to the Sudan before. Q. How significant is your method in terms of your knowing the place you are working in? A. It hasn't proved an obstacle because pretty well all the places in which I have done community mapping projects are places that I haven't been to before. Q. How long would a community mapping exercise last as a matter of desirability? A. It's a bit like saying, "How long is a piece of string?" I know that's not perhaps a very good answer. But my estimate that I was asked to give before coming out to the Sudan and getting a sense of how large the area was and not having too many ideas about how much access there was, I said a year, it could take up to a year for	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	Did you instruct the team to enquire about any sites or locations other than those of the Ngok Dinka? A. No. Q. You're aware, of course, that the context in which you were asked to produce this report is of a very vigorous, we should say, litigation between the SPLM/A and the Government? A. Yes. Q. And you're aware that the Ngok are deeply involved in that litigation? A. Mm-hm. Q. Did the 12 Ngok members of your enquiry teams stand to gain from the outcome of your report? A. I I don't know. I don't know. I had never thought about them gaining. Q. Do you know if any of them are witnesses in this case? A. I don't think so. I'm not sure. I don't believe they are. Q. The mapping team coordinator is Kwol Biong? A. Yes. Q. Is he a witness in this case? A. I don't think so, because I got an email from him

3

11:46	1	something to gain from the process, what measures did
-------	---	---

- 2 you take to safeguard against, say, unconscious bias?
- 3 A. I wouldn't know how to deal with unconscious bias, but
- 4 I did impress upon them that they -- their work and
- 5 their results were transparent, and open to challenge by
- 6 anybody with a GPS unit and an interest in inspecting
- 7 the results. That's the way it was set up. So they
- 8 were aware of that.
- 9 Q. Who prepared the questionnaires that were asked?
- 10 A. The -- my legal colleagues on the case.
- 11 Q. Did you approve them?
- 12 A. I approved of them, yes.
- 13 Q. No, that wasn't my question. I'm not asking whether you
- 14 approved of them, because my understanding is that you
- don't take responsibility for the content of the
- 16 material as distinct from the orderly method in which
- the material is gathered. Is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. So I am not asking whether you approved of them; I'm
- asking whether you approved them?
- 21 A. Well, I didn't -- I wasn't asked to approve them.
- 22 Q. No. So the answer is "no"?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. What were the procedures for independent supervision of
- 25 the mapping teams when they were in the field engaging

Page 93

- 11:50 1 meetings, and I assume that this was one of the them.
 - 2 I wasn't on all trips; we had three cars on the road.
 - So my assumption is that they came to this grave
 - 4 site, the elders said, "This is the grave site", and
 - 5 they took a photograph of it.
 - 6 Q. How many burial sites purporting to be from around 1905
 - 7 did you find in Abyei Town?
 - 8 A. They didn't do mapping in Abyei Town as far as I know,
 - 9 unless they did some after I left.
 - 10 Q. You referred to the study area. How far north did the
 - 11 study area extend?
 - 12 A. 40 kilometres, roughly 40 kilometres.
 - 13 Q. So in terms of the northwards coordinate, what was that?
 - 14 A. I'll just have to check.
 - 15 Q. Can I represent to you it was 10°7' north?
 - 16 A. Okay, I can't read it, it's too small, so --
 - 17 Q. I've been having the same problem.
 - 18 A. Okay. This is -- you're looking at the community
 - mapping map here? Is that the line along the top?
 - 20 10°7'.
 - 21 Q. They way we achieved 10°7' north was to take 40 miles
 - 22 north of Abyei in a direct northwards line --
 - 23 A. 40 kilometres, sorry.
 - 24 Q. 40 kilometres. I'm sorry, are we miles or kilometres?
 - 25 A. I'm going to go back to my slide on that one.

Page 95

11:48 1 in their activities?

- 2 A. There wasn't an independent supervisor.
- 3 Q. Can I take you to the burial sites. I'd like to look at
- 4 a picture which is figure 21 of your report, which we
- 5 will put on the screen, just before page 25 of the
- 6 report. The caption is "Grave of Deng Akonon,
- 7 Taj Alei".
- 8 You say that -- sorry, it's figure 21, just before
- 9 page 25 of your report.
- 10 A. Taj Alei, okay, yes.
- 11 Q. The bottom figure on that page.
- 12 A. Mm-hm.
- 13 Q. How do you know that that grave dates from 1905?
- 14 A. That -- the -- when the mapping team were in the field,
- they were there with elders, and the elders would have
- said, "That is the grave site", and even if it doesn't
- 17 look like a grave site, that for the mappers was the
- authority upon which they were resting.
- 19 Q. So the mapping team simply worked on the basis that they
- were told that that was a grave site?
- 21 A. Yes. I imagine that that grave site was the subject of
- the -- a community meeting, the relevant community
- 23 meeting for whichever chiefdom it is in, and that came
- up in discussion. There was a whole list of grave sites
- to be discussed with the elders, during the elders'

Page 94

- 11:51 1 Q. By all means. We understood that it was miles.
 - 2 A. Okay, I'm so used to see kilometres.
 - 3 Q. So I think counsel accepts that we're talking about
 - 4 miles.
 - 5 A. Okay.
 - 6 Q. So the 10°7' was what we achieved by taking 40 miles
 - 7 from Abyei Town.
 - 8 A. Mm-hm.
 - 9 Q. What's the northernmost point that the mapping team
 - plotted on the map?
 - 11 MR BORN: Professor Crawford, if I could just interrupt
 - for a moment, we've taken the liberty of putting the
 - map up so that perhaps you can read it a little bit
 - 14 more closely.
 - 15 PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: That's fine, thank you.
 - What's the northernmost point that the mapping team
 - reached within the study area?
 - 18 A. The name of it?
 - 19 Q. Well, the coordinates will do; the name would be
 - 20 helpful
 - 21 A. I can't read the coordinates.
 - 22 Q. I'm sorry. We regarded it as Raantilraan, which we put
 - 23 at 10°3' north.
 - 24 A. Okay.
 - 25 Q. You're happy with that?

			ļ
11:52 1	A. Yes.	11:56 1	southwestern Kordofan and the northern Bahr el Ghazal.
2	Q. The SPLM/A at paragraph 51 of the rejoinder states:	2	The peoples of those regions, including the
3	" the community mapping project, shows permanent	3	Ngok Dinka, were in effect sovereign. The
4	Ngok Dinka villages were located throughout the Bahr	4	Anglo-Egyptian colonial administration, which had just
5	region extending north to latitude 10°35' north,	5	been proclaimed in Khartoum, was only very gradually
6	both in 1905 and for decades thereafter."	6	widening the area it claimed to control, and that
7	There are two different issues here. One is the	7	nominal control did not include actual "government" in
8	Bahr region. But I'm interested in the aspect of that	8	any sense that we would understand the word today.
9	statement that says "extending north to latitude	9	
	10°35' north". Do you accept the accuracy of the		While the beginnings of administration can be seen in a few towns along the Nile north of Khartoum and in
10		10	· ·
11	statement that you showed that the Ngok Dinka villages	11	the central region, there was literally no government
12	extended to 10°35' north in 1905?	12	administration of any kind in southern Kordofan and the
13	A. I'm sorry, who made that statement?	13	northern Bahr el Ghazal before the transfer of 1905.
14	Q. That was made by the SPLM/A in a comment on your report.	14	British officials in Khartoum had very little or no
15	A. Ah. I wasn't involved in taking the mapping project	15	idea of who the Ngok Dinka were, where they were, their
16	that far north, so	16	population, the extent of their territory, the nature of
17	Q. Let me just read the sentence again, as it relates to	17	their society, or the relations with their neighbours.
18	the area furthest north. Community mapping project,	18	A few points about the vast Bahr el Ghazal basin
19	paragraph 51 of their rejoinder:	19	illustrate what I have just said. You will recall that
20	" the community mapping project, shows permanent	20	the Anglo-Egyptian Condominium was established only in
21	Ngok Dinka villages were located extending north to	21	1898, and until 1902 there was not even a province
22	latitude 10°35' north in 1905."	22	called Bahr el Ghazal. In fact, Bahr el Ghazal remained
23	Do you accept that the community mapping project	23	under marshal law until at least 1907.
24	shows that?	24	Only a few British administrators were posted in the
25	A. That information may have been gathered, but it wasn't	25	entire Southern Sudan, of which the Bahr el Ghazal was
	D 07		P 00
	Page 97		Page 99
11.54 1	included in the study area. That 10°35' would have been	11.58 1	only a part, and until the 1920s, their role was largely
11:54 1	included in the study area. That 10°35' would have been outside the study area.	11:58 1	only a part, and until the 1920s, their role was largely
2	outside the study area.	2	what was called loosely "pacification". So,
2 3	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that	2 3	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in
2 3 4	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project?	2 3 4	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants.
2 3 4 5	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan
2 3 4 5 6	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions.	2 3 4 5 6	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its
2 3 4 5 6 7	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you	2 3 4 5 6 7	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the provincial capital, had been destroyed during the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by PROFESSOR DALY	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the provincial capital, had been destroyed during the Mahdiyya, and was occupied by Anglo-Egyptian forces only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	outside the study area. Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by PROFESSOR DALY THE WITNESS: Perhaps the most salient point to bear in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the provincial capital, had been destroyed during the Mahdiyya, and was occupied by Anglo-Egyptian forces only in 1900/1901.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	O. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by PROFESSOR DALY THE WITNESS: Perhaps the most salient point to bear in mind when considering the mountains of evidence that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the provincial capital, had been destroyed during the Mahdiyya, and was occupied by Anglo-Egyptian forces only in 1900/1901. Efforts at administering the province were largely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by PROFESSOR DALY THE WITNESS: Perhaps the most salient point to bear in mind when considering the mountains of evidence that both sides have produced is that in 1905 there was no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the provincial capital, had been destroyed during the Mahdiyya, and was occupied by Anglo-Egyptian forces only in 1900/1901. Efforts at administering the province were largely limited to the area around El Obeid, the nucleus of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	O. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by PROFESSOR DALY THE WITNESS: Perhaps the most salient point to bear in mind when considering the mountains of evidence that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the provincial capital, had been destroyed during the Mahdiyya, and was occupied by Anglo-Egyptian forces only in 1900/1901. Efforts at administering the province were largely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by PROFESSOR DALY THE WITNESS: Perhaps the most salient point to bear in mind when considering the mountains of evidence that both sides have produced is that in 1905 there was no authority of any kind above the tribes themselves in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the provincial capital, had been destroyed during the Mahdiyya, and was occupied by Anglo-Egyptian forces only in 1900/1901. Efforts at administering the province were largely limited to the area around El Obeid, the nucleus of the original area of Kordofan, which was about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. And the community mapping project, to which that sentence refers, is your community mapping project? A. Yes. MR CRAWFORD: Thank you, I have no further questions. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. No questions? I thank you very much, Dr Poole. (11.54 am) (The witness withdrew) MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President. That took a little bit longer than I'd anticipated, and I'm going to move directly to Professor Daly, who will address some of the Condominium historical issues. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, and I call Professor Daly. (11.55 am) PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called) THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by PROFESSOR DALY THE WITNESS: Perhaps the most salient point to bear in mind when considering the mountains of evidence that both sides have produced is that in 1905 there was no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what was called loosely "pacification". So, appropriately, most of the officers in Southern Sudan in this period were soldiers rather than civil servants. By 1905, the year that most concerns us, the Sudan Government was still notifying indigenous peoples of its existence, and the province had not even been organised into districts with military and police posts. As for administration, in the sense of an actual active government involvement in the lives of local peoples, there was none at all. I repeat, there was no administration at all. Because Kordofan on the map is adjacent to the modern metropolitan area of Khartoum, people might think that it was more modern or advanced than the Bahr el Ghazal. This was not the case. Kordofan itself was a vast region extending from the Nile to Darfur, and from the Sahara to equatorial regions. It was established as a province only in 1900. El Obeid, the provincial capital, had been destroyed during the Mahdiyya, and was occupied by Anglo-Egyptian forces only in 1900/1901. Efforts at administering the province were largely limited to the area around El Obeid, the nucleus of the

2 concerns us. 4 Southern Kordofan, in particular, was isolated and concerns us. 5 remote. During the introy season it was almost impossable by outsiders. More to the point. 6 impossable by outsiders. More to the point. 7 outsiders — and here I mean the British — had no reason to go there. The few officers who were stationed in the province's regular. E) Obed, were fully occupied there, and had no particular reason to pay attention to the province's remote south. 10 Until long after 1905 there was no British and no interest in the Abyel Area in 1898. 11 Until long after 1905 there was no British and no interest in the Abyel Area in 1894. 12 Until long after 1905 there was no British and no interest in the Abyel adways been. 13 administrative processor presence of any kind in sunthweetern Kordofan, the Abyel region. This hears of any kind. There were no poss., no soldiers, no positis, administrative processor of the Covernment. 14 If the analysis of the Covernment. 15 If the analysis of the Covernment. 16 If the analysis of the Covernment. 17 If the Abyel Area in 1895. 18 If should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, the Abyel region in the northern of the Abyel region in the Abyel region was remote and inaccessible except in the day season, the Abyel region was remote and inaccessible except in the day season and the Abyel region was remote and inaccessible except in the day season and the Abyel region was remote and inaccessible except in the day season and the Abyel region was remote and inaccessible except in the day season and the Abyel region interest in the theory to the control of the Abyel region was remote and inaccessible except in the day season and the probability of the Covernment goal, simply of not interest in the day season and the Abyel advances the Abyel advances the Abyel advances to the Abyel region interest in the Abyel advances the Abyel ad	,			
2 cest-west route far to the north of the region that 3 concerns us. 4 Southern Kordofan, in particular, was isolated and 5 remote. During the rainy season it was almost of impassable by outsiders. More to the point, 6 impassable by outsiders. More to the point, 7 oursiders – and here I mean the British – had no 8 reason to go there. The Gwo (Ficers who were stationed in the province's capital, Fit Obeid, were fully occupied there, and had no particular reason to pay attention to the province's remote south. 11 In the province's remote south. 12 Until long after 1905 there was no British administrative presence of any kind in southern the province's remote south. 13 administrative process or presence of any kind in southern the province's remote south. 14 southwestern Kordofan, the Abyer iegon. This bears repeating: there was no British administrative presence of any kind. There were no pusts, no soldiers, and police, no representative of the Government. 18 It should have come as no surpixs to the Tribunal, the foreign of the remover of the foreign of the very preference, that with an administration in the northern label and the foreign of the very brief records of their brief tree, and and post provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a boundary. 2 Colorial government in either place, there were no revenues to be page 101 2 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be page 101 2 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be page 101 2 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be page 101 2 co	12:00 1	500 kilometres from the Abyei area; and to the main	12:03 1	general was certainly true of the Abyei Area in
4 Southern Kordofan, in particular, was isolated and remote. During the range season it was almost impassable by outsiders. More to the point, outsiders—and here I mean the British—had no received in the province's capital, Fil Obeid, were fully occupied the province's remote south. 12 Luril long after 1995 there was no British administrative process or presence of any kind in southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears of any kind-life the province's remote south. 13 administrative process or presence of any kind in southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears of any kind-life the province's remote south. 14 Southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears repeating: there was no British administrative presence of any kind-life the prevince's remote south. 15 repeating: there was no British administrative presence of any kind-life the prevince's remote south. 16 administrative process or presence of any kind in southernes and the Abyei region. This bears of any kind-life the department. 18 It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, therefore, that with an odministration in southern and the Bath of Charal. 21 Bath of Charal, there were no social services. 22 There was, simply po need for a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two of the provincial	2		2	particular. There was no administration of any kind
5 remote. Daring the rainy season it was almost 6 impassable by outsiders. More to the point, outsiders – and here I mean the British – had no reason to go there. The few officers who were stationed 9 in the province's remote South. 10 the province's remote South. 11 the province's region was remote and inaccessible except in the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 15 in 1905, was based on what a few Burgh's Officers In discovery the Abyei region was remote and inaccessible except in the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 12 the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 13 in 1905 was based on what a few Burgh's Officers In discovery the Abyei region was remote and inaccessible except in the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 12 the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 14 the Province I because they that on the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 15 in 1905 was based on what a few Burgh's Officers and the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 15 in 1905 was based on what a few Burgh's Officer and the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 15 in 1905 was based on what a few Burgh's Officer's Indianal Provinces. 15 in 1905 was b			3	
5 remote. Daring the rainy season it was almost 6 impassable by outsiders. More to the point, outsiders – and here I mean the British – had no reason to go there. The few officers who were stationed 9 in the province's remote South. 10 the province's remote South. 11 the province's region was remote and inaccessible except in the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 15 in 1905, was based on what a few Burgh's Officers In discovery the Abyei region was remote and inaccessible except in the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 12 the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 13 in 1905 was based on what a few Burgh's Officers In discovery the Abyei region was remote and inaccessible except in the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 12 the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 14 the Province I because they that on the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 15 in 1905 was based on what a few Burgh's Officers and the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 15 in 1905 was based on what a few Burgh's Officer and the dry season and, I emphasise again, simply of no interest. 15 in 1905 was based on what a few Burgh's Officer's Indianal Provinces. 15 in 1905 was b	4	Southern Kordofan, in particular, was isolated and	4	The British had no interest in the Abyei Area in 1898,
reason to go there. The few officers who were stationed in the province's capital, 14 Obeid, were fully occupied there, and had no particular reason to put attention to the province's capital, 15 Obeid, were fully occupied the province's remote south. 10 there, and had no particular reason to put attention to the province's remote south. 11 the province's capital, 15 Obeid, were fully occupied the there, and had no particular reason to put attention to the province's remote south. 12 Until long after 1905 there was no British administrative presence of any kind in the dry season and it emphasis again, simply of no interest. 13 administrative processor of presence of any kind in suttlements of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind in deciding the dry season and it emphasis again, simply of no interest. The flught dry season and it emphasis again, simply of no interest. 18 It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, the foreast with a season and it emphasis again, simply of no interest are region was remote and inaccessible except in the dry season and it emphasis again, simply of no interest. 18 It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, the should have been a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a soundary have left very brief records of their brief treeks. There were in a colonial grown the same and the season of the fore the soft of the season what a few British officials who passed through before 1905. These three and the British had no idea of			5	
reason to go there. The few officers who were stationed in the province's capital, 14 Obeid, were fully occupied the province's capital, 14 Obeid, were fully occupied the province's capital, 14 Obeid, were fully occupied the province's remote south. 10 there, and had no particular reason to pay attention to the province's remote south. 11 the province's capital, 14 Obeid, were fully occupied the theory of the province's remote south. 12 Until long after 1905 there was no British administrative presence of any kind in southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears repeating there was no British administrative presence of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no of any kind in the folding of any kind. There were some an ossurprise to the Tribunal, therefore, that with no administration in southern kind of a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a government services, there were no government services, there were no government in either place, there were no government services, there were no revenues to be page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be page 101 12-02 There was, simply put, no point in elimining a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 1- 1 Dobed or Wan, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to one province or another, to Kordofan or to the another, to Kordofan or to the another, to Kordofan were simply practical, a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or a ballmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or a ballmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or a ballmar		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6	British established no government post there, no school,
8 reason to go there. The few officers who were stationed in the province's capital. El Obeid, were fully occupied there, and had no particular reason to pay attention to the province's remote south. 12 Until long after 1905 there was no British administrative process or presence of any kind in synthwestern Kordofan, the Abyle region. This bears 14 repeating; there was no British administrative process or presence of any kind in synthwestern Kordofan, the Abyle region. This bears 14 repeating; there was no British administrative presence of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no police, no representative of the Government. 18 If should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, therefore, that with no administration in southern 20 Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in southern 20 modern and the state of the composition of the State of the colonial government in either place, there were no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to the Page 103 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to the Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to the Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to the Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to the Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to the Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7	
the province's capital, El Obied, were fully occupied there, and had no particular reason to pay attention to the province's remote south. 11 the province's remote south. 12 Until long after 1905 there was no British administrative processor or presence of any kind in southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears repeating: there was no British administrative presence of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no police, no representative of the Government. 18 It should have come as no surptise to the Tribunal, 19 therefore, that with no administration in the northern 20 known of the Government. 21 Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for 22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be 25 most of the region remained entirely unexplored. The Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting a a boundary. 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 13 Obeid or Wan, or even more distant Khurtoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 10 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose in this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 the left lighting, the British shad grow the bried progeness the world, 15 to the Bahr el Ghazal, the dry five five for the brief trees, was simply pot no richer was no 16 to the Bahr el Ghazal the British officials were simply practical, 18 to the Bahr el Ghazal the British officers in far away 19 to the provincial boundary to the comment of the Page 101 to the Bahr el Ghazal the British officers in far away 19 to the provincial boundary to the provincial boundary was conceived. 19 to the provincial boundary was conceived.	8	reason to go there. The few officers who were stationed	8	
10 there, and had no particular reason to pay attention to the province's remote south. 11 the province's remote south. 12 Until long after 1905 there was no British 13 administrative process or presence of any kind in 14 southwestem Kordofan, the Abyer region. This bears repeating: there was no British administrative process or presence of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no police, no representative of the Government. 15 repeating: there was no British administrative presence of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no police, no representative of the Government. 18 It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, therefore, that with no administration in southern 19 therefore, that with no administration in the northern 20 Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in the northern 21 Bahr I Glazzal, here was simply no need for 22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 24 provincial boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in fur away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 8 art 19 Clazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British imperalism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever have the post of the post shade of the wast subject to the Buh Page Alpa Ara. By the time of the bust wast of the spot and the post of the post shade of the wast subject of the was		-	9	
11 the province's remote south. 12 Until long after 1905 there was no British 13 administrative process or presence of any kind in 14 southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears 15 repeating: there was no British administrative presence 16 of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no 17 police, no representative of the Government. 18 It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, 19 therefore, that with no administrative in the northern 20 Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in the northern 21 Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for 22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary, have expended the place, there were no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordona or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical. 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closes for most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Salata which is in the 15 1905 Glicchen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary. The colonial regime was 17 the references to a provincial boundary in the official 18 of practical work to do. Linaes or maps dividing 29 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime was 21 the vast map of the Salata which is in the 22 of practical work to do. Linaes on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordof	10		10	
12. Until long after 1905 there was no British 13. administrative process or presence of any kind in 14. southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears 15. repeating: there was no British administrative presence 16. of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no 17. police, no representative of the Government. 18. It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, 19. therefore, that with no administration in southern 20. Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in southern 21. Bair el Ghazal, there was simply no need for 22. a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23. a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24. colonial government in either place, there were no 25. government services, there were no revenues to be 26. Page 101 12:00 1 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 6 on province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 on province or another, to Kordofan or to the 6 an allumark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closes for most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Glicken handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government guzettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. 18 The title the British diknow of the Abyei region in the 1904 19 There is nothing such as the colonial regime was 10 to the Ray Sudan and the Sudan and the Sudan as the Second 11 The In				
administrative process or presence of any kind in southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears repeating: there was no British administrative presence of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no police, no representative of the Government. It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, therefore, that with no administration in southern 20 Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in southern 21 Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for 22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there was no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closes or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is foundary. The colonial regime were problished. 15 1905 Gelichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary. The colonial regime was handled and very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundary. The colonial regime very proking and the matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 the British were just another foreign exploiter. They depend to the Tribunal, 15 to the Bahr el Ghazal, there was imply do the teristory of the territory. 16 the huge Abyel Area. By the time of their brief trees. 18 the was simply to the terr		-		
southwestern Kordofan, the Abyei region. This bears 15 repeating there was no British administrative presence 16 of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no 17 police, no representative of the Government. 18 It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, 19 therefore, that with no administration in southern 20 Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in the northern 21 Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for 22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be 26 page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be 27 page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be 28 page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 29 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 30 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 4 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khatoum, refer to 4 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 4 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 4 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 5 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 6 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 8 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is fund in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary. The colonial regime were 17 In the little the British and in ferse we days from El Obeid was not the region in the strain less seen while less seen what a few British officers as less they had no interest in the region, they maturally have left very brief records of their brief trees. There were in fact only the Emiti				
15 repeating: there was no British administrative presence 16 of any kind. There were no posts, no soldiers, no 17 police, no representative of the Government. 18 It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, 19 therefore, that with no administration in southern 20 Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in the northern 21 Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for 22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 25 government services, fhere were no revenues to be 26 page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be 27 a There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 28 a boundary. 29 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 30 a boundary. 40 For this reason, when British officers in far away 41 For this reason, when British officers in far away 42 For this reason, when British officers in far away 43 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, a ballmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime was known that few they flowed to the Bahr el Ghazal in the 1904 and the 1904 to the Bahr el Ghazal in the 1904 and the 20 seet the Ngok paramount chief, whom they called cose the Ngok paramount chief, whom they called cose the Ngok paramount chief, whom they called cose the huge Abyei Area. By the time of the 1905 transfer most of the region remained entirely unexplored. The they accounted for the vast amount of the supplement of the	14		14	
16		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•
17 police, no representative of the Government. 18 It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal, therefore, that with no administration in southern 20 Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in the northern 21 Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for 22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 24 who passed through before 1905. These three aimed to 25 government services, there were no revenues to be 26 page 101 12-01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be 27 page 101 12-02 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 27 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 44 For this reason, when British officers in far away 45 For this reason, when British officers in far away 46 For this reason, when British officers in far away 47 For this reason, when British officers in far away 48 It is worth remembering that the reason for these few Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British mere simply practical, a halmark of British imperialism all over the world, 49 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no references to a provinical boundary in the official 20 princial work to do. Lines on maps dividing 12 internal regions of the vast unaipting about them. 14 have been made in the last two days. As those British 16 practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 12 internal regions of the vast contribution of the Magiva," referring to the ere or of the Tuko-Egyptian colonial regime was known throughout the northern Sudan set he "second 1 Turkiyya", since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghaz	16	· ·	16	seen while passing through for a few days from El Obeid
therefore, that with no administration in southern Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in the northern Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no colonial government in either place, there were no government services, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12:02 1 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away a boundary is perfect of one province or another, to Kordofan or to the path of Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or late literacy are simply by acconcived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no references to a provincial boundaries imply did not matter. 14 Was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 15 Wat was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 16 Wat was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime was known throughout the northern Sudanaes or Arab soldiers, and on horseback, just as a read as the Sudanese were concerned, the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd	17	police, no representative of the Government.	17	
therefore, that with no administration in southern Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in the northern Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for a provincial boundary between the two. What would such a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no colonial government in either place, there were no government services, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12:02 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting a boundary. El Dobeid or Wau, or even more distant Kharoum, refer to one province or another, to Kordofan or to the Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or the lugging with local peoples from	18	It should have come as no surprise to the Tribunal,	18	Because they had no interest in the region, they
treks. There were in fact only three British officials who passed through before 1905. These three aimed to a poundary bave ment to two. What would such a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no colonial government in either place, there were no government services, there were no revenues to be Page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to one province or another, to Kordofan or to the form an uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, a hallmark of British inperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or barracks was closest or most convenient when the need arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 reference sto a provincial boundary in the official 20 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 21 internal regions of the vast majority of the territory. 12 It is worth termebre in fact only three British hed wo passed through before 1905. These three aimed to a who passed through before 1905. These three aimed to 22 who passed through before 1905. These three aimed to 22 who passed through before 1905. These three samed to the huge Abyei Area. By the time of the 1905 transfer most of the region remained entirely unexplored. The 1905 accounted of the huge Abyei Area. By the time of the 1905 transfer most of the region remained entirely unexplored. The 1905 flower in the past accounted of the huge Abyei Area. By the time of the 1905 transfer most of the region remained entirely unexplored. The 1905 flower is passed for the 1905 fransfer most of the region remained entirely unexplored. The 1905 flower in sever visited. And the areas they had never visited accounter wisited. And the areas they had		_		
22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be 26 Page 101 27 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 20 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 21 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 22 that was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 23 the huge Alpe and no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited. 24 a provinced or the vast majority of the territory. 25 British had no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited accounted for the vast majority of the territory. 26 few British had no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited accounted for the vast majority of the territory. 27 In this was in the areas they had never visited accounted for the vast majority of the territory. 28 British had no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited accounted for the vast majority of the territory. 29 In this was a work in the areas from the east of the territory. 30 The fer for the vast majority of the territory. 31 This is why no boundary is for ference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British had no idea of what was in the areas floy had never visited. 31 This is	20	Kordofan in 1905, and no administration in the northern	20	
22 a provincial boundary between the two. What would such 23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be 26 Page 101 27 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 20 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 21 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 22 that was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 23 the huge Alpe and no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited. 24 a provinced or the vast majority of the territory. 25 British had no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited accounted for the vast majority of the territory. 26 few British had no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited accounted for the vast majority of the territory. 27 In this was in the areas they had never visited accounted for the vast majority of the territory. 28 British had no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited accounted for the vast majority of the territory. 29 In this was a work in the areas from the east of the territory. 30 The fer for the vast majority of the territory. 31 This is why no boundary is for ference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British had no idea of what was in the areas floy had never visited. 31 This is	21	Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for	21	who passed through before 1905. These three aimed to
23 a boundary have accomplished? Since there was no 24 colonial government in either place, there were no 25 government services, there were no revenues to be 26 Page 101 12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no references to a provincial boundary in the official 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 21 had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concerned. 24 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no references to a provincial boundary in the official 21 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 22 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25	22		22	
12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 12 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Glichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 20 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in	23		23	"Sultan Rob". Otherwise they saw only a tiny part of
12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 12 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Glichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 20 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in	24		24	
12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime was internal regions of the vast majority of the territory. 1 It is worth remembering that the reason for these few British treks was simply to show the local people that the British had arrived in the Sudan, or "to show the flag", as it's often put. British officials on treks knew nothing of the Ngok Dinka language or customs, and there is no evidence they were interested in learning anything about them. 1 It is very likely that the Ngok Dinka would have been afraid of British officers who did visit the region. I refer now to some of the comments that have been afraid of British officers who did visit the region. I refer now to some of the comments that have been made in the last two days. As those British acts of the colonial regime were published. 13 This is add the areas they had never visited accounting few british had no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited accounting the thread accounted for the vast majority of the teritory. 14 It is worth remembering that the reason for these	25	government services, there were no revenues to be	25	most of the region remained entirely unexplored. The
12:01 1 collected or divided, there were no social services. 2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime was internal regions of the vast majority of the territory. 1 It is worth remembering that the reason for these few British treks was simply to show the local people that the British had arrived in the Sudan, or "to show the flag", as it's often put. British officials on treks knew nothing of the Ngok Dinka language or customs, and there is no evidence they were interested in learning anything about them. 1 It is very likely that the Ngok Dinka would have been afraid of British officers who did visit the region. I refer now to some of the comments that have been afraid of British officers who did visit the region. I refer now to some of the comments that have been made in the last two days. As those British acts of the colonial regime were published. 13 This is add the areas they had never visited accounting few british had no idea of what was in the areas they had never visited accounting the thread accounted for the vast majority of the teritory. 14 It is worth remembering that the reason for these		D 101		D 100
2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 21 had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in		Page 101		rage 105
2 There was, simply put, no point in delimiting 3 a boundary. 4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 21 had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in				
a boundary. For this reason, when British officers in far away El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to one province or another, to Kordofan or to the Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime and very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast majority of the territory. It is worth remembering that the reason for these few British breks was simply to show the local people that the British had arrived in the Sudan rive that the British had arrived in the Sudan rive that the British had arrived in the Sudan rive the world, the Hag", as it's often put. British officials on treks knew nothing of the Ngok Dinka language or customs, and there is no evidence they were interested in learning anything about them. It is very likely that the Ngok Dinka would have been afraid of British officers who did visit the region. I refer now to some of the comments that have been made in the last two days. As those British officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed often northern Sudanese or Arab soldiers, and on for fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was known throughout the northern Sudan as the "second Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was internal regions of the vast country w	12:01 1	collected or divided, there were no social services.	12:04 1	British had no idea of what was in the areas they had
a boundary. For this reason, when British officers in far away El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to one province or another, to Kordofan or to the Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no references to a provincial boundary in the official There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime acts of the colonial regime were published. There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime and very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in	2	There was, simply put, no point in delimiting	2	never visited. And the areas they had never visited
4 For this reason, when British officers in far away 5 El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to 6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 21 had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in	3		3	accounted for the vast majority of the territory.
6 one province or another, to Kordofan or to the 7 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 21 had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in	4	For this reason, when British officers in far away	4	It is worth remembering that the reason for these
8 Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and 8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 21 had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 7 the flag", as it's often put. British officials treks knew nothing of the Ngok Dinka language or customs, and there is no evidence they were interested in learning anything about them. 10 It is very likely that the Ngok Dinka would have 11 It is very likely that the Ngok Dinka would have 12 been afraid of British officers who did visit the 13 region. I refer now to some of the comments that have 14 been made in the last two days. As those British officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed 15 officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed 16 often northern Sudanese or Arab soldiers, and on 17 horseback, just as slave raiders had done in the past. 18 In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was 19 Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian 20 Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian 21 the flag", as it's often put. British officers who did visit the 22 the national free most to assume the sum of provincial boundary in the official 23 the	5	El Obeid or Wau, or even more distant Khartoum, refer to	5	few British treks was simply to show the local people
8 uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical, 9 a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, 10 dealing with local peoples from whichever post or 11 barracks was closest or most convenient when the need 12 arose. In this way a working boundary is found in the 1904 13 This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 14 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 21 had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in	6	one province or another, to Kordofan or to the	6	that the British had arrived in the Sudan, or "to show
a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world, dealing with local peoples from whichever post or barracks was closest or most convenient when the need arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime thad very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in	7	Bahr el Ghazal, their terms of reference were vague and	7	the flag", as it's often put. British officials on
dealing with local peoples from whichever post or barracks was closest or most convenient when the need rose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office who did visit the Intelligence Office who days. As those British Officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed Intelligence Office who did visit the Intelligence Office who days. As those British Officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed Intelligence Office who did visit the Intelligence Office who days. As those British Officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed Intelligence Office who days. As those British Officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed Intelli	8	uncertain. Instead the British were simply practical,	8	treks knew nothing of the Ngok Dinka language or
barracks was closest or most convenient when the need arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Officers who did visit the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Officers who did visit the Intelligence Office map of the Comments that have Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Comments that have Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Comments that have Intelligence Of	9	a hallmark of British imperialism all over the world,	9	customs, and there is no evidence they were interested
arose. In this way a working boundary was conceived. This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Comments that have Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Office map of the Comments that have Intelligence Office map of the Comments who days. As those British In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was known throughout the northern Sudan as the "second In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the past. In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was known throughout the northern Sudan as the "second In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the past. In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was the "second the Intelligence of the Intelligence of the Intellig	10	dealing with local peoples from whichever post or	10	in learning anything about them.
This is why no boundary is found in the 1904 Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the Intelligence Officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed Often northern Sudanese or Arab soldiers, and on In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in Intelligence Officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed Intelligence Officers	11	barracks was closest or most convenient when the need	11	It is very likely that the Ngok Dinka would have
Intelligence Office map of the Sudan which is in the 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no references to a provincial boundary in the official Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 14 been made in the last two days. As those British officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed 16 often northern Sudanese or Arab soldiers, and on 17 horseback, just as slave raiders had done in the past. 18 In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was 19 known throughout the northern Sudan as the "second 20 Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian 21 regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in 22 the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was 23 the slang expression for the new regime, the "second 24 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 26 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 27 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 28 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 29 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 29 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 20 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 21 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 22 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned,			12	been afraid of British officers who did visit the
15 1905 Gleichen handbook. This is also why we see no 16 references to a provincial boundary in the official 17 Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive 18 acts of the colonial regime were published. 19 There is nothing surprising or even unusual about 20 this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime 21 had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal 22 of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing 23 internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. 24 Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 26 officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed 16 officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed 18 officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed 19 officers travelled in sizeable groups with armed 10 often northern Sudanese or Arab soldiers, and on 11 horseback, just as slave raiders had done in the past. 12 In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was 13 known throughout the northern Sudan as the "second 24 Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian 25 the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was 26 the slang expression for the new regime, the "second 27 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 28 the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		~
references to a provincial boundary in the official Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 16 often northern Sudanese or Arab soldiers, and on horseback, just as slave raiders had done in the past. In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was known throughout the northern Sudan as the "second Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was the slang expression for the new regime, the "second Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd		*		•
Sudan Government gazettes, which is where definitive acts of the colonial regime were published. There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in horseback, just as slave raiders had done in the past. In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was known throughout the northern Sudan as the "second Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the past. In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the past. Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was the slang expression for the new regime, the "second Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
acts of the colonial regime were published. There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 18 In fact, the Anglo-Egyptian colonial regime was 19 known throughout the northern Sudan as the "second Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian 21 regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in 22 the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was 23 the slang expression for the new regime, the "second Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 24 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 25 the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
There is nothing surprising or even unusual about this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in the northern Sudan as the "second Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was the slang expression for the new regime, the "second Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
this lack of a definite boundary. The colonial regime had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in Turkiyya", referring to the era of the Turko-Egyptian regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was the slang expression for the new regime, the "second Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
had very few officers, very few funds, and a great deal of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 21 regime of the 19th century that had been overthrown in the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was the slang expression for the new regime, the "second Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
of practical work to do. Lines on maps dividing internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 22 the nationalist revolution of the Mahdiyya. This was the slang expression for the new regime, the "second Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
internal regions of the vast country were of no concern. Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 23 the slang expression for the new regime, the "second Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
Provincial boundaries simply did not matter. 24 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 25 What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 26 Turkiyya" since, as far as the Sudanese were concerned, 27 the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in 25 the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd				
	1 24		2/1	Turkivva" since as far as the Sudanese were concerned
Page 102 Page 104		_ ·		
		_ ·		
		What was true of Kordofan and the Bahr el Ghazal in		the British were just another foreign exploiter. They'd

,			
12:06 1	seen them before, like the Turko-Egyptians from the	12:09 1	We have to bear in mind that these treks were not
2	north, or the French and Belgians encroaching from the	2	for the purpose of recording the location and identity
3	west and south.	3	of local inhabitants. The purpose of these few British
4	The Ngok Dinka are likely to have been concerned for	4	treks was nothing more than reconnaissance, showing the
5	their and their community's safety in the presence of	5	flag, announcing the existence literally the
6	European officers. And they had no reason, certainly,	6	existence of the new regime in Khartoum, a week's
7	to trust them.	7	journey away.
8	Because the British administration was so	8	Because the documentary record is so scanty, Ngok
9	rudimentary and focused on practical issues rather than	9	witness testimony becomes important. The detail and
10	with details, the 1905 transfer decision was clearly	10	breadth of that testimony is, as I think you've seen to
11	about people, not land. The stated purpose of the	11	some extent this morning already, impressive. In many
12	transfer was to place slave raiders and the people they	12	cases the Ngok witness statements are the only evidence
13	raided under one administration. No effort was made to	13	we have on the issue of who inhabited the Abyei region
14	define the territory that this decision would involve.	14	in 1905. In other words, for large parts of the Abyei
15	There was no reason to define that territory.	15	Area before and in 1905 we have no contemporary
16	The covering letter transmitting to Cairo the	16	documents, and no witness testimony from anyone else.
17	material for the 1905 Governor-General's report on the	17	Indeed, for all the reasons I have already
18 19	Sudan was a typical summary of information in many	18 19	discussed, this is simply not surprising. Given this
20	departmental and provincial reports. The Sudan Government, or the Anglo-Egyptian Condominium, was	20	meagre record, the Ngok witness testimony is particularly interesting and important to the historian
20	highly bureaucratic. This 178-page cover letter was no	21	of the region and the historian of the period, providing
22	doubt compiled in the usual way by Sir Reginald	22	evidence of Ngok land use well north of the river
23	Wingate's civilian and military staff officers, then	23	systems of the Bahr and up into the goz in the period
24	likely drafted by the private secretary of the Sudan	24	around 1905.
25	Government, Lee Stack; whose career, incidentally, was	25	Thank you.
23		23	Thank you.
	Page 105		Page 107
12.07 1	the subject of my Landon DhD thesis	10.11 1	THE CHAIDMAN. I should see you are to Durfesson Dale.
12:07 1	the subject of my London PhD thesis.	12:11 1	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much, Professor Daly.
2	The important point, however, is that this cover	2	Questions on the part of the Government?
2 3	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok	2 3	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm)
2 3 4	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of	2 3 4	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD
2 3 4 5	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people.	2 3 4 5	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be
2 3 4 5 6	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about	2 3 4 5 6	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was	2 3 4 5 6 7	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no	2 3 4 5 6	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is absurd to imply that the Ngok must have been absent from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip. Q. It is in fact recorded that he did. He was apparently
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is absurd to imply that the Ngok must have been absent from the remaining areas. It is likewise unhistorical and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip. Q. It is in fact recorded that he did. He was apparently extremely versatile, I understand, and he wore the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is absurd to imply that the Ngok must have been absent from the remaining areas. It is likewise unhistorical and unreasonable to think that because a few British trek	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip. Q. It is in fact recorded that he did. He was apparently extremely versatile, I understand, and he wore the second-class robe of honour when that was appropriate,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is absurd to imply that the Ngok must have been absent from the remaining areas. It is likewise unhistorical and unreasonable to think that because a few British trek notes do not mention the Ngok Dinka as present in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip. Q. It is in fact recorded that he did. He was apparently extremely versatile, I understand, and he wore the second-class robe of honour when that was appropriate, and nothing at all when that was in accordance with what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is absurd to imply that the Ngok must have been absent from the remaining areas. It is likewise unhistorical and unreasonable to think that because a few British trek notes do not mention the Ngok Dinka as present in a certain area during a certain season, then they must	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip. Q. It is in fact recorded that he did. He was apparently extremely versatile, I understand, and he wore the second-class robe of honour when that was appropriate, and nothing at all when that was in accordance with what the Dinka would do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is absurd to imply that the Ngok must have been absent from the remaining areas. It is likewise unhistorical and unreasonable to think that because a few British trek notes do not mention the Ngok Dinka as present in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip. Q. It is in fact recorded that he did. He was apparently extremely versatile, I understand, and he wore the second-class robe of honour when that was appropriate, and nothing at all when that was in accordance with what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is absurd to imply that the Ngok must have been absent from the remaining areas. It is likewise unhistorical and unreasonable to think that because a few British trek notes do not mention the Ngok Dinka as present in a certain area during a certain season, then they must not have used that land during another season.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip. Q. It is in fact recorded that he did. He was apparently extremely versatile, I understand, and he wore the second-class robe of honour when that was appropriate, and nothing at all when that was in accordance with what the Dinka would do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The important point, however, is that this cover letter changed nothing. It merely noted that the Ngok people would forthwith be under the authority of Kordofan, as a people. In that cover letter there was nothing about a provincial boundary. Why would there be? There was still no reason for a provincial boundary. There is no evidence that Wingate or anyone on his staff had any idea of the extent of Sultan Rob's lands. Moreover, we know that by the time of the transfer there still was confusion about the location and names of the local rivers. We therefore still do not even know what was meant then by the Bahr el Arab, and Wingate confesses as much in this very cover letter of which so much has been made. The few British officers who trekked through the Abyei Area before 1905 saw only a fraction of the region that they passed on the route they had travelled. It is absurd to imply that the Ngok must have been absent from the remaining areas. It is likewise unhistorical and unreasonable to think that because a few British trek notes do not mention the Ngok Dinka as present in a certain area during a certain season, then they must	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Questions on the part of the Government? (12.11 pm) Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD Q. Professor Daly, my name is James Crawford, and I'll be asking you some questions. You said and I hope I don't misquote you that there was in effect no British administration of the Ngok Dinka under Sultan Rob at the period of the transfer? A. Yes. Q. In 1903 the Kordofan administration gave him a second-class robe of honour? A. Yes. Q. Which he subsequently wore when he went to the capital of Kordofan. Do you know that that is true or not? A. I know that the second-class robe of honour was bestowed. I did not know he wore it on a subsequent trip. Q. It is in fact recorded that he did. He was apparently extremely versatile, I understand, and he wore the second-class robe of honour when that was appropriate, and nothing at all when that was in accordance with what the Dinka would do. A. You are equating the two garments, I believe. No,

12:12 1 I didn't know that.

- 2 Q. Prior to the transfer in 1905 there had been at least
- 3 two complaints, one from the Twic and one from the Ngok,
- 4 about raiding from southern Kordofan Arabs; you're aware
- 5 of that?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And that was the motivation for the transfer?
- 8 A. That was the announced motivation, yes.
- 9 Q. Is there any reason to think that it wasn't the
- 10 motivation?
- 11 A. I haven't found one.
- 12 Q. So the answer is: no?
- 13 A. The answer to what?
- 14 Q. The answer to my question is: no. I said "Is there any
- reason to think that wasn't the motivation?" and you
- 16 said --
- 17 A. I don't have any reason.
- 18 Q. You said in your statement that Kordofan was established
- as a province in 1900?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. That's a province of the Condominium?
- 22 A. Right.
- 23 Q. Following the military victory. Of course, it had been
- a province under the Turkiyya since the 1820s; is that
- 25 right?

- 12:14 1 to a particular page, and obviously if you don't
 - 2 remember the page or deny that he says it, we'll do that
 - 3 later on.
 - 4 MR BORN: Which publication are you referring to?
 - 5 PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Hill.
 - 6 MR BORN: What's the name of the book, so that we can try
 - 7 to look at it in the record while you're asking the
 - 8 question?
 - A. It's called -- shall I? -- Richard Hill, Egypt in the
 - 10 Sudan, 1821-1881, published Oxford, I think, 1959.
 - 11 MR BORN: Do you know the page number, Professor Daly?
 - 12 A. Too many people are here to check! No, I don't.
 - 13 PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: He says that the Condominium
 - basically took the Turko-Egyptian provinces over when
 - 15 the administration was established.
 - Perhaps we'll leave this. I'll come to this in
 - 17 submission.
 - 18 A. If I might, the significance of this is that the
 - boundaries of Kordofan were never fixed, whether under
 - the Turkiyya, or indeed late into the Condominium
 - 21 period, and certainly not during the Mahdiyya, when
 - 22 Kordofan ceased to exist as a province.
 - 23 Q. In the 1903 annual reports there's a statement about the
 - 24 boundaries of Kordofan?
 - 25 A. Mm-hm.

Page 111

12:13 1 A. Yes.

- Q. My understanding, and you'll correct me if I'm wrong, is
- 3 that when the Condominium Administration was established
- 4 they basically took the existing provincial
- 5 boundaries -- or the existing provinces, let me put
- 6 it -- let me rephrase that: they took the existing
- 7 provinces as they were?
- 8 A. No, I think that is wrong. They did, as you began to
- 9 correct yourself, take the existing names, or took some
- 10 of the existing names from the previous pre-Mahdiyya
- 11 region. Kordofan is an example of that.
- The name "Kordofan" extends at least back to about
- the 1820s, if not earlier, but originally referred only
- 14 to the area around Jebel Kordofan, just to the south of
- 15 El Obeid, the capital. As the 19th century progressed
- the term "Kordofan" expanded, as control of the
 Turko-Egyptian regime from El Obeid expanded.
- But as Hill, the recognised source on the period,
- has stated in his classic book "Egypt in the Sudan"
- 20 there is still to this day no map from the Turkiyya,
- from the 19th century, that shows provincial boundaries,
- 22 including provincial boundaries between Kordofan and the
- 23 Bahr el Ghazal.
- 24 Q. Hill also says -- and I'm sorry that in the context of
- 25 this cross-examination I'm not in a position to take you

Page 110

- 12:16 1 Q. I'm sorry, can you say yes or no?
 - 2 A. Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't know it was a question.
 - 3 Q. Yes, it is a question. Everything I ask you is
 - 4 a question.
 - 5 A. I was waiting for a change of tone of voice.
 - 6 Q. I'm sorry, I'm an Australian and my tone of voice is
 - 7 very flat. That's not a question!
 - 8 A. Then I won't answer it! I don't have it at hand;
 - 9 I can't tell you.
 - 10 Q. But my question was this: is it the case that the annual
 - 11 reports for Kordofan prior to 1905 made a statement
 - 12 about provincial boundaries?
 - 13 A. Every year --
 - 14 Q. The annual reports.
 - 15 A. I don't know off-hand.
 - 16 Q. Thank you. You said that the British administrators who
 - passed through couldn't communicate with the local
 - people because they didn't know the language.
 - 19 A. Right.
 - 20 Q. Is that accurate?
 - 21 A. Yes, I said they didn't speak Dinka.
 - 22 Q. That's true, you said they didn't speak Dinka. So how
 - would they have communicated if they'd met?
 - 24 A. If they had met they would have communicated, if at all,
 - 25 through interpreters.

12:17 1	Q. Can I take you to Percival's route report of	12:20 1	Q. Yes, since one writes a lot, it's true.
2	December 1904.	2	Then we know from the 1904 annual report that
3	A. Yes.	3	Lieutenant Bayldon was told by Wingate to go and work
4	Q. This is at tab 31 of the common bundle. He's talking	4	out the little-known rivers, the Bahr el Arab, the Kiir,
5	about Sultan Rob, who he met at Burakol, he says "where	5	the Lol; that comes from the annual report for the Sudan
6	Sultan Rob is at present living". He makes some remarks	6	of 1904, and he did in fact do that?
7	about the region. Then he says:	7	A. Mm-hm.
8	"There are no Dinkas west of Burakol as far as	8	Q. So there is some evidence, isn't there, of a concern by
9	I could see, and Sultan Rob told me that there were only	9	the British Government to discover the hydrology of the
10		10	rivers?
11	Bahr el Arab"	11	A. There was certainly an interest. I think it's worth
12	By which I think we agree that he meant the river or	12	pointing out that the basin of the Bahr el Arab was the
13	part of the river to the north, not what we now call the	13	last, or certainly one of the last, of the river systems
14	Bahr el Arab?	14	in the Southern Sudan to be so opened up by the British.
15	A. Yes.	15	I think we tend to telescope things because of the
16	Q. " is uninhabited, he told me, except for occasional	16	concern over Abyei in this particular litigation, but
17	wandered [is what he says] parties of Arabs."	17	the Blue Nile had been completely opened earlier, the
18	A. I know the passage.	18	White Nile entirely opened as far as the Ugandan border,
19	Q. "He knew Chak Chak, which he said was the next lot of	19	the Sobat, the Pibor, the Bahr el Ghazal, the Jur to
20	natives to those he ruled."	20	Wau, other tributaries of the Bahr el Ghazal.
21	For someone who couldn't communicate, that's a fair	21	So what really this was is a way of tidying up, if
22	bit of information?	22	you like, opening up through sudd clearance one of the
23	A. As I say, there must have been some means of	23	last river systems.
24	translation. It's possible of course and likely	24	Q. Let's turn to the question of Ngok population. Would
25	I think, in fact that Sultan Rob spoke something of	25	you agree with the estimate of 50,000 for the population
	Page 113		Page 115
			The state of the s
12:18 1	what we would call today Juba Arabic, the sort of	12:22 1	of the Ngok in 1905?
2	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of	2	A. No.
2 3	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken	2 3	A. No.Q. How would you go about estimating that population?
2 3 4	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic.	2 3 4	A. No.Q. How would you go about estimating that population?A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only
2 3 4 5	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point,	2 3 4 5	A. No.Q. How would you go about estimating that population?A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively
2 3 4 5 6	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say:	2 3 4 5 6	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census
2 3 4 5 6 7	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little	2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions. MR BORN: On both sides.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases, migration, other factors, so I wouldn't attempt it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions. MR BORN: On both sides. PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Page 135, Empire on the Nile, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases, migration, other factors, so I wouldn't attempt it. Q. You would expect that the population of the Ngok, like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions. MR BORN: On both sides. PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Page 135, Empire on the Nile, you say:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases, migration, other factors, so I wouldn't attempt it. Q. You would expect that the population of the Ngok, like other population groups in Kordofan, would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions. MR BORN: On both sides. PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Page 135, Empire on the Nile, you say: "The first task of the Government in the south was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases, migration, other factors, so I wouldn't attempt it. Q. You would expect that the population of the Ngok, like other population groups in Kordofan, would have increased after 1900?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions. MR BORN: On both sides. PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Page 135, Empire on the Nile, you say: "The first task of the Government in the south was to extend and secure its river communications."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan censusQ. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases, migration, other factors, so I wouldn't attempt it. Q. You would expect that the population of the Ngok, like other population groups in Kordofan, would have increased after 1900? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions. MR BORN: On both sides. PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Page 135, Empire on the Nile, you say: "The first task of the Government in the south was to extend and secure its river communications." You refer to a command by Kitchener to Peake to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan censusQ. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases, migration, other factors, so I wouldn't attempt it. Q. You would expect that the population of the Ngok, like other population groups in Kordofan, would have increased after 1900? A. Yes. Q. Thank you. Can we turn to Wilkinson's route report.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions. MR BORN: On both sides. PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Page 135, Empire on the Nile, you say: "The first task of the Government in the south was to extend and secure its river communications." You refer to a command by Kitchener to Peake to reconnoitre the Bahr el Ghazal and the Bahr el Jebel;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan census Q. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases, migration, other factors, so I wouldn't attempt it. Q. You would expect that the population of the Ngok, like other population groups in Kordofan, would have increased after 1900? A. Yes. Q. Thank you. Can we turn to Wilkinson's route report. Here's a clean copy of it. (Handed)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	lingua franca of the borderlands, and certainly some of the British officials' entourage would have spoken Arabic. Q. In your second report at page 3, fourth bullet point, you say: "Southern Kordofan's complex hydrology was of little or no concern to the Sudan Government in 1905." Do you agree with that still? A. Yes. Q. In The Empire on the Nile, which I have to say and this isn't a question I enjoyed very much, you say at page A. I won't thank you, since it's not a question. Q. At page 135 I think we're having comments as well as questions. MR BORN: On both sides. PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Page 135, Empire on the Nile, you say: "The first task of the Government in the south was to extend and secure its river communications." You refer to a command by Kitchener to Peake to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. No. Q. How would you go about estimating that population? A. I am not a demographer, I don't have a way. I have only the historical sources. I have looked extensively through the nine volumes of the 1955/56 Sudan censusQ. Yes. A and taken to heart its findings. I have no reason to argue with them. The only way to go back and look at population statistics before that is to use very complicated mathematical formulae to extrapolate backward, if you like, from a census. Q. You would expect A. It's hard to do that, especially for someone untrained in demography, because these involve epidemic diseases, migration, other factors, so I wouldn't attempt it. Q. You would expect that the population of the Ngok, like other population groups in Kordofan, would have increased after 1900? A. Yes. Q. Thank you. Can we turn to Wilkinson's route report.

12:23 1			
i	say:	12:27 1	go back to some of these slides if necessary for the
2	"We are left then with the conclusion that the best	2	purposes of clarification.
3	documentary evidence so far located for the northern	3	I am very honoured to be here presenting some
4	boundary of the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms in	4	evidence. The last time I was here I believe was about
5	1905 remains, in the opinion of this historian and as of	5	eight or nine years ago, when I was showing some of my
6	the date of the present report, Wilkinson's itinerary of	6	MA students around the wonderful ICJ museum downstairs,
7	1902, which establishes a permanent Ngok presence on the	7	recommended for everybody if it's open.
8	Ragaba al-Zarqa."	8	Some of my details are here, you can read those at
9	That's what you say in your report?	9	your leisure, but I should state at the outset that I am
10	A. Yes.	10	not a Sudanese expert, nor would I ever purport to be,
11	Q. Can you point me to the words in Wilkinson's route	11	but I have been recognised as an expert on the origins
12	report, his itinerary of 1902, which establish	12	of international boundaries and boundary questions more
13	a permanent Ngok presence on the Ragaba ez Zarga?	13	generally within the Middle East, particularly in the
14	A. Well, Wilkinson never uses a phrase like that.	14	Gulf and the Arabian peninsula. Obviously my knowledge
15	Q. So the answer is you can't?	15	tends to be best where Britain has had a hand of some
16	A. I cannot point you to anything in the itinerary that	16	sort.
17	establishes where Wilkinson says there had been	17	I am going to begin by looking at some of the
18	established a permanent Ngok presence on the	18	terminology that we might use in order to establish the
19	Ragaba ez Zarga. What I'm doing there is summarising my	19	boundaries' various degrees of health.
20	view of the meaning of Wilkinson's itinerary.	20	I was reminded of the way in which the government's
21	PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Professor Daly. I have no	21	expert, Mr MacDonald, stated at the time of the transfer
22	further questions.	22	that the Bahr el Arab was fit for the purposes of
23	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you. There are no questions from	23	delimitation, ie hadn't yet been delimited, but the
24	the part of the Tribunal. I thank you very much,	24	feature was robust enough to be considered for
25	Professor Daly.	25	delimitation.
	Page 117		Page 119
12:25 1	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	12:28 1	I think I would have to say that I must take issue
2	MR BORN: Thank you, Professor Daly.	2	with that particular comment for the critical region of
3	(12.25 pm)	3	the river along the borderlands, the indeterminate
4	(The witness withdrew)	4	borderlands, simply on the first hand because there was
5	MR BORN: I apologise for failing on this occasion to		
		5	confusion as to its identification held at the highest
6	•	6	levels between the governors and the governor-general
7	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he	6 7	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can
7 8	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field.	6 7 8	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more
7 8 9	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will	6 7 8 9	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides
7 8 9 10	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will	6 7 8 9 10	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday.
7 8 9 10 11	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms	6 7 8 9 10 11	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University
7 8 9 10 11 12	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you.	6 7 8 9 10 11	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm)	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called)	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited? Well, I am going to take a functional definition of
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by MR SCHOFIELD	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited? Well, I am going to take a functional definition of a boundary which may be applicable at either the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by MR SCHOFIELD THE WITNESS: I've got around ten minutes to go through	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited? Well, I am going to take a functional definition of a boundary which may be applicable at either the international or the provincial level. It's one
77 88 99 100 111 122 133 144 155 166 177 188 199 200 211 222 233	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by MR SCHOFIELD THE WITNESS: I've got around ten minutes to go through quite a few slides here and to make one or two points.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited? Well, I am going to take a functional definition of a boundary which may be applicable at either the international or the provincial level. It's one provided by the leading geographer to have written about
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by MR SCHOFIELD THE WITNESS: I've got around ten minutes to go through quite a few slides here and to make one or two points. What I would ask is that anyone on the Tribunal, any	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited? Well, I am going to take a functional definition of a boundary which may be applicable at either the international or the provincial level. It's one provided by the leading geographer to have written about international boundaries, Victor Prescott. He says that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by MR SCHOFIELD THE WITNESS: I've got around ten minutes to go through quite a few slides here and to make one or two points. What I would ask is that anyone on the Tribunal, any	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited? Well, I am going to take a functional definition of a boundary which may be applicable at either the international or the provincial level. It's one provided by the leading geographer to have written about
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by MR SCHOFIELD THE WITNESS: I've got around ten minutes to go through quite a few slides here and to make one or two points. What I would ask is that anyone on the Tribunal, any	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited? Well, I am going to take a functional definition of a boundary which may be applicable at either the international or the provincial level. It's one provided by the leading geographer to have written about international boundaries, Victor Prescott. He says that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	will recall, yesterday in glowing terms. I think he demonstrated his historical mastery of the field. I am trying to manage my time judiciously and will therefore move directly to Mr Schofield, who I also will not introduce. I introduced him in glowing terms yesterday and he will now address you. THE CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr Schofield. (12.26 pm) MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called) THE CHAIRMAN: Could you read the affirmation in front of you, please. THE WITNESS: Certainly. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. Presentation by MR SCHOFIELD THE WITNESS: I've got around ten minutes to go through quite a few slides here and to make one or two points. What I would ask is that anyone on the Tribunal, any of the people surrounding me on either side, we could	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	levels between the governors and the governor-general themselves, and that was during the dry season. You can imagine that the picture would have been a lot more complex during the wet season, as Tony Allan's slides would have attested yesterday. Yesterday Professor Crawford of Cambridge University made the point that state boundaries are drawn by state actions, drawing our attention and reinforcing the centrality of the state in establishing boundaries, whether they be international or internal. Now, this may seem like a geographer trying to talk to lawyers, and I suppose it is in many ways, but what I say here is back to basics: what is a boundary and when is it delimited? Well, I am going to take a functional definition of a boundary which may be applicable at either the international or the provincial level. It's one provided by the leading geographer to have written about international boundaries, Victor Prescott. He says that it is:

12:30	1	" a line separating areas of different political	12:32 1	references didn't constitute a central defining action
	2	administration, authority or jurisdiction."	2	by the Condominium government allocating or establishing
	3	Of course, if we are actually going to talk about	3	a boundary. Of course, as we'll find, there was actual
	4	delimitation then we ought to look at the other	4	confusion as to the course of the feature purporting to
	5	recognised stages very briefly in a boundary's	5	represent the provincial boundary, in our opinion and
	6	evolution.	6	my opinion rendering the territorial limit both
	7	Recognised by de Lapradelle in 1928 and refined by	7	indeterminate and indefinite.
	8	the American geographer Stephen Jones in 1945, there are	8	A legacy of uncertainty. Again, in many, many ways
	9	three stages to this. Generally the stage of allocation	9	we can say that the Bavarian traveller Ignatius Pallme,
	10	allocates the territory in a line will in future be	10	his description in 1844 of an Ottoman boundary which
	11	drawn. Note that it doesn't allocate a boundary as	11	contracted and retreated, and did so regularly over
	12	such.	12	a period of years, as recorded in many Ottoman
	13	The second stage would be delimitation, where the	13	salnameh not here, but elsewhere in the Ottoman
	14	line is established, and of course, as we know, the line	14	world that was a fairly standard depiction of
	15	has no width; it needs to be specified. A demarcation,	15	an Ottoman provincial boundary. Some were more firmly
	16	although there are many instances of confusion, simply	16	established than others, it must be said, depending
	17	physical marks out that line on the ground. Let's go	17	where you looked.
	18	on.	18	But certainly by 1898 we had the definition at the
	19	Delimitation requires, I would purport at, both	19	bottom. This mudiria was vaguely defined, but may have
	20	levels, inasmuch as the way I described it, an executive	20	been described as enclosing the entire district water by
	21	act determining a boundary line, geographic	20	the southern tributaries; very vague, and certainly
	22	identification of the boundary line, the line being the	22	a zonal implication.
	23	point here, detailed description of the location of	23	Uncertainty continued to rein into the 1900s. Abyei
	23 24	a boundary line, ideally to the degree that it can be	23	had not been defined, numerous Condominium officials, as
	2 4 25	mapped, and a fourth stage will often be taken: a survey	25	we've heard very eloquently over the last few days, had
	23	mapped, and a fourth stage will often be taken: a survey	23	we've heard very eloquentry over the fast few days, had
		Page 121		Page 123
12:31	1	of the immediately surrounding borderlands so that	12:34 1	referred to the Ngol/Ragaba ez Zarga as the
12:31	2	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated.	2	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted
12:31	2 3	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will	2 3	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made
12:31	2 3 4	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had	2 3 4	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois
12:31	2 3 4 5	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There	2 3 4 5	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French
12:31	2 3 4 5 6	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining	2 3 4 5 6	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd.
12:31	2 3 4 5 6 7	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic	2 3 4 5 6 7	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that
12:31	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in 1905, and therefore I would say that any identification	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer. So any putative boundary surely, by
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in 1905, and therefore I would say that any identification of the Bahr el Arab as the boundary must therefore have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer. So any putative boundary surely, by extension, could only be indeterminate and indefinite.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in 1905, and therefore I would say that any identification of the Bahr el Arab as the boundary must therefore have been indeterminate and indefinite.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer. So any putative boundary surely, by extension, could only be indeterminate and indefinite. Reflecting this uncertainty. I don't need to spend
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in 1905, and therefore I would say that any identification of the Bahr el Arab as the boundary must therefore have been indeterminate and indefinite. The Bahr el Arab was referred to in absolutely	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer. So any putative boundary surely, by extension, could only be indeterminate and indefinite. Reflecting this uncertainty. I don't need to spend too much time on it, other than to say: he was the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in 1905, and therefore I would say that any identification of the Bahr el Arab as the boundary must therefore have been indeterminate and indefinite. The Bahr el Arab was referred to in absolutely minimal terms: three words, "Bahr el Arab", as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer. So any putative boundary surely, by extension, could only be indeterminate and indefinite. Reflecting this uncertainty. I don't need to spend too much time on it, other than to say: he was the governor of the Bahr el Ghazal at the time of transfer.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in 1905, and therefore I would say that any identification of the Bahr el Arab as the boundary must therefore have been indeterminate and indefinite. The Bahr el Arab was referred to in absolutely	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer. So any putative boundary surely, by extension, could only be indeterminate and indefinite. Reflecting this uncertainty. I don't need to spend too much time on it, other than to say: he was the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in 1905, and therefore I would say that any identification of the Bahr el Arab as the boundary must therefore have been indeterminate and indefinite. The Bahr el Arab was referred to in absolutely minimal terms: three words, "Bahr el Arab", as a boundary in provincial administrative reports. These	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer. So any putative boundary surely, by extension, could only be indeterminate and indefinite. Reflecting this uncertainty. I don't need to spend too much time on it, other than to say: he was the governor of the Bahr el Ghazal at the time of transfer. Unfortunately he would die in the Bahr el Ghazal region
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a delimited line can in fact be demarcated. Now, we can say and I don't think anyone will particularly challenge here that as of 1905 there had been no delimitation of a provincial boundary. There had been no Sudan action establishing or determining a boundary line. There had been no geographic identification of a boundary line and no detailed description of the location of that boundary line. No boundary line certainly was capable of being mapped and demarcated. On to the next. Now, if we haven't had delimitation, let's go back to that earlier stage of allocation and let's think about the putative definition of a provincial territorial divide which appeared in the early years of the 20th century. Remember, an allocation prescribes a boundary zone or an area, or an area in which the boundary will be drawn. References to the Bahr el Arab were uncertain in 1905, and therefore I would say that any identification of the Bahr el Arab as the boundary must therefore have been indeterminate and indefinite. The Bahr el Arab was referred to in absolutely minimal terms: three words, "Bahr el Arab", as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Bahr el Arab. The Government seems to have accepted this designation, and that the following officials made such an admission: Wilkinson, Percival, Boulnois I don't know if it's an anglicised or a French O'Connell and Lloyd. Whatever the reason, they did acknowledge that reality. The important thing is that the Government appears to suggest that references by the governors of Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, separate ones in each of their administration reports to the Bahr el Arab as a provincial boundary, were sufficient to establish a boundary. I would reckon, although I couldn't be absolutely sure, that provincial boundaries cannot be unilaterally determined by provincial governors. Some centralised executive action is probably needed. Even then, both Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal governors were demonstrably confused as to the location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer. So any putative boundary surely, by extension, could only be indeterminate and indefinite. Reflecting this uncertainty. I don't need to spend too much time on it, other than to say: he was the governor of the Bahr el Ghazal at the time of transfer.

12:35 1	actually in May 1905. But again recounting Percival's	12:39 1	the Arab, the Lol and the Kiir; again the Kiir
2	march in late 1904, he acknowledged that the Kiir was in	2	distinguished differently and clearly from the Arab.
3	fact 50 miles south of the Bahr el Arab.	3	If we go on a few years later and I'm not
4	James O'Connell. I know this was acknowledged as	4	providing any context for this statement; it's on the
5	a mistake by Government the other day, one which they	5	record it confirms a reality that was alluded to by
6	said was quickly corrected. Nonetheless, he was the	6	my colleague Martin Daly, where Wingate says even in
7	Governor of Kordofan, the top dog if you like, and he	7	1909 that much of the course is the Bahr el Arab is
8	located Hasoba on the Bahr el Arab, meaning the Ngol or	8	still unexplored.
9	the Ragaba ez Zarga.	9	So if we come to a conclusion, clearly there was no
10	Here are the words from the appropriate report:	10	delimited boundary between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal
11	"I at once proceeded to Hasoba on the Bahr el Arab."	11	provinces in 1905. I would say that both the Kordofan
12	Uncertainty: cartography. The point was: in 1905 no	12	and Bahr el Ghazal Governors were confused as to the
13	Sudan Government map had determined, delimited or	13	location of the Bahr el Arab at the time of transfer in
14	designated any provincial boundary. This has been	14	1905. If we were charitable we would say that the
15	established, but we'll have another look at the 1904	15	governor-general himself was confused in late
16	War Office map. And the insert of course there: the	16	January 1905; but perhaps later, as I've alluded to.
17	Bahr el Arab is running along the Ngol.	17	I still said still some uncertainty; perhaps less
18	On to the next one. Uncertainty: Wingate. This was	18	uncertainty, but uncertainty nonetheless.
19	noted in the Government's representations over the last	19	Logically, therefore, any putative Bahr el Arab
20	two days, that there was uncertainty in the 1904 annual	20	boundary must have been indeterminate and indefinite.
21	report. I refer to some of the highlighted sections	21	There had been no central allocation, never mind
22	there, particularly the individual specification in the	22	delimitation; while significant leading Condominium
23	first paragraph of the quote as Bahr el Arab, Kiir and	23	personnel didn't know where it was.
24	Lol are separate rivers.	24	There was uncertainty as to the extent of provincial
25	On to the next one, please. There's still some	25	administration in the emerging territory's undefined
	Page 125		Page 127
12:37 1	uncertainty, it must be said, in the 1905 annual report,	12:40 1	margins therefore.
2	which was dated January 1906. We were taken through	2	So I would say that Mr MacDonald's assertion that
3	very, very eloquently again by the Government counsel	3	the Bahr el Arab's pre-transfer depiction of the river
4	elements of this report. I refer to pages 10 and 11 of	4	was fit for the purpose of boundary delimitation at the
5	the annual report for 1905. But if we look at page 10,	5	time does not hold, other than perhaps in its western
6	the Bahr el Ghazal exploration, the last sentence says:	6	reaches, west of the Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal borderlands
7	"Much of the course of these rivers is still	7	themselves.
8	unknown and doubt still exists as to the correct	8	I'd leave it there, thank you.
9	names of the intricate waterways which intersect this	9	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much.
10	part of the Sudan."	10	Questions?
11	On the next page, of course page 11, which we heard	11	(12.41 pm)
12	about yesterday, we had a very full treatment of the	12	Cross-examination by MR BUNDY
13	sudd clearing in the Bahr el Arab. It was very evident	13	Q. Mr Schofield, I know we know each other very well, but
14	from this that Wingate, the governor-general, had begun	14	for the record I'll introduce myself: Rodman Bundy,
15	to think about clearing up the question of identifying	15	counsel for the Government of Sudan.
16	rivers in the Southern Sudan. That's been addressed	16	You will probably be aware that I asked
17	yesterday. The point I would make is that we'd only got	17	Professor Allan yesterday about your primary conclusion
18	so far in this process.	18	in your report at paragraph 2. You state:
19	If we look at the second paragraph of page 11 of the	19	"Our primary conclusion is that in 1905 there
20	report, there is still an indication that Wingate is	20	existed no provincial boundary between Bahr el Ghazal
21	confused in January 1906, whereupon he repeats almost	21	and Kordofan provinces."
22	the same phrase as was made in the previous annual	22	Is it your opinion that Condominium officials at
23	report, saying that the various waterways he asked	23	that time considered there was no provincial boundary?
24	Lieutenant Walsh to go back to penetrate as far as	24	A. Well, there was certainly no provincial boundary
25	possible along the various waterways known locally as	25	delimitation. If there was a putative boundary
	Do 127		Da 120
	Page 126		Page 128

10.41	- 1		
12:41	- 1	recognised or inter	-provincial limit" might be

- 2 a better term -- recognised as separating somehow the
- 3 two adjoining provinces, I don't think it could be
- 4 considered a definite boundary at all, simply because of
- 5 the pertaining confusion over the feature that actually
- 6 constituted the boundary; as I say, one which went right
- 7 the way up to 1905.
- 8 So in effect you could not be sure, when referring
- 9 to the Bahr el Arab, which feature, for much of the
- early part of the decade, was actually being referred
- 11 to. And as I say, that was in the dry season --
- 12 Q. You accept, though --
- 13 MR BORN: Please, if you could let the witness finish his
- 14 answer.
- 15 MR BUNDY: I have specific questions. My specific
- 16 question was: is it your opinion that Condominium
- officials took the view at that time that there was no
- provincial boundary? He can answer, "No, I don't
- think they took that position", or, "Yes". It's
- 20 a simple question.
- 21 MR BORN: I think he was answering your question,
- 22 Mr Bundy.
- 23 A. I think I was trying to provide a context, and I think
- if you read through the report, and if you listened to
- what I've just said, I don't think I could give such

- 12:44 1 Q. And it's your view that that's not a description of
 - 2 a provincial boundary?
 - 3 A. Not a defined one, no.
 - Q. If there was no provincial boundary in 1905,
 - 5 Mr Schofield, why was there a need for a transfer from
 - 6 one province to another?
 - 7 A. It's been alluded to earlier today that a people were
 - 8 transferred from one province to another.
 - 9 Q. How could a people be transferred from one province to
 - another if there was no distinguishment between the two
 - 11 provinces, if there was no provincial boundary?
 - 12 A. Because the margins of the borderlands, the borderland
 - margins of the two provinces weren't adequately defined.
 - 14 Q. If the Condominium's intention had been to fix
 - 15 a provincial boundary on a line of latitude, do you
 - accept that that would have been a straightforward
 - 17 exercise that could have been done?
 - 18 A. It's beyond my competence to talk about lines of
 - 19 longitude and latitude in a technical sense.
 - 20 Q. I'm just saying: if they had wished to fix the boundary
 - as a line of latitude, would it have been relatively
 - easy just to say "The boundary follows such and such
 - a latitude", if that had been their wish?
 - 24 A. If they'd gone for a very -- it's a hypothetical
 - 25 question because they never decided to do that.

Page 131

- 12:43 1 an easy "yes" or "no" [answer], simply because in my
 - 2 mind no boundary had been allocated, no boundary had
 - 3 been delimited, no boundary had been noted other than
 - 4 running along a river in an administration report. But
 - 5 that, to my mind, did not constitute a boundary
 - 6 definition.
 - 7 MR BUNDY: But do you accept in these administration
 - 8 reports -- are you referring to the annual reports by
 - 9 that?
 - 10 A. Yes, I'm referring to the 1902/1903, obviously,
 - 11 Bahr el Ghazal, those independent --
 - 12 Q. The annual reports. Do you accept in those annual
 - 13 reports there is a section entitled "Province
 - 14 Boundaries"?
 - 15 A. I accept that. It's absolutely on the record, yes.
 - 16 Q. Do you accept that under those headings the southern
 - 17 boundary of Kordofan and the northern boundary of
 - Bahr el Ghazal is stated as the Bahr el Arab?
 - 19 A. In individual reports, yes.
 - 20 Q. Thank you. If there was no --
 - 21 A. No, it's not stated as a boundary. I'm sorry to
 - interrupt again. It's under a heading, it's under
 - a box, "Provincial Boundaries".
 - 24 Q. And then it sets out a description?
 - 25 A. Yes.

Page 130

- 12:45 1 Q. It's entirely hypothetical, I agree.
 - 2 A. It's often commented, isn't it -- and I think
 - 3 Stephen Jones, the famous American geographer, made the
 - 4 point -- that nomination of lines of latitude and
 - 5 longitude and nominations of rivers are a sure guarantee
 - 6 of absenteeism in boundary drawing.
 - 7 Q. My question --
 - 8 MR BORN: If you could let him answer the question.
 - 9~ MR BUNDY: I'm sorry, Mr Born. Mr President, I've asked
 - 10 a simple question.
 - If it had been the intention -- I'm not saying it
 - was -- to draw a provincial boundary, any provincial
 - boundary, along a line of latitude, could that simply
 - have been stated in reports or other official documents?
 A. In my opinion, no, because for a deliberate delimitation
 - along lines of latitude there would need to be central
 - action sanctioning such a development. It would need to
 - 18 be official.
 - 19 Q. Are you aware of any boundaries in Sudan that follow
 - 20 lines of latitude?
 - 21 A. I haven't looked much beyond this one, no.
 - 22 Q. The references in the annual reports before 1905 under
 - the heading "Province Boundary" refer to the
 - 24 Bahr el Arab. Would it be fair to consider that
 - 25 Condominium officials were considering a river as the

,			
12:47 1	province boundary, even if we accept your proposition	12:51 1	area of cultivation, what the SPLM/A did here, as it did
2	that the location of the river was uncertain?	2	before the ABC experts and which is hardly any
3	A. Obviously from the content, yes.	3	surprise is to try to use manageable and practical
4	Q. Professor Daly, in his second report, has called Wingate	4	straight-line boundaries. It used some that already
5	"the only official who mattered". Do you agree with	5	exist, it extended some that already exist, and it
6	that?	6	relied on the evidence which I've demonstrated
7	A. I subscribe I would subscribe to his expertise	7	I think in great detail as to why the Ngok Dinka
8	inasmuch as he has written, as far as I know, the only	8	territory extended up to latitude 10°35' north.
9	biography of the individual; I know of no other.	9	That's not and I won't pretend it is precise.
10	MR BUNDY: Thank you very much, Mr Schofield.	10	I'm not saying that there wasn't a Ngok Dinka village
11	I have no further questions, Mr President.	11	just to the north, or it didn't go quite up to the north
12	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you.	12	of that line. But in terms of putting forward a claim
13	I thank you very much, Professor Mr Schofield.	13	in these proceedings, as was put forward before the ABC
14	(12.49 pm)	14	experts, that is a line that provides a fair
15	Submissions by MR BORN (continued)	15	representation of the extent of the Ngok Dinka
16	MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President, and thank you,	16	territories in all directions. And the suggestion that
17	Mr Schofield.	17	it was some sort of cartographically challenged mishmash
18	I've been working hard to manage my time	18	has no more substance than the accusation that the ABC
19	judiciously. I'm not sure I have succeeded terribly	19	experts' report was a scientific shambles.
20	well in that.	20	With that, Mr President, I'd like to thank you all
21	I only now in closing want to address one issue.	21	very much for your attention during this presentation.
22	Professor Crawford referred to us not quite as badly as	22	Thank you.
23	he referred to the ABC experts; he didn't say that our	23	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much, Mr Born.
24	memorial was a scientific shambles; but he did say we	24	I understand that there is a question on the part of
25	were cartographically challenged in how we put our	25	Judge Schwebel.
	D 122		D 125
	Page 133		Page 135
12:49 1	statement as to the delimitation of the Abyei Area in	12:52 1	(12.52 pm)
12:49 1 2	statement as to the delimitation of the Abyei Area in the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address	12:52 1 2	(12.52 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
	•		
2	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's	2	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
2 3	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very	2 3	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President.
2 3 4	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's	2 3 4	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the
2 3 4 5	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point.	2 3 4 5	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch.
2 3 4 5 6	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways.	2 3 4 5 6	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei referendum, there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei referendum, there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered, there will need to be an Abyei Area that sits with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the situation further as it raised serious fears among the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered, there will need to be an Abyei Area that sits with the other provincial boundaries that are in Sudan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the situation further as it raised serious fears among the Ngok."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered, there will need to be an Abyei Area that sits with the other provincial boundaries that are in Sudan. Therefore, in delimiting the Abyei Area and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the situation further as it raised serious fears among the Ngok." I'd be grateful if you would give your view as to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei referendum, there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered, there will need to be an Abyei Area that sits with the other provincial boundaries that are in Sudan. Therefore, in delimiting the Abyei Area and recognising that it was impossible, particularly in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the situation further as it raised serious fears among the Ngok." I'd be grateful if you would give your view as to the thesis that inheres in that statement, as well as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei referendum, there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered, there will need to be an Abyei Area that sits with the other provincial boundaries that are in Sudan. Therefore, in delimiting the Abyei Area and recognising that it was impossible, particularly in the timescale of this arbitration, to go out and demarcate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the situation further as it raised serious fears among the Ngok." I'd be grateful if you would give your view as to the thesis that inheres in that statement, as well as its factual inferences. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei referendum, there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered, there will need to be an Abyei Area that sits with the other provincial boundaries that are in Sudan. Therefore, in delimiting the Abyei Area and recognising that it was impossible, particularly in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the situation further as it raised serious fears among the Ngok." I'd be grateful if you would give your view as to the thesis that inheres in that statement, as well as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei referendum, there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered, there will need to be an Abyei Area that sits with the other provincial boundaries that are in Sudan. Therefore, in delimiting the Abyei Area and recognising that it was impossible, particularly in the timescale of this arbitration, to go out and demarcate each stream, each riverbed, each area of shrubbery, each	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the situation further as it raised serious fears among the Ngok." I'd be grateful if you would give your view as to the thesis that inheres in that statement, as well as its factual inferences. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much. The hearings are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the event that the Tribunal were to go on and address the question under Article 2(c). I'd just like very briefly in closing to address that question. It's a relatively straightforward and simple point. The Government seems to want to have it both ways. When we draw what they call "fuzzy boundaries" they castigate us. When we draw precise boundaries they castigate us also. The truth of the matter is and we've, I think, been very straightforward about this, the ABC experts were straightforward about it if the Tribunal were to address the question under 2(c) of identifying the precise territory of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, that's difficult. It's hard to draw precise lines, we don't deny that. On the other hand, the SPLM/A also faces the practical and to some extent political difficulty in that there will need to be an Abyei referendum, there will need to be an Abyei Area that is administered, there will need to be an Abyei Area that sits with the other provincial boundaries that are in Sudan. Therefore, in delimiting the Abyei Area and recognising that it was impossible, particularly in the timescale of this arbitration, to go out and demarcate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL JUDGE SCHWEBEL: Thank you, Mr President. A question for Mr Born, to which counsel for the Government may also wish to respond, both after lunch. The witness statement of Zakaria Atem Diyin Thibek Deng Kiir, who testified not this morning but earlier, states in paragraph 33 as follows: "A great deal of this conflict has been caused by the fact that the SPLM/A had realised too late that the boundary which they accepted denied the Ngok their rights to the land they used north of the Bahr el Arab after 1905. This territory is known by the Ngok Dinka to have been in Kordofan before 1905, and was thus not part of the area transferred. The Ngok were not at all happy about the SPLM decision to accept the 1905 boundary. The SPLM wanted to cover up for their political embarrassment by clinging to the life buoy thrown to them by the experts. This complicated the situation further as it raised serious fears among the Ngok." I'd be grateful if you would give your view as to the thesis that inheres in that statement, as well as its factual inferences. Thank you.

12:55 1			
12.00 1	adjourned until 3 o'clock.	15:02 1	describe exactly how many of the Bahr it is, but it's
2	MR BORN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.	2	clear it's a big chunk. It goes up beyond what we've
3	(12.55 pm)	3	called the Ngol, the Ragaba ez Zarga, in Atem's words,
4	(Adjourned until 3.00 pm)	4	the Government's witness's words.
5	(3.00 pm)	5	He then goes on in that paragraph and also in
6	THE CHAIRMAN: A question was asked by Judge Schwebel just	6	paragraphs 25 and 26 to describe why that is, and
7	before the break to Mr Born, with the possibility, of	7	I think it's helpful to look at why that is because it
8	course, for the Government to answer it if they want.	8	coincides very nicely with the Government's other
9	Reply to the Tribunal by MR BORN	9	witness, Professor Cunnison, who wasn't able to be here.
10	MR BORN: Thank you, Mr Chairman.	10	He says, and this is in the next sentence of
11	Turning to the relevant paragraph, 33 of	11	paragraph 23:
12	Zakaria Atem's witness statement which was read out, the	12	"The area to the north of Abyei is good for cattle
13	question is: what was the thesis of that paragraph and	13	grazing and has always been the grazing for my
14	what factual inferences might be drawn from it?	14	sub-section."
15	The thesis we would submit is almost identical to	15	"Always". He goes on in paragraph 25 to say:
16	the Government's legal case, and one can surmise how the	16	"Beginning in October, the Messiriya migrate south
17	Government's legal case found its way into Mr Atem's	17	of Abyei where they stay for the entire summer period
18	witness statement. That legal case is, of course, that	18	until the first rain when they return. The reason for
19	the Abyei Area is defined as a transferred area that lay	19	this is that the Messiriya cattle are sensitive to the
20	to the south of what the Government takes to be the	20	flies."
21	Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal boundary in 1905, what they call	21	We've seen that referred to before in the record:
22	the Bahr el Arab or the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, and that the	22	"The Ngok Dinka build luaks for the rainy season and
23	transferred area can only be that area to the south of	23	our cattle can survive the flies."
24	the Kiir.	24	I'd like to take us back to the description of the
25	The thesis as well and this is going to take me	25	Bahr region, the environmental evidence which we put in
20	The thosp to were that this is going to thice me	23	Buil region, the charlothichtal evidence which we put in
	Page 137		Page 139
15:01 1	some time I think to work through in Atem's statement	15:04 1	and which is uncontroverted. Atem here affirms that in
2	•	2	terms. He explains how it is that the Ngok can survive
3		3	throughout the Bahr region, which we looked at, where
4		4	there is seasonal flooding and where there are the
5			
6	NT 1 1.1	5	flies: they build luaks, and they have the short-legged,
		6	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that
7	himself thought that that was unfair.	6 7	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area.
7 8	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that	6 7 8	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit
7 8 9	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because	6 7 8 9	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my
7 8 9 10	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the	6 7 8 9 10	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say:
7 8 9 10	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their	6 7 8 9 10	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into
7 8 9 10 11	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited."
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says:
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that"
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz:
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived"	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some to the east. All nine chiefdoms were intermingling,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are used to it and the people have methods for treating the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some to the east. All nine chiefdoms were intermingling, there were no boundaries among them either. The	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are used to it and the people have methods for treating the symptoms of that we Ngok Dinka do not know."
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some to the east. All nine chiefdoms were intermingling, there were no boundaries among them either. The settlements were in Thigai, Dawas, Antila, the Rgaba	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are used to it and the people have methods for treating the symptoms of that we Ngok Dinka do not know." I will come back in closing and explain to you what
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some to the east. All nine chiefdoms were intermingling, there were no boundaries among them either. The settlements were in Thigai, Dawas, Antila, the Rgaba Zerga and Fawel."	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are used to it and the people have methods for treating the symptoms of that we Ngok Dinka do not know." I will come back in closing and explain to you what lisaig is. You won't be surprised, though, when I tell
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some to the east. All nine chiefdoms were intermingling, there were no boundaries among them either. The settlements were in Thigai, Dawas, Antila, the Rgaba Zerga and Fawel." Then he goes on, and I'd just like to pause there.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are used to it and the people have methods for treating the symptoms of that we Ngok Dinka do not know." I will come back in closing and explain to you what lisaig is. You won't be surprised, though, when I tell you now that lisaig is a grass that grows in sandy
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some to the east. All nine chiefdoms were intermingling, there were no boundaries among them either. The settlements were in Thigai, Dawas, Antila, the Rgaba Zerga and Fawel." Then he goes on, and I'd just like to pause there.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are used to it and the people have methods for treating the symptoms of that we Ngok Dinka do not know." I will come back in closing and explain to you what lisaig is. You won't be surprised, though, when I tell
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some to the east. All nine chiefdoms were intermingling, there were no boundaries among them either. The settlements were in Thigai, Dawas, Antila, the Rgaba Zerga and Fawel." Then he goes on, and I'd just like to pause there.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are used to it and the people have methods for treating the symptoms of that we Ngok Dinka do not know." I will come back in closing and explain to you what lisaig is. You won't be surprised, though, when I tell you now that lisaig is a grass that grows in sandy
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	himself thought that that was unfair. He draws a conclusion from that in paragraph 33 that it caused political difficulties for the SPLM because when they realised in effect, in his view and the Government's legal view, that they had given up their traditional ancestral homelands to the north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, people were angry with them. That is what I would submit quite clearly is the thesis of Atem's witness statement. I'd like to take you to paragraph 23 of his witness statement, and we can look through at how that thesis is elaborated: "Before the 1965 conflict the Ngok Dinka lived around Abyei, with some to the north and west and some to the east. All nine chiefdoms were intermingling, there were no boundaries among them either. The settlements were in Thigai, Dawas, Antila, the Rgaba Zerga and Fawel." Then he goes on, and I'd just like to pause there. That is a substantial chunk of the Bahr; he doesn't	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	non-humped cattle which are able to survive in that area. Then he gives another reason that I was a little bit embarrassed frankly that I hadn't made this in my presentation, but he goes on in paragraph 26 to say: "If a Ngok wishes to take his cattle into a Messiriya area he is not prohibited." That, of course, is above the goz. He says: "But he does not need that" He doesn't to go need to go up into the dry areas above the goz: "However, grazing to the north of our normal areas is unsuitable for our cattle. The grass there, called lisaig, makes our cattle sick. The Messiriya cattle are used to it and the people have methods for treating the symptoms of that we Ngok Dinka do not know." I will come back in closing and explain to you what lisaig is. You won't be surprised, though, when I tell you now that lisaig is a grass that grows in sandy areas. It doesn't grow in the goz, it grows up in the

,			
15:05 1	north.	15:08 1	What he tells you there is, if you accept the
2	I'd finally like to take you to paragraph 28. If	2	Government's legal theory, which he had put in his
3	you look, he gives an explanation which, not	3	statement, it is in his view unfair because it takes
4	surprisingly, coincides with the government's legal	4	away from the Ngok Dinka their traditional lands.
5	thesis. Then in the second-to-last sentence he says,	5	The good news is it isn't unfair. The good news
6	and he is describing the Abyei Area in accordance with	6	is we've seen it before, we're going to hear it
7	the Government's case:	7	again the legal formula in Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei
8	"This clearly excludes areas of Ngok settlements	8	Protocol does not adopt the bizarre interpretation that
9	which were in Kordofan before the transfer."	9	the Government has put. Instead the experts got it
10	So here he's referring to the areas north of the	10	exactly right.
11	Bahr el Arab which were in Kordofan before the transfer	11	Thank you, Mr Chairman.
12	and which caused, from his perspective, the political	12	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much.
13	problems. This was the area to the north of the Kiir	13	Does the Government want to answer the question
14	which supposedly got given away.	14	raised by Judge Schwebel?
15	The important thing, the important factual	15	Reply to the Tribunal by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD
16	inferences to draw from this, is that the Government's	16	PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Most certainly, yes, sir. It's
17	witness, Zakaria Atem, who they brought here, in his	17	an important question, and we would as a matter of
18	witness statement does two important things: he	18	courtesy have answered it in any event.
19	describes how the traditional Ngok territories extended	19	However, I have to say that we've now had what
20	well north of the Kiir/Bahr el Arab, up to and beyond	20	amounted to a ten-minute speech going somewhat beyond
21	the Ngol/Ragaba ez Zarga.	21	the implications of the question and I reserve the right
22	We saw him. He's not a scientist, but he can tell	22	to come back tomorrow in my discussion of the
23	us about the area, and he told us why that would be the	23	travaux préparatoires of the Abyei Protocol to deal
24	case. He told us about the luaks, he told us about the	24	further with the implications of what counsel for the
25	flies, he told us about the rains and he told us	25	SPLM/A have just said.
			•
	Page 141		Page 143
15:06 1	something we didn't even know about the lisaig grass.	15:09 1	The first point I would make is that the whole of
2	The last thing that he said isn't in his statement	2	that statement was Mr Zakaria's testimony and not just
3	but I'd like to read from page [45, line 24, to page 46	3	the bits that suit counsel for the SPLM/A. It's obvious
4	line 5] of his witness [testimony], in response to	4	if you read our witness statements that they are not
5	questions from the Tribunal. He said in reference to	5	completely consistent with each other. The reason for
6	the Abyei Area:	6	that is that there are different views held amongst the
7	"Danforth said that this is the place where the	7	various people who gave witness statements and we didn't
8	Dinka have been transferred, but this is a small	8	try and homogenise them.
9	triangle"	9	It's clear that Mr Zakaria, as a respected elder
10	This is in reference to what took to be the	10	member of the Ngok community, takes a broader view of
11	transferred area beneath the Kiir:	11	the extent of historical Ngok lands than the Government
12	" this is a small triangle, so it is not enough	12	does; that's his prerogative. But he also takes the
13	to accommodate even the owners of the area."	13	view, which is his own view as I understand it, that the
14	That takes us back to what I told you about the	14	Danforth compromise involved a territorial transfer to
15	Government's theory that you really need high-rise	15	Kordofan. It's not a very surprising view because
16	condominiums in the 14 miles of swampland underneath the	16	that's what it says.
17	Kiir to accommodate all the Ngok Dinka that would need	17	He expresses the corollary of that: that when that
18	to live there. There's not enough room there, Mr Atem	18	compromise was reached, after intensive and lengthy
19	told us; "it is not enough to accommodate even the	19	negotiations, as I said in my first speech, there was
20	owners of the area".	20	considerable disquiet amongst the Ngok community as to
21	Then he went on and said, and this is very	21	the implications for them, as well there might have
22	important:	22	been. The agreement was reached by the SPLM/A and not
23	"So as a Dinka tribe member I think that this is	23	by the Ngok, and that gave rise to disquiet. That's
24	unfair, because Dinka used to extend from the south	24	what he's saying.
25	from the north and to the south as well."	25	What its implications are for this Tribunal of
	Page 142		Page 144
	1 ago 1+2		Tage 144

15:10 1	course is unfathomable, but the Government affirms the	15:14 1	interject a brief comment. Yesterday afternoon Mr Born
2	truth of what he is saying in the paragraph to which you	2	purported to quote something that I said yesterday
3	refer, and then the context of the testimony that he	3	morning in my first-round presentation. At page 183 of
4	gave allowed him to say what he thought on all fronts.	4	the transcript counsel said that I said:
5	Thank you, sir.	5	"It is self-evident that as of 1905 Government
6	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much. We are now to begin	6	officials would have had no knowledge of tribal
7	the second round of replies, this time on the	7	locations."
8	delimitation issue. I recall that each side will have	8	That's what counsel said that I said: that as of
9	80 minutes and the Government begins.	9	1905 Government officials would have had no knowledge of
10	Please, Mr Bundy, you have the floor.	10	tribal locations.
11	(3.11 pm)	11	As an advocate I can certainly have no objection if
12	Submissions by MR BUNDY	12	opposing counsel tries to cite my words against me. But
13	MR BUNDY: Thank you, Mr President, distinguished members	13	when he does so, I'd prefer it if he could quote me
14	of the Tribunal. I shall begin the Government's reply	14	correctly. I did not say that it's "self-evident that
15	to the SPLM/A's first-round pleading on the question:	15	as of 1905 Government officials would have no knowledge
16	what was the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms	16	of tribal locations".
17	transferred to Kordofan in 1905? I'll be followed by	17	If one checks the actual transcript at page 20
18	Professor Crawford, who will discuss the SPLM/A's	18	Mr Born's reference to the transcript was incorrect, but
19	tribal case.	19	if one checks the actual transcript, it will be seen
20	We've heard two very different accounts of what	20	that what I actually said was:
21	happened at the time. The SPLM/A has painted a picture	20	"It is self-evident that as of 1905 Government
22	of confusion, ignorance, uncertainty in the minds of	22	officials would have no knowledge of tribal locations or
23	Condominium officials as to the area that was	23	other factors that only emerged after that date."
23	transferred from Bahr el Ghazal to Kordofan in 1905, and		
25		24	By dropping the final words that I said, counsel
23	the people of that area.	25	seriously distorted my point.
	Page 145		Page 147
15:12 1	According to our opponents there was no provincial	15:15 1	As both Professor Crawford and I have shown, by 1905
15:12 1 2	According to our opponents there was no provincial boundary between the two provinces at the time. That,	15:15 1 2	As both Professor Crawford and I have shown, by 1905 Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the
2	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That,	2	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the
2 3	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal	2 3	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was
2 3 4	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The	2 3 4	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year.
2 3 4 5	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the	2 3 4 5	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge
2 3 4 5 6	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task.	2 3 4 5 6	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at
2 3 4 5 6 7	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming":
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had a well articulated intention. There had been complaints
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along with the MENAS report and the first daily report.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along with the MENAS report and the first daily report. They also say that Condominium officials had little	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had a well articulated intention. There had been complaints from Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan of raids of Baggara Arabs living in Kordofan on Dinkas living in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along with the MENAS report and the first daily report. They also say that Condominium officials had little idea where the Ngok Dinka were really located. That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had a well articulated intention. There had been complaints from Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan of raids of Baggara Arabs living in Kordofan on Dinkas living in Bahr el Ghazal. It was thought that this situation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along with the MENAS report and the first daily report. They also say that Condominium officials had little idea where the Ngok Dinka were really located. That's from paragraph 114 of their rejoinder.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had a well articulated intention. There had been complaints from Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan of raids of Baggara Arabs living in Kordofan on Dinkas living in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along with the MENAS report and the first daily report. They also say that Condominium officials had little idea where the Ngok Dinka were really located. That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had a well articulated intention. There had been complaints from Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan of raids of Baggara Arabs living in Kordofan on Dinkas living in Bahr el Ghazal. It was thought that this situation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along with the MENAS report and the first daily report. They also say that Condominium officials had little idea where the Ngok Dinka were really located. That's from paragraph 114 of their rejoinder. On that last point, Mr President, I need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had a well articulated intention. There had been complaints from Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan of raids of Baggara Arabs living in Kordofan on Dinkas living in Bahr el Ghazal. It was thought that this situation could be better controlled if those territories of the Ngok Dinka and the Twic, those territories situated in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along with the MENAS report and the first daily report. They also say that Condominium officials had little idea where the Ngok Dinka were really located. That's from paragraph 114 of their rejoinder.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had a well articulated intention. There had been complaints from Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan of raids of Baggara Arabs living in Kordofan on Dinkas living in Bahr el Ghazal. It was thought that this situation could be better controlled if those territories of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	boundary between the two provinces at the time. That, as you'll recall from this morning, was the principal conclusion of MENAS: no provincial boundary. The location of the pre-transfer boundary and the post-transfer boundary is thus irrelevant to your task. That was repeated by Mr Born on Sunday. Boundaries have not been established pursuant to any decree or proclamation; a point raised by Professor Daly. There was no administration on the ground; a point also raised by Professor Daly this morning. No one knew for sure which river was which, or where the rivers lay, a theme that permeates the SPLM/A's pleadings; and that the Governor-General's views that the districts transferred, that were formerly part of the Bahr el Ghazal province, and that lay to the south of the Bahr el Arab, that those were incorporated into Kordofan should be disregarded; which is precisely what the SPLM/A's memorial and counter-memorial did, along with the MENAS report and the first daily report. They also say that Condominium officials had little idea where the Ngok Dinka were really located. That's from paragraph 114 of their rejoinder. On that last point, Mr President, I need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Condominium officials did have a good idea of where the Ngok Dinka were located, and of the area that was transferred in that year. The litany of points of confusion, lack of knowledge and uncertainty posited by our opponents brings, at least to my mind, the eloquent words of Yeats in his poem "The Second Coming": "The falcon cannot hear the falconer; "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, "The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere "The ceremony of innocence is drowned; "The best lack all conviction, while the worst "Are full of passionate intensity." It's a moving verse, but it's not the way Condominium officials viewed the situation at the time. The transfer decision was not controversial in 1905, and it was not complicated. Condominium officials had a well articulated intention. There had been complaints from Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan of raids of Baggara Arabs living in Kordofan on Dinkas living in Bahr el Ghazal. It was thought that this situation could be better controlled if those territories of the Ngok Dinka and the Twic, those territories situated in

15:17 1	the Bahr el Ghazal province at the time, were	15:20 1	not diminish its importance, although it may say
2	transferred to Kordofan so that all the protagonists	2	something about the ABC's work. The centre does indeed
3	would be under the same administrative authority of the	3	hold; nothing falls apart. Perhaps, if I may be
4	Governor of Kordofan.	4	permitted to say so, this Tribunal is in a very real
5	There was no dispute in 1905 over these issues.	5	sense the second coming when compared to the ABC
6	Condominium officials were not trying to settle	6	experts' report.
7	a territorial dispute where different positions have	7	Now, we have been told by the SPLM/A not to
8	been advanced. No one was posturing for litigation	8	second-guess or rewrite what Government administrators
9	purposes. All that was involved was a straightforward	9	wrote at the time, and that the most reliable approach
10	administrative transfer of an area from one province to	10	is to look at what Government administrators said they
11	another. It did not involve large-scale change to	11	transferred to Kordofan in 1905.
12	Sudan's provincial boundaries. Relatively limited	12	The SPLM/A memorial in fact, at paragraph 1579
13	though nonetheless important areas were at stake.	13	called the 1905 Condominium official documentary records
13	This was not a complex matter for Condominium	14	"decisive". Precisely. And we encourage the Tribunal
15	administrators in 1905, and we would submit that it does	15	to take that approach.
16	not need to be a complicated task for this Tribunal	16	Yet yesterday afternoon counsel for the SPLM/A took
17	either. The pieces of the documentary record fit	17	exactly the opposite approach. He now emphasises that
18	together like a jigsaw puzzle; they add up. The	18	the documentary evidence should be looked at with
19	essential task for this Tribunal, we would respectfully	19	scepticism because of its so-called limitations.
20	submit, is to examine that record as a whole in	20	From what we heard for a good part of yesterday
20	assessing the parties' positions.	20	afternoon, what is more important is to look at what
22	Does it really support the proposition that	22	Condominium officials did not say, rather than what they
23	Condominium officials in 1905 intended to transfer from	23	said, and the Tribunal is invited to play detective and
23	Bahr el Ghazal to Kordofan areas that extended up to the	23	speculate as to the alleged missing gaps.
25	10°35' north latitude, or even the 10°22'30" north	25	In short it turns out that we should second-guess
23	10 33 Horti latitude, of even the 10 22 30 Horti	23	in short it turns out that we should second-guess
	Page 149		Page 151
15:19 1	latitude? Is that what the record really shows? Or	15:22 1	the Condominium officials after all, and today we've
15:19 1 2	latitude? Is that what the record really shows? Or does the record support the proposition that the	15:22 1 2	the Condominium officials after all, and today we've actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the
	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials		actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive.
2 3 4	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the	2	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the
2 3	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south?	2 3	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the
2 3 4	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than	2 3 4	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even
2 3 4 5 6 7	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer,	2 3 4 5	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation"
2 3 4 5 6	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator which he recorded contemporaneously and which referred	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear that Government administrators were not relying on oral
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator which he recorded contemporaneously and which referred specifically to the transfer and its location.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear that Government administrators were not relying on oral tradition or on post-1905 events when they described the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator which he recorded contemporaneously and which referred specifically to the transfer and its location. It is a rich and informative body of documentary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear that Government administrators were not relying on oral tradition or on post-1905 events when they described the transferred area; nor did they feel that they needed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator which he recorded contemporaneously and which referred specifically to the transfer and its location. It is a rich and informative body of documentary evidence. We know what happened at the time because the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear that Government administrators were not relying on oral tradition or on post-1905 events when they described the transferred area; nor did they feel that they needed to know where all the areas were that the Ngok Dinka
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator which he recorded contemporaneously and which referred specifically to the transfer and its location. It is a rich and informative body of documentary evidence. We know what happened at the time because the relevant documents are on the record. The fact that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear that Government administrators were not relying on oral tradition or on post-1905 events when they described the transferred area; nor did they feel that they needed to know where all the areas were that the Ngok Dinka allegedly occupied or used.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator which he recorded contemporaneously and which referred specifically to the transfer and its location. It is a rich and informative body of documentary evidence. We know what happened at the time because the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear that Government administrators were not relying on oral tradition or on post-1905 events when they described the transferred area; nor did they feel that they needed to know where all the areas were that the Ngok Dinka
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator which he recorded contemporaneously and which referred specifically to the transfer and its location. It is a rich and informative body of documentary evidence. We know what happened at the time because the relevant documents are on the record. The fact that the ABC experts did not refer to much of this record does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear that Government administrators were not relying on oral tradition or on post-1905 events when they described the transferred area; nor did they feel that they needed to know where all the areas were that the Ngok Dinka allegedly occupied or used. They didn't need to know and they weren't interested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	does the record support the proposition that the transferred area was viewed by Condominium officials themselves as much more limited, and as lying along the Bahr el Arab and to its south? Unlike many boundary disputes dating from more than a century ago, the basic facts relating to the transfer, and the evidence of the intention of Government officials who effectuated the transfer, are well documented. Despite counsel's complaint that there are only two dozen or so documents referring to the Ngok Dinka or Messiriya from the time, the fact is that we have numerous intelligence reports prepared on a monthly basis, annual reports for the relevant provinces of Bahr el Ghazal and Kordofan for each of the significant years; very detailed accounts from Government officials who visited the area, including with their sketch maps, and the views of the seniormost Government administrator which he recorded contemporaneously and which referred specifically to the transfer and its location. It is a rich and informative body of documentary evidence. We know what happened at the time because the relevant documents are on the record. The fact that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actually heard virtually no discussion whatsoever of the documents that the SPLM/A previously said were decisive. There's been no mention today, for example, of the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report, no mention of the 1905 annual reports. These were documents that even Professor Daly in his first report termed "foundation texts", and yet he couldn't even remember the annual reports in questions put to him this morning. Now, we also have had by Mr Schofield, my good friend and colleague, a passing reference to Wingate's memorandum, but nothing at all focusing on what Wingate actually said about the transferred area. That was the passage we all recall where Wingate said that the transferred areas comprised the districts of the two Sultans to the south of the Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of Bahr el Ghazal province, that had been incorporated into Kordofan. In considering the evidence it's perfectly clear that Government administrators were not relying on oral tradition or on post-1905 events when they described the transferred area; nor did they feel that they needed to know where all the areas were that the Ngok Dinka allegedly occupied or used.

15:24 1	in connection with the transfer in climatic conditions,	15:27 1	Bayldon was in the relevant area. It was Bayldon who
2	soil, vegetation and other environmental elements. They	2	was the one that Sheihk Rihan of the Twic had complained
3	weren't interested in those, and those did not figure	3	to as reported in the February 1905 intelligence report
4	into their decision and their description of the	4	about raiding. Bayldon was the one in fact the only
5	transfer.	5	one who explored the Ragaba ez Zarga in any details.
	Condominium officials make no mention of these kinds		
6		6	He went up 40 miles. He also had been engaged obviously
7	of factors in relation to the transfer decision, and	7	on the Bahr el Arab, the real Bahr el Arab.
8	indeed Professor Allan confirmed in response to	8	What is clear is that there is not a single document
9	a question put to him that there's no document	9	on the record there's not one suggesting that the
10	evidencing that Condominium officials considered these	10	transfer decision was motivated by and contingent on
11	kinds of environmental factors relevant at all to the	11	identifying the extent of the territory occupied or used
12	transfer decision or to their description of the	12	by the Ngok Dinka in 1905. Condominium officials were
13	transferred area.	13	simply not concerned with that issue. They were solely
14	Those officials were focused on a much more limited	14	concerned with the transfer of an area from one province
15	exercise: transferring the districts, the areas, the	15	to another to control raiding in areas that formerly had
16	territories, the country those are the terms that are	16	formed part of the province of Bahr el Ghazal, and to
17	used of two tribal chiefs previously located in	17	accomplish that task they were only concerned with the
18	Bahr el Ghazal to Kordofan. The location of the	18	Ngok Dinka and Twic areas situated in Bahr el Ghazal,
19	transferred area must be viewed in the light of the	19	since it was only this area that would be transferred.
20	object and purpose behind the transfer.	20	As I said, areas or even people already in Kordofan
21	That purpose was only to transfer an area that was	21	did not need to be transferred to Kordofan in order to
22	previously in Bahr el Ghazal province to Kordofan so	22	achieve the object and purpose of the transfer. Hence
23	that the area would be placed under the same	23	Wingate's description in his 1905 memorandum that it's
24	administration, and the only areas transferred were	24	the districts of the two sultans to the south of
25		25	Bahr el Arab, and formerly in the Bahr el Ghazal
23	those necessary to fulfil that purpose, ie areas that	23	Baill et Arab, and formerly in the Baill et Ghazai
	Page 153		Page 155
15:26 1	previously had been in Bahr el Ghazal. People already	15:29 1	province, that have been transferred to Kordofan.
2	living in Kordofan did not need to be transferred to	2	Nor were colonial administrators trying to divide up
3	Kordofan.	3	the goz, or to allocate permanent or secondary grazing
4	On Sunday counsel for the SPLM/A said that the	4	rights in an equitable manner, or to apply African
5	decisive issue for the ABC experts was to locate:	5	principles of law. The Tribunal will search the record
6	" the extent of the territory of the nine	6	in vain for any trace of evidence that these kinds of
7	Ngok Dinka chiefdoms as they stood in 1905, not the	7	considerations were in the minds of Condominium
8	location of the putative provincial boundary"	8	administrators when they carried out and when they
9	I don't intend to return to the question put to the	9	reported on the transfer. Such concepts were utterly
10	ABC experts it's possible that Professor Crawford may	10	alien to the whole raison d'être underlying the transfer
11	in closing tomorrow but what I would say is that that	11	decision.
12	formula, simply "the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka	12	Let me turn to the actual transfer documents,
13	chiefdoms as it stood in 1905", is most certainly not	13	despite the fact that they've been virtually ignored by
13	a correct description of this Tribunal's delimitation	13	our opponents in their first round presentation. What
	mandate. The words "transferred to Kordofan" cannot	15	**
	mandate. The words transferred to Kordolan cannot	13	do they tell us was the Condominium's contemporary
15 16		12	understanding of what they were doing and which areas
16	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is	16 17	understanding of what they were doing, and which areas
16 17	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905	17	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly
16 17 18	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation.	17 18	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting
16 17 18 19	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon	17 18 19	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware,
16 17 18 19 20	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon were not dispatched to investigate the location of areas	17 18 19 20	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware, been even referred to by our colleagues in the
16 17 18 19 20 21	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon were not dispatched to investigate the location of areas occupied or used by the Ngok Dinka. Bayldon, as we	17 18 19 20 21	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware, been even referred to by our colleagues in the delimitation phase of these proceedings.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon were not dispatched to investigate the location of areas occupied or used by the Ngok Dinka. Bayldon, as we know, was sent with very different instructions:	17 18 19 20 21 22	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware, been even referred to by our colleagues in the delimitation phase of these proceedings. Even to the extent it referred to Sultan Rob or
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon were not dispatched to investigate the location of areas occupied or used by the Ngok Dinka. Bayldon, as we know, was sent with very different instructions: specifically to explore the relevant rivers, which was	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware, been even referred to by our colleagues in the delimitation phase of these proceedings. Even to the extent it referred to Sultan Rob or Sultan [Rihan's] people and it's not clear that
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon were not dispatched to investigate the location of areas occupied or used by the Ngok Dinka. Bayldon, as we know, was sent with very different instructions: specifically to explore the relevant rivers, which was the primary interest of Government officials.	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware, been even referred to by our colleagues in the delimitation phase of these proceedings. Even to the extent it referred to Sultan Rob or Sultan [Rihan's] people and it's not clear that "people" is in the large sense, or just referring to
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon were not dispatched to investigate the location of areas occupied or used by the Ngok Dinka. Bayldon, as we know, was sent with very different instructions: specifically to explore the relevant rivers, which was	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware, been even referred to by our colleagues in the delimitation phase of these proceedings. Even to the extent it referred to Sultan Rob or Sultan [Rihan's] people and it's not clear that
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon were not dispatched to investigate the location of areas occupied or used by the Ngok Dinka. Bayldon, as we know, was sent with very different instructions: specifically to explore the relevant rivers, which was the primary interest of Government officials. Contrary to the submissions of our opponents,	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware, been even referred to by our colleagues in the delimitation phase of these proceedings. Even to the extent it referred to Sultan Rob or Sultan [Rihan's] people and it's not clear that "people" is in the large sense, or just referring to Sultan Rob and Sultan Rihan but even if it referred
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	simply be suppressed, as counsel does, and that is certainly not the way that Condominium officials in 1905 viewed the situation. Officers such as Wilkinson, Percival and Bayldon were not dispatched to investigate the location of areas occupied or used by the Ngok Dinka. Bayldon, as we know, was sent with very different instructions: specifically to explore the relevant rivers, which was the primary interest of Government officials.	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they considered they were transferring? Surprisingly the March 1905 Sudan Intelligence Report first reporting on the transfer has not, at least as far as I'm aware, been even referred to by our colleagues in the delimitation phase of these proceedings. Even to the extent it referred to Sultan Rob or Sultan [Rihan's] people and it's not clear that "people" is in the large sense, or just referring to

15:31 1	to Sultan Rob's people, those people had a country. The	15:34 1	subsequently carried out in the same year by Sciplini
2	Sudan Intelligence Report of March 1905 clearly states	2	and Walsh. We know that because he referred to these in
3	that the country of Sultan Rob is on the Kiir. There's	3	his 1905 memorandum. And yet, as is clear from the
4	never been any confusion about where the Kiir was. It	4	submissions of the other side, either by omission or by
5	didn't say his country was on the Ragaba ez Zarga or the	5	denigration, the description of the only official who
6	Bahr el Homr further north; it said it was on the Kiir.	6	mattered, his description of the transferred area should
7	Then of course we have, as I've explained,	7	be given no weight. Once again, I'd respectfully ask:
8	Governor-General Wingate's description of the	8	which party is now trying to rewrite or second-guess
9	transferred area. On Monday counsel for the SPLM/A	9	what Condominium officials said?
10	asserted and this is in the transcript at page 90	10	I turn to a related issue which concerns the
11	that Condominium officials had:	11	relevance of the provincial boundary. It's obviously
12	" no idea of what the territorial boundaries of	12	another issue on which the parties remain divided. The
13	the thing that they would have been transferring was."	13	SPLM argues that the location of the provincial boundary
14	Well, that's certainly not the case for	14	is irrelevant to the question posed. We say it's not.
15	Governor-General Wingate; he had a very good idea of the	15	Indeed we believe an assessment of the northern limits
16	thing. It wasn't a thing; it was two districts that was	16	of the transferred area is inextricably linked to the
17	being transferred to the south of the Bahr el Arab.	17	question of the provincial boundary, and it's linked
18	It can't be disputed that Wingate was the most	18	both before and after the transfer, and that that is how
19	senior official in the Sudan. Let me just recall how	19	Condominium officials at the time viewed the situation.
20	Professor Daly has described him: his power was	20	As I've already noted in my first round
21	absolute; he was a virtual dictator; the supreme	21	presentation, three of the four transfer documents,
22	military and civil command in Sudan was vested in him;	22	three of the four documents from 1905 specifically
23	and lastly, the governor-general in Khartoum was "the	23	referring to the transfer do so under headings/rubric
24	only official who mattered". The only official who	24	dealing with provincial boundaries and changes to
25	mattered. That's in Professor Daly's second report at	25	provincial boundaries.
	D 157		P. 150
	Page 157		Page 159
15:32 1	page 19.	15:36 1	In contrast we have the SPLM/A's complaint, repeated
2	Wingate was not thus merely some administrative		
. ~		2	by their expert, that there was no administration to
	•	2 3	by their expert, that there was no administration to speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the
3 4	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation		speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the
3	•	3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
3 4	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered.	3 4	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was
3 4 5	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers	3 4 5	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that
3 4 5 6	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for	3 4 5 6	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of
3 4 5 6 7	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly	3 4 5 6 7	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the
3 4 5 6 7 8	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning.	3 4 5 6 7 8	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest".	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer decision which was reported in the same intelligence	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing that sovereignty is inexistent. Each case must be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer decision which was reported in the same intelligence report would have been kept secret for months and for	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing that sovereignty is inexistent. Each case must be appreciated in accordance with the particular
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer decision which was reported in the same intelligence report would have been kept secret for months and for years as well, and we know that that is not the case for	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing that sovereignty is inexistent. Each case must be appreciated in accordance with the particular circumstances."
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer decision which was reported in the same intelligence report would have been kept secret for months and for years as well, and we know that that is not the case for either of those.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing that sovereignty is inexistent. Each case must be appreciated in accordance with the particular circumstances." We submit that these same considerations apply to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer decision which was reported in the same intelligence report would have been kept secret for months and for years as well, and we know that that is not the case for either of those. Wingate knew about the transfer, and Wingate knew	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing that sovereignty is inexistent. Each case must be appreciated in accordance with the particular circumstances." We submit that these same considerations apply to administrative boundaries. Displays of sovereignty or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer decision which was reported in the same intelligence report would have been kept secret for months and for years as well, and we know that that is not the case for either of those.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing that sovereignty is inexistent. Each case must be appreciated in accordance with the particular circumstances." We submit that these same considerations apply to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer decision which was reported in the same intelligence report would have been kept secret for months and for years as well, and we know that that is not the case for either of those. Wingate knew about the transfer, and Wingate knew	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing that sovereignty is inexistent. Each case must be appreciated in accordance with the particular circumstances." We submit that these same considerations apply to administrative boundaries. Displays of sovereignty or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	official, as was intimated by the SPLM/A's presentation the other day; he was the only official that mattered. Moreover, he was interested in where the relevant rivers lay, as his 1904 memorandum and the annual report for that year clearly shows. And even Professor Daly acknowledged this this morning. Previously in Professor Daly's written statements he had said, quite categorically, that the hydrology of the region we're concerned with was of little or no concern to Condominium officials in 1905. This morning he said, and I quote, "there was certainly an interest". It's been suggested in the MENAS report, although not repeated in testimony this morning, that Bayldon's March 1905 report, where he correctly identified the Bahr el Arab River, would have been kept secret for months and even years. That is pure speculation, but I'd note that if that was the case than the transfer decision which was reported in the same intelligence report would have been kept secret for months and for years as well, and we know that that is not the case for either of those. Wingate knew about the transfer, and Wingate knew about Bayldon's 1905 explorations, as well as those	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	speak of in the area in question, and that therefore the very existence of a provincial boundary was inconsequential. We would respectfully suggest that that line of argument is ill-founded on a number of grounds, both legal and factual. Let me start with the legal. As was pointed out as far back as the Island of Palmas case, but it's a passage that has been cited with approval in the court's recent case in Singapore v Malaysia, state authority should not necessarily be displayed in fact at every moment or every point of territory. As Max Huber stated in his award: " in the exercise of territorial sovereignty there are necessarily gaps, intermittence in time and discontinuity in space The fact that a state cannot prove display of sovereignty as regards such a portion of territory cannot forthwith be interpreted as showing that sovereignty is inexistent. Each case must be appreciated in accordance with the particular circumstances." We submit that these same considerations apply to administrative boundaries. Displays of sovereignty or of administration vary according to the nature of the

,			
15:37 1	territory being administered. When territory is	15:41 1	one province to another? If you haven't got
2	relatively remote, a display of modest amounts of	2	a provincial boundary, why do you need a transfer from
3	administration does not imply that a province is not	3	one province to another province?
4	administered as a unit, or that provincial boundaries do	4	In a situation where there are no provincial
5	not exist or were not deemed to be important.	5	boundaries, it would have been meaningless to carry out
6	Factually we know that Sultan Rob was given a robe	6	an administrative act the sole purpose of which was to
7	of honour; it's actually reported in gazetted documents	7	transfer the districts of two sultans from the
8	that the SPLM/A is so fond of, an administrative act.	8	administration of Bahr el Ghazal to that of Kordofan in
9	We know that both he and Sheihk Rihan approached the	9	order to place them under the same governor.
10	Government to control raiding; we know that the	10	Condominium officials would not have needed a transfer
11	Government responded; and we know that one of the	11	if there was no provincial boundary.
12	responses was the transfer. That transfer decision was	12	It's precisely because the districts of the two
13	quintessentially an administrative act.	13	sultans, as so clearly shown in Wingate's memorandum,
14	MENAS's primary conclusion, which I can only assume	14	had formerly been situated in the province of
15	that the SPLM/A shares, is that in 1905 there existed no	15	Bahr el Ghazal that they were incorporated in the
16	provincial boundary between the two provinces. And this	16	transfer into Kordofan, and it's why he discusses it
17	morning Professor Daly asserted that in Wingate's cover	17	under the heading "Changes to Provincial Boundaries",
18	letter he called Wingate's memorandum Wingate's	18	and it's one of his principal changes.
19	"cover letter". In speaking of Wingate's cover letter	19	As I noted in my first-round presentation, it's true
20	he said:	20	that prior to 1905 there were large portions of the Bahr
20	"There was nothing in there about a provincial	20	el Arab that remained unexplored, but Condominium
22	boundary."	22	officials knew that. That was the whole reason why
23	We disagree with that, and based on Condominium	23	Lieutenant Bayldon was sent to explore the river at the
23	accounts and contemporary accounts of the situation it's	24	end of 1904.
25	quite clear that Government officials of the day did not	25	Nonetheless, the Condominium officials were aware
23	quite cicar that Government officials of the day did not	23	Nonetheless, the Condomination officials were aware
	Page 161		Page 163
15:39 1	share that view either. Certainly, as Professor Allan	15:42 1	that areas remained unexplored, but that did not prevent
15:39 1 2	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be	15:42 1 2	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to
	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in		them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two
2	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial	2	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary
2 3	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case.	2 3	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur,
2 3 4	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of	2 3 4	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned.
2 3 4 5 6 7	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports	2 3 4 5 6 7	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was irrelevant to the transfer or to assessment of where the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary. Why else would Wingate, under his section entitled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was irrelevant to the transfer or to assessment of where the transferred area lay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary. Why else would Wingate, under his section entitled "Changes to the Provincial Boundaries", state that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was irrelevant to the transfer or to assessment of where the transferred area lay. But there's a further point: if in 1905, just before	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary. Why else would Wingate, under his section entitled "Changes to the Provincial Boundaries", state that the two districts of the sultans south of the Bahr el Arab
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was irrelevant to the transfer or to assessment of where the transferred area lay. But there's a further point: if in 1905, just before the transfer, there really had been no provincial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary. Why else would Wingate, under his section entitled "Changes to the Provincial Boundaries", state that the two districts of the sultans south of the Bahr el Arab had formerly been part of Bahr el Ghazal province and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was irrelevant to the transfer or to assessment of where the transferred area lay. But there's a further point: if in 1905, just before the transfer, there really had been no provincial boundary between the two provinces, then why would there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary. Why else would Wingate, under his section entitled "Changes to the Provincial Boundaries", state that the two districts of the sultans south of the Bahr el Arab had formerly been part of Bahr el Ghazal province and that they were being transferred? That necessarily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was irrelevant to the transfer or to assessment of where the transferred area lay. But there's a further point: if in 1905, just before the transfer, there really had been no provincial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary. Why else would Wingate, under his section entitled "Changes to the Provincial Boundaries", state that the two districts of the sultans south of the Bahr el Arab had formerly been part of Bahr el Ghazal province and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was irrelevant to the transfer or to assessment of where the transferred area lay. But there's a further point: if in 1905, just before the transfer, there really had been no provincial boundary between the two provinces, then why would there have been a need for a transfer in the first place from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary. Why else would Wingate, under his section entitled "Changes to the Provincial Boundaries", state that the two districts of the sultans south of the Bahr el Arab had formerly been part of Bahr el Ghazal province and that they were being transferred? That necessarily implies that the Bahr el Arab, the Bahr el Arab that he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	confirmed yesterday, there's no document that can be pointed to, referenced during the relevant period, in which Condominium officials said there was no provincial boundary. In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Frankly, I cannot see, Mr President and members of the Tribunal, how, when the pre-transfer annual reports for the two provinces contain a specific section entitled "Province Boundaries" these are the ones that Professor Daly could not recall this morning and when they state that the boundary is the Bahr el Arab, and when Wingate makes reference to the changes in that boundary brought about by the transfer, and when he discusses the transfer under a section of his memorandum, or covering letter if you prefer, entitled in bold type "Changes to Provincial Boundaries and Nomenclature", I do not see in the light of those materials that it can be maintained that there existed no provincial boundary or that such a boundary was irrelevant to the transfer or to assessment of where the transferred area lay. But there's a further point: if in 1905, just before the transfer, there really had been no provincial boundary between the two provinces, then why would there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	them from still considering the Bahr el Arab to constitute the provincial boundary between the two provinces, just as it was the provincial boundary further west between Bahr el Ghazal and Darfur, a boundary which cannot be questioned. First of all, rivers can and do represent administrative boundaries and even international boundaries, and there is no general principle of law that requires rivers to be surveyed in their entirety to be considered delimited administrative or international boundaries, and I would suggest that the Honduras v El Salvador case to which I have made reference before supports that proposition. When the Bahr el Arab was correctly identified by Bayldon in March 1905 and later referred to by Wingate in his memorandum, there was no suggestion that that river was somehow no longer thought to have been the pre-transfer boundary. Why else would Wingate, under his section entitled "Changes to the Provincial Boundaries", state that the two districts of the sultans south of the Bahr el Arab had formerly been part of Bahr el Ghazal province and that they were being transferred? That necessarily

15:44 1	had referred to in his long paragraph at page 11 as	15:47 1	Tribunal, the Government of Sudan submits that when the
2	where Bayldon, Walsh and Sciplini were carrying out	2	documents are looked at as a whole, the documents that
3	their operations, that implies that the Bahr el Arab had	3	shed light on and evidence what Condominium officials
4	been the pre-transfer boundary.	4	intended with respect to the 1905 transfer and the
5	We have, in short, four key factors relating to the	5	location of the transferred area, the following
6	provincial boundary.	6	conclusions emerge.
7	Prior to 1905 it was expressly recorded in the	7	First, there was a clear purpose behind the
8	annual reports for both provinces that the provincial	8	transfer.
9	boundary was the Bahr el Arab; not the putative	9	Second, that purpose was to transfer areas belonging
10	Bahr el Arab, the Bahr el Arab; not a parallel of	10	to the two sultans, and necessarily the people living in
11	latitude, the Bahr el Arab. That was the case for the	11	those areas or districts, that formerly had been
12	Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal boundary and it was equally the	12	situated in the province of Bahr el Ghazal to the
13	case for the Darfur/Bahr el Ghazal boundary. It was the	13	province of Kordofan, so that such areas would be under
14	only river in this area that fit that description going	14	the administration of the same provincial governor, the
15	east to west from Darfur to its origins in the east	15	Governor of Kordofan.
16	surveyed by Saunders and Peake.	16	Third, there was no need and no intention to
17	Secondly, we have the 1905 annual reports. They	17	transfer anything that was already in Kordofan before
18	show the description of the provincial boundary changes,	18	1905. That would have been meaningless.
19	and instead of referring to the Bahr el Arab now as the	19	Fourth, the transferred area as described by Wingate
20	provincial boundary, they record the transfer. Those	20	is consistent with the fact that the March 1905
21	are foundation texts that we should pay close attention	21	intelligence report situates Sultan Rob's country on the
22	to; "essential" is the word that the SPLM uses.	22	Kiir, as to which there's no dispute, and Sheihk Rihan's
23	We then have Wingate's memorandum talking about the	23	between the Kiir and the Lol. The Percival and
24	transfer in connection with the provincial boundaries,	24	Wilkinson sketches show Sultan Rob's territory, a great
25	and we have after the transfer the new provincial	25	swathe of it, lying, particularly in the Percival
	·		or and or it, 17 ing, paraeutary in the 1 ererval
	Page 165		Page 167
15:45 1	boundary, not fully delimited because the southern area	15:48 1	sketch, to the south of the Kiir.
15:45 1 2	boundary, not fully delimited because the southern area of the transferred districts had not been precisely	15:48 1 2	sketch, to the south of the Kiir. Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to
2	of the transferred districts had not been precisely	15:48 1 2 3	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to
2 3	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like	2	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been
2 3 4	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you	2 3 4	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas
2 3 4 5	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new	2 3	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been
2 3 4 5 6	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to	2 3 4 5 6	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province
2 3 4 5 6 7	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the	2 3 4 5 6 7	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record.	2 3 4 5 6	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until the frontier of Kordofan is reached, when the boundary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab that had formerly been in Bahr el Ghazal province.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until the frontier of Kordofan is reached, when the boundary divides certain tribal districts to Lake No."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab that had formerly been in Bahr el Ghazal province. Eighth, that is why the post-1905 provincial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until the frontier of Kordofan is reached, when the boundary divides certain tribal districts to Lake No." Previously, in 1903, the boundary had been the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab that had formerly been in Bahr el Ghazal province. Eighth, that is why the post-1905 provincial boundary changes and is situated on maps to the south of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until the frontier of Kordofan is reached, when the boundary divides certain tribal districts to Lake No." Previously, in 1903, the boundary had been the Bahr el Arab to Lake No. Now it's saying the boundary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab that had formerly been in Bahr el Ghazal province. Eighth, that is why the post-1905 provincial boundary changes and is situated on maps to the south of Bahr el Arab.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until the frontier of Kordofan is reached, when the boundary divides certain tribal districts to Lake No." Previously, in 1903, the boundary had been the Bahr el Arab to Lake No. Now it's saying the boundary divides certain tribal districts. That's because of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab that had formerly been in Bahr el Ghazal province. Eighth, that is why the post-1905 provincial boundary changes and is situated on maps to the south of Bahr el Arab. Finally, our conclusion on this is that it follows
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until the frontier of Kordofan is reached, when the boundary divides certain tribal districts to Lake No." Previously, in 1903, the boundary had been the Bahr el Arab to Lake No. Now it's saying the boundary divides certain tribal districts. That's because of the transfer. The southern limits had not been precisely	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab that had formerly been in Bahr el Ghazal province. Eighth, that is why the post-1905 provincial boundary changes and is situated on maps to the south of Bahr el Arab. Finally, our conclusion on this is that it follows that the transferred area in 1905 that was intended and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until the frontier of Kordofan is reached, when the boundary divides certain tribal districts to Lake No." Previously, in 1903, the boundary had been the Bahr el Arab to Lake No. Now it's saying the boundary divides certain tribal districts. That's because of the transfer. The southern limits had not been precisely identified, but the northern limits were. So in conclusion, Mr President, members of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab that had formerly been in Bahr el Ghazal province. Eighth, that is why the post-1905 provincial boundary changes and is situated on maps to the south of Bahr el Arab. Finally, our conclusion on this is that it follows that the transferred area in 1905 that was intended and carried out by Condominium officials was the area between the Bahr el Arab and the new provincial boundary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the transferred districts had not been precisely identified it did not necessarily follow a river like the northern limits which were transferred but you had the new southern boundary, the new Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary, starting to be shown on maps like the Lloyd map I projected and the whole series of sheet 65 maps that are in the record. That's the boundary that ultimately becomes the 1956 boundary on independence. That is why, for example, the 1911 Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Handbook, when it describes the northern boundaries of Bahr el Ghazal province, states as follows: "The actual boundary line is not yet delimited, but it follows the course of the Bahr el Arab or Rizeigat from the Nile/Congo watershed [that's in Darfur] until the frontier of Kordofan is reached, when the boundary divides certain tribal districts to Lake No." Previously, in 1903, the boundary had been the Bahr el Arab to Lake No. Now it's saying the boundary divides certain tribal districts. That's because of the transfer. The southern limits had not been precisely identified, but the northern limits were.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Next, the transfer decision was obviously related to the location of the provincial boundary. Had there been no such boundary, there would not have been any areas which could have been said to have been in the province of Bahr el Ghazal that needed to be transferred to Kordofan. Sixth, the transfer documents, the so-called foundation texts the decisive documents, according to the other side refer to the transfer in connection with the provincial boundary and the change in that boundary that the transfer gave rise to. Seven, Wingate's memorandum: Wingate, the only official who mattered, bears this out. His memorandum also provides the clearest and the best description of the location of the transferred area: the area of the two sultans situated to the south of the Bahr el Arab that had formerly been in Bahr el Ghazal province. Eighth, that is why the post-1905 provincial boundary changes and is situated on maps to the south of Bahr el Arab. Finally, our conclusion on this is that it follows that the transferred area in 1905 that was intended and carried out by Condominium officials was the area

,			
15:50 1	further south.	15:53 1	an anthropological fact, and he has discussed the entire
2	Thank you very much, Mr President, members of the	2	case in what is known as the anthropological present;
3	Tribunal. I'd be grateful if you could now call on	3	that is to say on the assumption that all dates are
4	Professor Crawford.	4	compressed and that everything that is happening now is
5	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you, Mr Bundy, and I give the floor	5	deemed always to have happened. Yet dates, and
6	to Professor Crawford.	6	especially 1905, are crucial to this case.
7	(3.50 pm)	7	The fourth element of the tribal delimitation case
8	Submissions by MR CRAWFORD	8	is what I might describe as environmental determinism.
9	PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Mr President, members of the	9	It's not too much to say that he discussed the
10	Tribunal, Mr Born's presentation on delimitation	10	environment rather than the evidence. The environment
11	insofar as it concerns the so-called tribal	11	was used to generate a presumption that everything that
12	interpretation demonstrated six general	12	happened in a grossly extended area of the so-called
13	characteristics.	13	Bahr was attributable to the Ngok in case of doubt.
14	The first is that as it concerns the crucial date of	14	His fifth characteristic is the continued
15	1905, it's based entirely on inference. However much	15	cartographical challenge, amounting in some cases to
16	Detective Sherlock Born or it may be in the present	16	incompetence, as in his treatment of the Wilkinson map
17	context, Mr President, Hercule Born tried to stretch	17	and route report to which I will come; and sixth,
18	it. There is no smoke without fire, and there is no	18	a pronounced tendency to miss the point.
19	fire without the Ngok; there is no dung without cattle,	19	My anthropological fact he said a very
20	and there's no cattle without Ngok, and so on. It's	20	complicated question of fact related only to the
21	a new form of prima facie title: if you are in someone's	21	tribal definition, and I made that perfectly clear. In
22	presumptive area, any activity is presumed to be that	22	our view, if we are right on the territorial definition
23	someone, no matter how large the area.	23	of the mandate, the question is not very difficult.
24	The second characteristic was a highly selective	24	Of course there is still a question of delimitation,
25	attitude to sources, with which is associated	25	and on the view of delimitation put forward by
	Page 169		Page 171
	Ç		Ç
15:52 1	an unwillingness to actually address our real argument.	15:55 1	Mr Schofield, unless the delimitation is virtually
2	On the latter point they almost seem to have abandoned	2	already achieved, it's beyond the reach of a tribunal.
3	any claim to area 1, which seems to have been given over	3	But you would understand the questions of delimitation
4	wholly to the Twic.	4	that would involve a certain degree of difficulty. The
5	One need only look at the article he discussed at	5	degree of difficulty is by no means excessive in the
6	length yesterday one by scientists, he stressed by	6	context of the run of delimitation cases.
7	Stubbs and Morrison regarding the Ngok agro-pastoral way	7	My point was different: to determine the boundaries
8	of life. The opening sentence of the article reads as	8	of the area transferred in 1905, if that means the
9	follows:	9	boundaries of the area of the Ngok in 1905, is
10	"The western Dinkas, who now number some 140,000	10	an extraordinarily difficult thing to do. It's not
11	persons living along the Lol, the Chel, the Pongo and	11	a case, according to their position, simply of
12	the Bahr el Arab."	12	determining the outer edges of the Ngok in 1905 and then
13	"Along", I stress. These four rivers paint a rough	13	straightening the lines; it's a case of assuming that
14	geographic box, with the Bahr el Arab forming the	14 15	they extend to vast swathes of area.
15 16	northern side. And yet it is suggested that a country	15 16	Area 4, the area north of the Ragaba ez Zarga, I remind you, constitutes a majority of the ABC experts'
17	the size of Belgium sits on top of them. A third remarkable fact for someone who believes as	17	area, 11,000 square kilometres. There is no extant
17	rigidly as Mr Born does in the rules of English grammar	17	definition of the goz which would produce that result.
19	is the complete tone-deafness to the critical date in	19	I will come back to each of these points.
20	this case.	20	My first point of substance then is environmental
20	He purported to accept my characterisation of the	20	determinism and the idea that you are allowed, as it
22	anthropological fact, although characteristically there	22	were, to give the Ngok the benefit of the doubt whenever
23	is no sentence of Mr Born that doesn't involve some	23	any doubt arises on environmental grounds.
24	twisting of the argument and he didn't accept the point	24	One of the features of this case is the way in which
25	I was making. But he said: yes, there is	25	the SPLM/A rely on their experts to say things and to do
	Page 170		Page 172
		L	

15:56 1	things that their experts do not agree. We saw that	16:00 1	black soil predominates."
2	this morning with community mapping as well.	2	We entirely accept that that may be true as a matter
3	It's remarkable that Professor Allan who answered	3	of geographic fact; it doesn't determine where the Ngok
4	questions entirely fairly and openly yesterday, accepted	4	were in 1905. It doesn't even begin to do that. What
5	that he was not an environmental determinist. He said	5	Mr Born omitted to say yesterday was that he was citing
6	and I quote:	6	from a 1907 Lloyd article, "Some Notes on the Dar Homr",
7	"As a geographer as part of my professional	7	in which Lloyd says:
8	experience, geographers learn that environmental	8	"Dar Homr, or the country of the Homr Arabs, is
9	determinism doesn't work. You can't say, 'Well, that	9	situated in the southwest corner of the province of
10	particular tract of land will lead to that particular	10	Kordofan."
11	livelihood' So I'm not at all suggesting that the	11	If the ABC experts are right, it's not situated
12	Bahr region determines anything, or the goz region	12	there anymore.
13	determines anything."	13	With regard to the heralded black soil, Lloyd later
14	That's a perfectly fair statement, and yet that of	14	writes:
15	course is precisely what the SPLM/A counsel did: to	15	"The southern half of Kordofan, which included
16	determine that, on the basis of an inflated definition	16	Dar Nuba, consists of black soil in the centre of which
17	of the Bahr and of the goz, all the Bahr and half the	17	rise the Nuba Mountains. The plains are inhabited by
18	goz belongs to the Ngok on environmental grounds.	18	cattle-owning Baggara Arabs and the mountains by
19	The SPLM/A's environmental claim is essentially	19	numerous tribes of Nuba."
20	based on two points. The first is that because the Ngok	20	He doesn't mention the Ngok. I accept that the Ngok
21	crop, dura, is ideally suited to the Bahr region, they	21	live also on black soil, but they didn't have a priority
22	must necessarily have lived throughout the Bahr region.	22	right to it. There are no patent rights of the Ngok in
23	The same argument is made with respect to the cattle	23	the black soil. This is a sort of agricultural
24	being adapted to the Bahr region's damp climate and	24	determinism. MacMichael, the prolific Sudan scholar and
25	terrain.	25	former Condominium governor, refers to the Homr living
23		20	
	Page 173		Page 175
15:58 1	Now, there is of course an important point here. We	16:01 1	on black soil; it was not exclusive to the Ngok. Nor
15:58 1 2	Now, there is of course an important point here. We accept entirely that the environment of the region does	16:01 1 2	on black soil; it was not exclusive to the Ngok. Nor was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out.
	Now, there is of course an important point here. We accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live		
2	accept entirely that the environment of the region does	2	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit
2 3	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live	2 3	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had
2 3 4	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it	2 3 4	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part
2 3 4 5	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in	2 3 4 5	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had
2 3 4 5 6 7	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive.	2 3 4 5 6	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the
2 3 4 5 6 7	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in	2 3 4 5 6 7	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see. Moreover, the whole area is much more variegated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of imprecision in that language. The reason is quite
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see. Moreover, the whole area is much more variegated than the simplistic black and white picture presented of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of imprecision in that language. The reason is quite obvious: that a ragaba doesn't stop a soil type. If you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see. Moreover, the whole area is much more variegated than the simplistic black and white picture presented of it by counsel for the SPLM/A. Mr Born cited an article	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of imprecision in that language. The reason is quite obvious: that a ragaba doesn't stop a soil type. If you are in an area of soil type and you come to an important
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see. Moreover, the whole area is much more variegated than the simplistic black and white picture presented of it by counsel for the SPLM/A. Mr Born cited an article by Governor Lloyd, who said:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of imprecision in that language. The reason is quite obvious: that a ragaba doesn't stop a soil type. If you are in an area of soil type and you come to an important river channel or a channel of an important khor, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see. Moreover, the whole area is much more variegated than the simplistic black and white picture presented of it by counsel for the SPLM/A. Mr Born cited an article by Governor Lloyd, who said: "In the north the soil is reddish sand, interspersed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of imprecision in that language. The reason is quite obvious: that a ragaba doesn't stop a soil type. If you are in an area of soil type and you come to an important river channel or a channel of an important khor, the chances are that soil patterns will continuous at least
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see. Moreover, the whole area is much more variegated than the simplistic black and white picture presented of it by counsel for the SPLM/A. Mr Born cited an article by Governor Lloyd, who said: "In the north the soil is reddish sand, interspersed with tracts of sand and clay mixed. This gradually	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of imprecision in that language. The reason is quite obvious: that a ragaba doesn't stop a soil type. If you are in an area of soil type and you come to an important river channel or a channel of an important khor, the chances are that soil patterns will continuous at least for some period of time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see. Moreover, the whole area is much more variegated than the simplistic black and white picture presented of it by counsel for the SPLM/A. Mr Born cited an article by Governor Lloyd, who said: "In the north the soil is reddish sand, interspersed with tracts of sand and clay mixed. This gradually increases further south until the red sand disappears and black soil commences. South of latitude 10°30'	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of imprecision in that language. The reason is quite obvious: that a ragaba doesn't stop a soil type. If you are in an area of soil type and you come to an important river channel or a channel of an important khor, the chances are that soil patterns will continuous at least for some period of time. But I remind you again that the area we are talking about is 11,000 square kilometres to the north of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	accept entirely that the environment of the region does influence the movement patterns of the groups that live there, both with respect to the cattle of the Homr and the cattle of the Ngok. But that doesn't mean, and it doesn't establish, that the Ngok are in any place in which dura can be grown or their cattle can survive. In particular, whatever may have happened since 1905, it doesn't establish that that was the case in 1905. There are all sorts of reasons why the Ngok may have been further to the south in 1905 than the environmental capacity of their main crop and their main form of livelihood, which was milk from cattle, would have sustained, including political factors; the Mahdiyya itself, which forced them towards the south, and which also forced the Messiriya towards the south, as we will see. Moreover, the whole area is much more variegated than the simplistic black and white picture presented of it by counsel for the SPLM/A. Mr Born cited an article by Governor Lloyd, who said: "In the north the soil is reddish sand, interspersed with tracts of sand and clay mixed. This gradually increases further south until the red sand disappears	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was cultivation, as Lloyd equally points out. Nor does the environmental cattle argument sit comfortably with the assertion that the Ngok had permanent villages as far north as 10°35'. A large part of this area is the goz, a sandy, waterless area. Ngok cattle do not move well in that area. Of course the Ngok may move around it for various purposes, but the idea that they live there permanently is fantastic, and the idea that the Messiriya should have to divide that area on a 50/50 basis because of only somewhat different lifestyles is equally fantastic. I turn to Professor Cunnison. He defines, in paragraph 6 of his first witness statement, the Bahr as "the riverine area around the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga". That was his translation. There is, it is fair to say, a slight degree of imprecision in that language. The reason is quite obvious: that a ragaba doesn't stop a soil type. If you are in an area of soil type and you come to an important river channel or a channel of an important khor, the chances are that soil patterns will continuous at least for some period of time. But I remind you again that the area we are talking

16:02 1	Ragaba ez Zarga, and the mere fact that some slight	16:05 1	materials in the record, given the shortness of time,
2	areas to the north of the Ragaba ez Zarga might have	2	but since it is said that Professor Cunnison supports
3	black soil doesn't begin to establish Ngok ownership of	3	the SPLM/A, I have no choice but to read the whole
4	those areas. You have to look at the actual documents	4	paragraph. He says:
5	which demonstrate where the Ngok were in 1905 to	5	"The goz overlaps the so-called 'shared rights area'
6	establish that.	6	of the ABC report. In describing that area in this way,
7	I have two other points in Cunnison which I make	7	it seems to me the ABC was fundamentally mistaken.
8	incidentally in the context of this reply. The first	8	I did not observe this."
9	relates to his non-appearance here.	9	He refers to his two and a half years living in the
10	Mr Born suggested that we deliberately withheld him	10	region with the Homr, travelling down as far as the
11	as a witness on the ground that his evidence was	11	Bahr el Arab:
12	unfavourable to us. I've already had occasion to remark	12	" I did not observe this as an area of shared
13	about the normal etiquette amongst legal professionals	13	rights at all. Nor was the dividing line drawn by the
14	of not inferring bad faith in the context of their	14	ABC within that area in any way regarded as a boundary
15	handling of a case.	15	between the Homr and Dinka. The Dinka were to the
16	In fact we specifically said why Professor Cunnison	16	south, as I have said. Some Dinka sought employment in
17	is not here in a letter to the Tribunal of	17	Muglad. It was not unknown for individual families to
18	20th March 2009. We said:	18	travel north and be, so to speak, adopted into one or
19	"The Government of Sudan is willing to make all of	19	another of the omodiyas of the Homr. They might also
20	its witnesses available to attend the hearing [they	20	take surplus cattle north to market, but they did not
21	didn't ask to see them all] except for Mr Ian Cunnison,	21	exercise regular grazing or similar rights in the
22	who will be unable to attend due to his poor health."	22	so-called 'shared rights area'."
23	He was born in 1923. He is 86. Some octogenarians	23	The real area of sharing was further south in the
24	manage to travel to The Hague with considerable	24	Bahr, as he defines it. There the two groups coexisted
25	frequency; some do not. The judgment that was made, in	25	for a fairly short season, but this was not a host-guest
23	requericy, some do not. The judgment that was made, in	23	for a fairty short scason, but this was not a nost-guest
	Page 177		Page 179
16:04 1	consultation with his wife, was that he was not well		
	consultation with his wife, was that he was not well	16:06 1	relationship. For him it was the Bahr, the area to the
2	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to	2	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights
2 3	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we	2 3	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which
2 3 4	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do	2 3 4	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square
2 3 4 5	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so.	2 3 4 5	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area.
2 3 4 5 6	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm	2 3 4 5 6	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his
2 3 4 5 6 7	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence.	2 3 4 5 6 7	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself. He does, however, express a very important view	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is it suggested that in 1905, without a trace of evidence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself. He does, however, express a very important view about the concept of shared rights as he understands	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is it suggested that in 1905, without a trace of evidence except the odd wisp of smoke in the distance, that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself. He does, however, express a very important view about the concept of shared rights as he understands them, and he does this in paragraph 9 of his first	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is it suggested that in 1905, without a trace of evidence except the odd wisp of smoke in the distance, that the Ngok exploded from this 500 square miles to occupy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself. He does, however, express a very important view about the concept of shared rights as he understands them, and he does this in paragraph 9 of his first witness statement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is it suggested that in 1905, without a trace of evidence except the odd wisp of smoke in the distance, that the Ngok exploded from this 500 square miles to occupy 23,000 square kilometres? That is a fantastic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself. He does, however, express a very important view about the concept of shared rights as he understands them, and he does this in paragraph 9 of his first witness statement. We had taken the view that we would not read out to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is it suggested that in 1905, without a trace of evidence except the odd wisp of smoke in the distance, that the Ngok exploded from this 500 square miles to occupy 23,000 square kilometres? That is a fantastic suggestion, and there is no basis in the evidence for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself. He does, however, express a very important view about the concept of shared rights as he understands them, and he does this in paragraph 9 of his first witness statement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is it suggested that in 1905, without a trace of evidence except the odd wisp of smoke in the distance, that the Ngok exploded from this 500 square miles to occupy 23,000 square kilometres? That is a fantastic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself. He does, however, express a very important view about the concept of shared rights as he understands them, and he does this in paragraph 9 of his first witness statement. We had taken the view that we would not read out to you large slabs of witness statements and other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is it suggested that in 1905, without a trace of evidence except the odd wisp of smoke in the distance, that the Ngok exploded from this 500 square miles to occupy 23,000 square kilometres? That is a fantastic suggestion, and there is no basis in the evidence for it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	enough to travel. If the SPLM/A had asked to talk to him, arrangements could have been made to do it, as we offered to do with the vice president. They did not do so. I do not take kindly to the suggestion that I'm engaged in the suppression of evidence. The second point relates to the suggestion made by counsel for the SPLM/A that except on one point which was put to Professor Cunnison by counsel for the Government, Professor Cunnison agrees with their position. First of all, on the point that Professor Cunnison was told about, about the effect of the shared rights area, he makes it quite clear in his first witness statement that this is something he was told. He expresses unlike certain experts witnesses for the SPLM/A no view on any legal issue. You can read his witness statements for yourself. He does, however, express a very important view about the concept of shared rights as he understands them, and he does this in paragraph 9 of his first witness statement. We had taken the view that we would not read out to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	south, which in the early 1950s was the shared rights area. That bore no relationship to the reasoning which enabled the ABC experts to transfer 11,000 square kilometres of Kordofan to the Abyei Area. He said much the same thing in paragraph 3 of his second statement, which I will not read. I made the point yesterday that there is an extraordinary problem. Let's accept for the sake of argument that the Civsec area is simply a description of where the Ngok are in the dry season. I'll come back to the Civsec area in a little more detail later on, but the point is this: the Civsec area of the Ngok represents 500 square miles. Is it seriously suggested that that group of Ngok, a rather small group in 1905, somehow exploded? Assume for the sake of argument that the purple area shown on the Civsec map represented the area of the Ngok in 1905; we don't concede that, but let's assume it. Is it suggested that in 1905, without a trace of evidence except the odd wisp of smoke in the distance, that the Ngok exploded from this 500 square miles to occupy 23,000 square kilometres? That is a fantastic suggestion, and there is no basis in the evidence for

16:08 1	Counsel quoted Cole and Huntingdon, a modern account	16:11 1	broadly northwest. Then he walks back on a somewhat
2	based on fieldwork in Abyei in the 1970s of agricultural	2	different route, again to the river that he calls the
3	patterns in the region. Cole and Huntingdon shed light	3	Bahr el Arab.
4	on the difficulties of the region and its extremely	4	The two small villages which Mr Born said were Ngok
5	variegated character, which anyone who knows anything	5	villages on the Ragaba ez Zarga are El Jaart and
6	about the geography of riverine areas will find is not	6	Um Geren. He said they were Ngok villages because they
7	surprising. This is what they say at page 88 of their	7	have the characteristic mode of there only being three
8	study:	8	or four houses in a rather separate area. This is
9	"First, it was generally assumed [they mean it was	9	a wonderful example. This would be an architectural
10	generally assumed before they began their study] that	10	monopoly. No one else is allowed to have three houses
11	there was a huge amount of cultivable land just waiting	11	in a small village; it has to be six or eight or some
12	to be utilised with the available technology in the	12	other number.
13	general area around Abyei. In part this myth was	13	If you look at how it's described, he talks about
14	fostered by the northern Ministry of Agriculture	14	a series of settlements. It's true that he mentions
15	officials, who compared the apparently fertile open	15	some being Arab settlements, but he's giving general
16	lands of Abyei to the drier and sandier lands to the	16	descriptions. He refers to a few Homr Arabs living in
17	north. The supposed vast sources of land on the flood	17	various places. While he's north of Fauwel so far as
18	plains of Western and Southern Sudan were a myth under	18	one can tell the whole area up to now has been Arab
19	existing technologies, at least in the Abyei Area and	19	he says:
20	probably to a greater or lesser extent in the rest of	20	"Fula Hamadai with a little water [is] sufficient to
21	the region as well."	21	water animals dry on 9.2.02."
22	In fact Willis and Wilkinson knew where the Ngok	22	It's amazing how these administrators who didn't
23	went in the wet season. They were more congregated	23	administer were concerned about the availability of
24	together; and, at the time Willis and Wilkinson were	24	water for the locals.
25	writing, more or less immediately after the transfer,	25	He then says:
	Page 181		Page 183
16:09 1	that was very much in the south.	16:13 1	"Small villages: mere collection of three or four
10.07	that was very mach in the south.		
2	Lturn to the second issue of cartographic		
2 3	I turn to the second issue of cartographic incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place	2	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren."
3	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place	2 3	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the
3 4	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The	2 3 4	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok.
3 4 5	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place	2 3 4 5	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to:
3 4 5 6	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren.	2 3 4 5 6	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'."
3 4 5 6 7	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair,	2 3 4 5 6 7	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no
3 4 5 6 7 8	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A	2 3 4 5 6	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're
3 4 5 6 7 8	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached."
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and it's the route report	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the fourth or possibly the third Dinka village. When he
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and it's the route report which begins at page 151 of volume 2, Major Wilkinson,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the fourth or possibly the third Dinka village. When he said "first" he meant first; that's what he said. There
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and it's the route report which begins at page 151 of volume 2, Major Wilkinson, the route report of January and February of 1902.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the fourth or possibly the third Dinka village. When he said "first" he meant first; that's what he said. There was no reason to refer to every clutch of a few houses
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and it's the route report which begins at page 151 of volume 2, Major Wilkinson, the route report of January and February of 1902. There are basically three stages to the route that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the fourth or possibly the third Dinka village. When he said "first" he meant first; that's what he said. There was no reason to refer to every clutch of a few houses at an earlier stage as being Arab for them to be Arab
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and it's the route report which begins at page 151 of volume 2, Major Wilkinson, the route report of January and February of 1902. There are basically three stages to the route that Wilkinson took. There's the stage south, where he meets	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the fourth or possibly the third Dinka village. When he said "first" he meant first; that's what he said. There was no reason to refer to every clutch of a few houses at an earlier stage as being Arab for them to be Arab from the context; and there's no indication that they
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and it's the route report which begins at page 151 of volume 2, Major Wilkinson, the route report of January and February of 1902. There are basically three stages to the route that Wilkinson took. There's the stage south, where he meets a river which he is told is the Bahr el Arab, and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the fourth or possibly the third Dinka village. When he said "first" he meant first; that's what he said. There was no reason to refer to every clutch of a few houses at an earlier stage as being Arab for them to be Arab from the context; and there's no indication that they were not, in particular because they're described as the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and it's the route report which begins at page 151 of volume 2, Major Wilkinson, the route report of January and February of 1902. There are basically three stages to the route that Wilkinson took. There's the stage south, where he meets a river which he is told is the Bahr el Arab, and then goes further south to see Sultan Rob. There's a short stage in a direction which we'll come back to, which is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the fourth or possibly the third Dinka village. When he said "first" he meant first; that's what he said. There was no reason to refer to every clutch of a few houses at an earlier stage as being Arab for them to be Arab from the context; and there's no indication that they were not, in particular because they're described as the first Dinkas. And the first Dinkas he sees are even later, at Etai.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	incompetence. Here I want to deal in the first place with Wilkinson's report. There are three points. The first relates to the alleged Ngok villages of El Jaart and Um Geren. It's fair to say and one does try to be fair, even under provocation that counsel for the SPLM/A accepted that this was an inference or a hypothesis. I have to say, when counsel for the SPLM/A accepts that something is an inference, he would, on the other side, take that as a definite admission. His normal forensic mode is that of carpet-bombing, so to suggest something is an inference is already to admit a high level of doubt. But curiously enough there's not much doubt at all if you look at the document. This is of course taken from the volume 2 routes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and it's the route report which begins at page 151 of volume 2, Major Wilkinson, the route report of January and February of 1902. There are basically three stages to the route that Wilkinson took. There's the stage south, where he meets a river which he is told is the Bahr el Arab, and then goes further south to see Sultan Rob. There's a short	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	huts passed to the El Jaart and Um Geren." And that is said to be an acknowledgement of the Ngok. Then he refers to: "Fula Hamadai a village named 'Fut'." Well, these are villages. There's absolutely no evidence that they're Ngok villages at this time. And one would infer from the text of the report that they're not, because he goes on to say, after reaching Fauwel with its large Arab settlements, and crossing the Bahr el Arab", he finds the road to a Dinka chief named Ruweng; bearing in mind of course, there were other Dinka in this area, though this was the Ruweng. Then he says: "The first Dinka village of Bombo is reached." According to counsel that should have been the fourth or possibly the third Dinka village. When he said "first" he meant first; that's what he said. There was no reason to refer to every clutch of a few houses at an earlier stage as being Arab for them to be Arab from the context; and there's no indication that they were not, in particular because they're described as the first Dinkas. And the first Dinkas he sees are even

16:14 1	It's pure supposition to suggest that because	16:17 1	of any human presence found by Wilkinson north of the
2	Condominium officials didn't describe a clutch of huts	2	real Bahr el Arab on this trip, on the return leg of his
3	north of Fauwel, they're somehow presumed to belong to	3	journey, was a Homr settlement.
4	the Ngok.	4	I make the point, incidentally, that that particular
5	We now come to the second phase of Wilkinson's	5	village, Abu Kareit, if you look very carefully at the
6	journey after he leaves Sultan Rob. Mr Born quoted the	6	map I'll leave it to your cartographical consultants
7	following extract, and he did it in order to demonstrate	7	to do so is actually not on the real Ragaba ez Zarga;
8	that there was Ngok settlement well to the north of the	8	it's on a tributary. It lies on a stream which runs
9	Bahr el Arab in 1902.	9	into the Ragaba at Mellum.
10	I interpolate to say: we don't deny that there was	10	In any event, our basic proposition is this: we have
11	Ngok settlement to the north of the Bahr el Arab in	11	never said that there was a mistake of the whole course
12	1902; we could not do so in light of the evidence. What	12	of the Ragaba ez Zarga in or around 1905 for the
13	we deny is that it reached anywhere near the	13	Bahr el Arab; there was not, for the perfectly good
14	Ragaba ez Zarga, and that is a crucial fact in this	14	reason that the course of the Ragaba ez Zarga in general
15	case. It's one which, since each party at this phase	15	was not known at the time. That was why it was possible
16	has to prove its own case, the onus is on the SPLM/A to	16	for people like Wilkinson to mistake the Bahr el Arab:
17	do it.	17	they weren't looking for another river.
18		18	But I would draw the attention of your consultants
	Mr Born tried valiantly, I have to say but		
19	everything he does is valiant to prove the point, and	19	to the fact that the river which is identified as the
20	he quoted the following passage:	20	river on which Abu Kareit lies, the Ragaba ez Zarga, is
21	"Leaving Sultan Rob's settlement the road runs	21	actually not the Ragaba ez Zarga but a tributary of it.
22	northwest, and the river is left on the left, but is	22	Mr Born called for detective work and scientific
23	struck again 2.5 miles on, and the path keeps along the	23	appreciation. Looking at a map would have been a good
24	left bank. The country here is all open and much dura	24	start.
25	cultivated."	25	I would also refer to the concession no, I'm
	Page 185		Page 187
	<u> </u>		
16:16 1	It is not in dispute that this country was Ngok	16:19 1	sorry, I won't use that word. I will also refer to the
16:16 1 2	It is not in dispute that this country was Ngok country:	16:19 1 2	sorry, I won't use that word. I will also refer to the response made by Professor Daly this morning to my
2	country:	2	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my
2 3	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country	2 3	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal
2 3 4	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect."	2 3 4	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do
2 3 4 5	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map	2 3 4 5	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the
2 3 4 5 6	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along	2 3 4 5 6	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find
2 3 4 5 6 7	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from	2 3 4 5 6 7	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as a large swamp, now dry, but referred to, as Mr Born	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons we don't need to go into, but the suggestion that the Ngok were immune is without foundation, for the reasons
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	country: "Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as a large swamp, now dry, but referred to, as Mr Born claimed it yesterday, to be a Ngok village; and then Abu Kareit, a Homr settlement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons we don't need to go into, but the suggestion that the Ngok were immune is without foundation, for the reasons stated in our rejoinder.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as a large swamp, now dry, but referred to, as Mr Born claimed it yesterday, to be a Ngok village; and then Abu Kareit, a Homr settlement. The inference is that where he's been talking about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons we don't need to go into, but the suggestion that the Ngok were immune is without foundation, for the reasons stated in our rejoinder. Professor Cunnison writes of this period and he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as a large swamp, now dry, but referred to, as Mr Born claimed it yesterday, to be a Ngok village; and then Abu Kareit, a Homr settlement. The inference is that where he's been talking about settlements of one particular group, and then comes upon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons we don't need to go into, but the suggestion that the Ngok were immune is without foundation, for the reasons stated in our rejoinder. Professor Cunnison writes of this period and he had obviously looked at the history rather carefully
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as a large swamp, now dry, but referred to, as Mr Born claimed it yesterday, to be a Ngok village; and then Abu Kareit, a Homr settlement. The inference is that where he's been talking about settlements of one particular group, and then comes upon a settlement of a different tribe, he says at that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons we don't need to go into, but the suggestion that the Ngok were immune is without foundation, for the reasons stated in our rejoinder. Professor Cunnison writes of this period and he had obviously looked at the history rather carefully himself:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as a large swamp, now dry, but referred to, as Mr Born claimed it yesterday, to be a Ngok village; and then Abu Kareit, a Homr settlement. The inference is that where he's been talking about settlements of one particular group, and then comes upon a settlement of a different tribe, he says at that point, as he did on the way down he does it on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons we don't need to go into, but the suggestion that the Ngok were immune is without foundation, for the reasons stated in our rejoinder. Professor Cunnison writes of this period and he had obviously looked at the history rather carefully himself: "The tribe [he is referring to the Homr at the end
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as a large swamp, now dry, but referred to, as Mr Born claimed it yesterday, to be a Ngok village; and then Abu Kareit, a Homr settlement. The inference is that where he's been talking about settlements of one particular group, and then comes upon a settlement of a different tribe, he says at that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons we don't need to go into, but the suggestion that the Ngok were immune is without foundation, for the reasons stated in our rejoinder. Professor Cunnison writes of this period and he had obviously looked at the history rather carefully himself:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"Dinka dwellings are dotted about, and the country presents a most prosperous aspect." Even the quickest look at Wilkinson's map demonstrates that what he was doing was walking along the Bahr el Arab. He crossed the Bahr el Arab from Sultan Rob's village on the south bank, then headed northwest, along or close to the north bank of the river. He only turned away from the river at the village of Gohea, which he described as on the riverbank. So of course he encountered Ngok villages and cultivation, but they were on the Bahr el Arab; to the north of it, of course, but on it. Heading northeast and then north, the next three things he mentioned were the Regabet el Lau, a watercourse; El Niat, described by Wilkinson as a large swamp, now dry, but referred to, as Mr Born claimed it yesterday, to be a Ngok village; and then Abu Kareit, a Homr settlement. The inference is that where he's been talking about settlements of one particular group, and then comes upon a settlement of a different tribe, he says at that point, as he did on the way down he does it on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	response made by Professor Daly this morning to my question in relation to Percival's report. The Tribunal will remember I asked him: where in Percival's report do you find an express reference to Ngok settlements on the Ragaba ez Zarga? Professor Daly said he couldn't find an express reference; it was simply his interpretation. I pause in what I have to accept is a slightly disconnected presentation the Tribunal will forgive me for this to make two other historical remarks. The first concerns the differential impact of the Mahdi. We have dealt with this in our pleadings, but it was trotted out in the last day and it needs to be mentioned. The suggestion is that the Ngok were immune to the factors which, it is true, had a very material adverse impact on the Homr during the Mahdi period, for reasons we don't need to go into, but the suggestion that the Ngok were immune is without foundation, for the reasons stated in our rejoinder. Professor Cunnison writes of this period and he had obviously looked at the history rather carefully himself: "The tribe [he is referring to the Homr at the end

,			
16:20 1	the Bahr el Arab [that is in the riverine area] and	16:23 1	yourself.
2	rebuilt their stocks of cattle by trading ivory they	2	Mr Born did not refer to the majority of the route
3	hunted for cattle from traders who established buying	3	reports and associated information which I took you
4	centres there."	4	through yesterday. He has a rather snotty and selective
5	So they were well to the south at that time, hiding	5	view about colonial administration, it seems.
6	from the impact of the Mahdi and the extremely disturbed	6	Instead the primary basis on which the SPLM/A
7	conditions to which that had given rise.	7	constructed its case is the combination of its
8	A second point in the immediately post-Condominium	8	environmental argument, its form of environmental
9	period related to the Government's concern about the	9	determinism, with oral history.
10	river system. I would simply make the point, in	10	I have already commented on oral history. I don't
11	supplement to the questions that I asked Professor Daly,	11	deny its value in determining a general position, but it
12	that the Sudan Intelligence Report for November 1904	12	has to be checked against the other evidence. It's said
13	makes it clear that Bayldon was beginning to investigate	13	that Sultan Rob, who was himself of course a direct
14	areas to the north.	14	actor in the event, was lying when he said there were no
15	In February 1905, the month before the transfer,	15	Ngok to the west of his settlement in Burakol.
16	there was a report in Bayldon's progress reproduced in	16	What we suggest is you look at the other evidence on
17	the Sudan Intelligence Reports which refers to the raids	17	that particular point. To take one example, what is the
18	on Sultan Gorkwei of the district of Toj, and says that:	18	other evidence? The other evidence is the route report
19	"The Camel Corps Company, now in Bahr el Arab, will	19	which someone walks from Gerinti, which is not a Ngok
20	investigate their case on the way to Kordofan."	20	settlement and certainly was not a Ngok settlement in
21	Professor Daly presented this picture as one of	21	1905, to the new village, to Burakol, and finds no
22	complete absence of Government administration. All	22	treks, and then says that on the Ragaba there are only
23	I would say is: read the documents for yourself. They	23	Arabs travelling south to go to the village to buy
24	may be colonial documents; they are colonial documents.	24	grain.
25	One doesn't like colonialism in principle. What is	25	There is a concordance of evidence conforming with
	Page 189		Page 191
16:22 1	clear is that the coming of the Condominium was	16:25 1	Sultan Rob, who may have lied on occasions but doesn't
2	an unqualified blessing for the people of the Sudan,	2	seem to have been lying on this occasion, and there is
3	including both the peoples primarily involved in this	3	much other evidence of the non-involvement of the Ngok
4	case.	4	on the Darfur boundary, north of the Bahr el Arab.
5	Professor Daly fully accepted my view that the	5	But the principal new element about the oral history
6	population estimate given by the SPLM/A of 50,000 was	6	is the community mapping report. Now, one cannot deny
7	wrong. He wasn't prepared to put his own estimate on	7	the value of community mapping in certain contexts, but
8	it. We've given an estimate based upon his methodology	8	frankly it's the case that the information gathered may
9	of 5,000-10,000. Counsel distorted my statement, which	9	be gathered in a more systematic way, but it can only be
10	was a slight modification of our earlier position, by	10	checked in a very careful manner. We simply don't have
11	giving the number of 15,000, but didn't explain where that came from.	11 12	the data, the data produced by the community mapping
12 13	The consequence was that it's obvious from the	13	project that was conducted in a hurry. You heard the circumstances in which it was
13	evidence that there was significant interest by the	13	conducted, but in particular you heard the concession by
15	Government in clarifying the river situation at	15	Dr Poole when I asked him whether he accepted the
16	precisely the time when the transfer occurred, and that	16	SPLM/A's representation of what he had established.
17	incidentally in the course of those programmes there was	17	I will quote it again from paragraph 51 of the
18	something which is indistinguishable from	18	rejoinder:
19	administration.	19	"The community mapping project shows permanent
20	Can you imagine, if you were counsel in my	20	Ngok Dinka villages were located throughout the Bahr
21	hypothetical case between the British Government and the	21	region, extending north to latitude 10°35' north, both
22	French Government for the delimitation of the boundary	22	in 1905 and for decades thereafter."
23	between a French Bahr el Ghazal and an English Kordofan,	23	He obviously accepted under some pressure that that
24	how much you would leap on these documents with joy as	24	was not the case. It is a clear misrepresentation. The
25	evidence of administration? But you know that for	25	community mapping project can establish nothing except
	D 100		D 102
	Page 190		Page 192

,				
16:26 1	for the area in which it was covered. You can look at	16:29	1	shows.
2	the outcome as to what you would think in relation to		2	If they are not on the Darfur boundary, then their
3	areas to the north of the Ragaba ez Zarga.		3	own theory of the case means that the Abyei Area does
4	I come back to my point about hybrid boundaries		4	not include an area so far to the west, and Sultan Rob
5	which I made yesterday and which counsel for the SPLM/A		5	was right in saying that more or less at the time of the
6	responded to very briefly this afternoon. I will revert		6	transfer.
7	to some of the issues about the determination of the		7	You can determine the anthropological fact because
8	tribal area of the Ngok at 1905 in my final presentation		8	that is your mandate in the context of the delimitation
9	tomorrow, but I do want to address this issue because it		9	exercise. We say, of course, that it is
10	is of fundamental importance.	1	10	an extraordinarily difficult fact to demonstrate, and
11	When I was making a point about being geographically	1	11	I think the process of the last two days will have
12	challenged, I was not making that point in relation to	1	12	satisfied you of that proposition, on which counsel do
13	the hybrid issue; I was making the point in relation to	1	13	in fact agree.
14	rather more, let us say, trivial questions of whether	1	14	We say the fact of that is the reason why there was
15	their submission actually contained the complete area or	1	15	an excess of mandate in this case, because the fact that
16	not, and whether particular references to coordinates	1	16	was determined was actually a fact relating to
17	were geographically accurate.		17	provincial boundaries, without the most crucial
18	The broader point is this: if the SPLM/A wants to	1	18	provincial boundary being taken into account at all.
19	live by the tribal boundary hypothesis, then they die by	1	19	Mr President, I think I've reached the period at
20	it as well. They can't pick and choose. They can't		20	which we are supposed to stop at this phase; we will do
21	say, as they now seem to be saying, there were virtually		21	it, but with, I hope, the assurance that if there's
22	no Ngok in area 1, the area below the Bahr el Arab, and		22	anything that I've left out in these rather scattered
23	then say that as a matter of tribal interpretation it		23	remarks, I can come back to it before Mr Born has the
24	belonged to the Ngok.		24	last word tomorrow morning.
25	On the basis of the assumption that that area was	2	25	Thank you, sir. Thank you, members of the Tribunal.
	Page 193			Page 195
16:28 1	virtually empty, it did not belong to the Ngok;			THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much, Professor Crawford.
2	apparently it belonged to the Twic, who accepted their		2	Are there any questions on the part of the Tribunal?
3	being moved to the south in a boundary which		3	No. Then we'll break until 5 o'clock.
4	Titherington showed was some considerable distance south			(4.31 pm)
5	of the river and which was coexistent with the boundary		5	(A short break)
6	between the Ngok and the Twic.			(4.59 pm)
7	The positions they're taking don't add up, they			THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Born.
8	don't make sense. There is no actual evidence that they		8 9	Submissions by MR BORN MR BORN: Thank you, Mr President.
9 10	were on the Darfur boundary. Mr Born says, and it's		.0	I would like to turn now in our rebuttal submissions
	true, that the agreement to which one version of the Civsec document was attached the reason we gave you		1	to the interpretation of the definition of the Abyei
11 12	two versions is that it was an annex to a meeting held		2	Area. I addressed this in some detail, as you remember,
13	in the 1930s, which is one of those annex numbers he		3	on Monday, but it seems that I need to do so again.
13	mentioned. But it obviously was brought into being for		4	You will remember that on Monday and Tuesday the
15	another purpose and was used in the context of		5	Government, both Mr Bundy and Professor Crawford, argued
16	a discussion about grazing rights for the Ngol Dinka		.6	at some length that the Abyei Area can consist only of
17	south of the Bahr el Arab and south of the Darfur		7	the territory that was located to the south of the
18	boundary.		.8	putative Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal provincial boundary in
19	It's obvious that the Ngok had no interest in what		9	1905. As we've seen, they argue basically that
20	was being discussed at that meeting, although the map		20	Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol refers to the
21	itself was being used as an apparently valuable addition		21	transfer of an area or a territory in 1905, and not to
22	to the body of information about grazing rights in the		22	the transfer of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms.
23	general area. But the fact that they had no interest in		23	I promised you yesterday that I would come back and
24	it demonstrates the point, which is that they were not		24	address this in some detail.
25	on the Darfur boundary at all, as the other evidence	2	25	I'd like to start by just referring briefly to the
1	Dogo 104			Page 106
	Page 194			Page 196

17:00 1	consequences of the Government's definition. It would	17:04 1	sort of enquiry by this Tribunal, the Government's
2	mean that, irrespective of what the historical and the	2	interpretation of Article 1.1.2 is wrong; it's
3	factual evidence showed, even though the Ngok's	3	demonstrably wrong in substance.
4	historical and ancestral homelands were located 88%, as	4	It's important as we turn to interpreting that
5	Professor Crawford put it, or 98% to the north of the	5	definition of the Abyei Area to look to the language of
6	Kiir/Bahr el Arab, that would be irrelevant; that 88% or	6	the Abyei Protocol. That's something that Mr Bundy, who
7	98% of the Ngok's territory would be excluded from the	7	revisited this issue for the Government today and
8	Abyei Area would result, in Mr Crawford's submission,	8	yesterday, did not do. He and the Government would
9	entirely by virtue of the parties' agreement in 2005 in	9	instead define the Abyei Area more or less by reference
10	the Abyei Protocol.	10	to Wingate's memorandum and by reference to what they
11	As we saw at the question just at the end of the	11	call the transfer documents, and not by reference to the
12	morning's session that I came back and answered, that is	12	language or the purposes of the Abyei Protocol; or in
13	essentially the thesis also of Zakaria Atem's witness	13	fact, as we come to see soon, to the drafting history of
14	statement on behalf of the Government.	14	the Abyei Protocol.
15	I would like to turn now to the Government's	15	Let's start then, as we set about trying to give
16	interpretation of Article 1.1.2, but I'd like to do that	16	a substantive interpretation to Article 1.1.2, with the
17	in a way that's a bit different from how the Government	17	language of what the parties agreed to, the Government
18	has done it, which, as you will recall, is to address	18	and the SPLM/A in 2005.
19 20	Abyei Protocol's language in its first presentations and then to spend time dwelling, in these presentations in	19 20	What they agreed to you can see it on the screen, and it's language we've had read to us repeatedly but
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
21 22	the last couple of days, on the historical documents, I'd like to put those two pieces together and look at	21 22	it's worth looking at again the territory is defined as the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms transferred
23	them together. Naturally what I'd like to do is to	23	to Kordofan in 1905. That's the place we start.
23 24	begin with the language of Article 1.1.2.	23	I discussed at some length on Sunday that in the
25	Preliminarily, though, as we've seen and this	25	English language the plain meaning of Article 1.1.2
23	reminiarity, mough, as we've seen and this	23	English language the plant meaning of Article 1.1.2
	Page 197		Page 199
17:02 1	goes back to excess of mandate provisions the	17:05 1	refers to the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms
2	Government's claim that the experts misinterpreted	2	which were which were collectively transferred to
3	Article 1.1.2 is not a basis for an excess of mandate	3	Kordofan in 1905. It does not refer to the transfer of
4	claim. The experts' misinterpretation of the definition	4	some sub-part of an area of the nine Ngok Dinka
5	of the Abyei Area in Article 1.1.2 would be an error of	5	chiefdoms, as the Government would have you believe.
6	law or an error of interpretation, not an excess of	6	We also saw how that interpretation was confirmed by
7	substantive mandate.	7	the expert report of Professor Crystal OBE.
8	I would suggest I will probably be accused of	8	Professor Crystal explained and applied the simple but
9	misinterpreting counsel's submissions, but I don't think	9	very important English grammatical rule of proximity.
10	I do here; I think Professor Pellet forthrightly	10	It's a common-sense rule. It makes sense. He applied
11	acknowledged that in the questions from the Tribunal,	11	it in other contexts. The Government did not choose to
12	Professor Reisman in particular, and that's precisely	12	challenge that report, did not seek to cross-examine
13	consistent with the Government's memorial that	13	him. His evidence on that issue, the rule of proximity,
14	an error in substantive interpretation is not the basis	14	is unchallenged and uncontroverted in the record.
15	for an excess of mandate claim the Tribunal does not	15	He said, and it's worth looking at his report, that:
16	sit as a Court of Appeal and an error,	16	"The analysis of all the grammatical factors
17	a misinterpretation, in how the definition of the Abyei	17	involved in this sentence [that is to say Article 1.1.2]
18	Area is set forth in Article 1.1.2 is not	18	taken in textual isolation [that means looking at
19	a jurisdictional excess; it's not an excess of mandate	19	Article 1.1.2 itself] points to the clear conclusion
20	within the meaning of Article 2(c) of the Arbitration	20	that it is the chiefdoms which are being transferred."
21	Agreement.	21	That means not a particular area that's being
22	If I'm right on that, that's an end of the matter,	22	transferred, but rather the chiefdoms, the nine
23	and in a sense I don't need to keep talking on this	23 24	Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, which is what the SPLM/A's
24 25	issue, but I will. In any event, even if that were the basis for some	24 25	position has been, it's what the experts' position was, as we are going to see.
23	in any event, even if that were the basis for some	23	as no are going to see.
	Page 198		Page 200

1. Left labe a sept away from just the language of 2				
2 Article 1.1.2 and look at the entire provision in a language that broader context before sort of taking 4 successive steps hack, further away, and looking at the 1 suggest in a broader context as well. 5 That conclusion — Professor Crystal's conclusion, 6 our conclusion — is continued by the fact that 9 Ngok Dinka chiefdons*; not seven, not these, not however may may have been been been that between the Mirch in the passes it wanted to 1 include some of them or some indeterminate number, 12 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons it to the parties around the temperature all of 1 the Pyok Dinka chiefdons. 1 include some of them or some indeterminate number, 1 include some of them or some indeterminate number, 1 include some of them or some indeterminate number, 1 include some of them or some indeterminate number, 1 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons. 1 include some of them or some indeterminate number, 1 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons. 1 include some of them or some indeterminate number, 1 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons under 1 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons under 1 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons. 1 include some of them or some indeterminate number, 1 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons under 1 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons. 2 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons. 2 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons. 3 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdons. 3 include all of Ngok Dinka Chiefdons. 4 include all of Ngok Dinka Chi	17:07 1	Let's take a step away from just the language of	17:10 1	that they wanted to choose, to vote freely and
a latel broader context before sort of taking 4 successive steps back, further away, and looking at the 5 language in a broader context as well. 6 That conclusion — Forfessor Crystal's conclusion, 7 our conclusion — Forfessor Crystal's conclusion, 8 Article 1.1.2 included the phrase "the area of the nine 9 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. The area of the nine 10 nine. I referred to all mine because it where, not however 10 many may have been beneath the Kitr, but instead all 11 nine. I referred to all mine because it wanted to 12 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. It didn't want 13 to include some of them to some indestrumate number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms in didn't because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka people. That is bow you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka their all mine. Ryok Dinka chiefdoms in didn't because those were the 19 Ngok Dinka people. That is bow you defined the Ngok 19 have. The parties songly begin-fally in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka people. That show you defined the Ngok 23 single paramount chief, whose witness statement you 24 have. The parties songly begin-fally in doing that to 25 are shown and agreed to find language that the same provided or an Article 1.1.2. Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 26 of gammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 27 all the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 28 of gammar; that confirms between the words mean. But it's 29 all the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of gammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 3 all the Abyel Potocool. All the September of the Abyel Potocool. 3 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of gammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, 1 word and parties the word was the words mean. But it's 4 also, 1 word and parties the words was the words mean. But it's 4 also, 1 wor	2		2	•
4 successive steps hack, further away, and looking at the language in a broader context as well. 6 That conclusion — Professor Crystal's conclusion, our conclusion — is confirmed by the fact that 4 and 4 mine. It referred to all the phrase "the area of the inte 10 min may may have been been beneath the Kilir, but it is include all of the Psylo Dinka chiefdoms. It does not not be a subject where of the Psylo Dinka people. That would be completely contains to the basic purpose of the referred to all nine. It referred to all nine because it wanted to include some of them or some indeterminate number, to the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 1 house words are clear. The passing paramone of the fish post parties to the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 1 house words are clear. The basic purpose of the referred to the purpose of the Allyei Protecol, and parties meant in 2005. They haven't confirms power than the comment of the parties wanted specifically in doing that to ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 2 may be a subject where again, just as they doind a suggest that that's a very proveful and important aspect in 6 powerfully — what the words that they end mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to not just look at what the purpose of the Allyei Protecol, and in particular the definition of the Allyei Protecol, and in particular the definition of the Allyei Protecol, and in particular the definition of the Allyei Protecol, and in particular the definition of the Allyei Protecol, and in particular the definition of the Allyei Protecol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Allyei Protecol are referendum with all Protecol for the Mayor in the Allyei Protecol, and in particular the definition of the Allyei Protecol, and in particular the definition of the Allyei Protecol, and page and the page and to in the Allyei Protecol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Allyei Protecol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Allyei Protecol are clear. The ba	3		3	
6 That conclusion — Perfessor Crystal's conclusion, 7 our conclusion — is confirmed by the first that 8 Article 1.1.2 included the phrase "the area of the nine 9 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms; not seven, not three, not however 10 many may have been heneath the Kity, but instead all 11 nine. It referred to all nine because it wanted to 12 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. It didn't want 13 to include some of them or some indeterminate number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. It didn't want 16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under 18 an include some of them or some indeterminate number, 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 19 a single paramount chief, whose wiress statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 19 a single paramount chief, whose wiress statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 19 a single paramount chief, whose wiress statement you 21 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 22 Those words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are elear. 23 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of 24 abo, I would suggest, important to not just look at 25 Agok Dinka chiefdoms and the parties want of the Abyei Protocol are 26 powerfully — What the words that they used mean. 37 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't and mare importantly, I day, they laveral answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are residents would be entitled to participate in the Red words had they is referred to was to specify that region whose residences would be entitled to participate in the Red words had they be appropriate in Protocol was to specify that region whose residences would be entitled to participate in the Red educations of the Abyei Protocol are releared meaning to the Abyei Protocol are releare	4	successive steps back, further away, and looking at the	4	That's why Article 1.1.2 referred to the Ngok Dinka
for that conclusion — Professor Crystal's conclusion, conclusion — Storffmed by the first that Article 1.1.2 included the phrase "the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms"; not seven, not three, not however any may have been heneath the Kith, but instead all inime. It referred to all nine because it wanted to include some of them or some indeterminate number, to the parties wanted specifically to capture all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. It didn't want to include some of them or some indeterminate number, to the Pays Dinka chiefdoms. It is the parties wanted specifically to capture all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under a single paramount other, whose winess statement you have. The parties suggit specifically in doing that to easy to be a saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17.08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of parties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms powerfully — What the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they ditha' answer Professor Crystal they have not asswered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Protocol the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Protocol and the three of the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Protocol that the anisotate in the Federadum which is a particle to the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Protocol the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the clear than the main south	5	language in a broader context as well.	5	and referred to the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. In those
8 Article 1.1.2 included the phrase. The area of the nine 9 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, in not seven, not three, not however 10 many may have been beneath the Kiir, but instead all 11 nine. It referred to all nine because it wanted to 12 include all of the Ngob Dinka chiefdoms. It dink want 13 to include some of them or some indeterminate number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to require all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. It all not because those were the 16 As we've seen, hey did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka ribe; all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under 19 a single parmount chief, whose winess statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in old in the to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at 26 Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of 5 porties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms 6 powerfully — what the words han they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol and 12 and the Abyei Protocol are 13 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Protocol and 17 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 18 elections, in the referendum; no many the territory of the Chief of the Ngok Dinka 18 decidents who would get to vote freely and democratically in the Abyei Protocol. 22 Those words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 23 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of parties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms 24 abo, I would suggest, important to look at what the purpose of referring the Abyei Protocol. 2	6	That conclusion Professor Crystal's conclusion,	6	
8 Article 1.1.2 included the phrase. The area of the nine 9 Ngob Dinka chiefdons? not seven, not three, not however 10 many may have been beneath the Kiir, but instead all 11 nine. It referred to all nine because it wanted to 12 include all of the Ngob Dinka chiefdons. It didn't want 13 to include some of them or some indeterminate number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to equive all of 15 the Ngob Dinka chiefdons. 16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngob Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngob 18 Dinka ribe: all nine Ngob Dinka chiefdons under 19 a single paramount chief, whose winess statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in claif of the 22 Ngob Dinka chiefdons, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to look at what the 26 programmer, that confirms what the words mean. But it's 27 a labout 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 28 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of 29 powerfully – what the words that they used mean. 30 of grammer that confirms what the words that they used mean. 40 powerfully – what the words that they used mean. 41 Those purposes recurded in the Abyei Protocol. 42 and the Abyei Protocol are 43 celections, in the referendum, out of the Abyei Protocol. 44 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 45 porties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms 46 powerfully – what the words that they believe the purpose of referring the Abyei Protocol are 47 referendum which is provided for in the Abyei Protocol. 48 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 49 more importantly, I d say, they haven't answered the 40 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are 41 referendum when the referendum is not in the Abyei Protocol. 41 Those purposes recurded in the Abyei Protocol are 42 referendum what a provided for in Abyei Protocol are 43 referendum when provided for in Active 8 of	7	our conclusion is confirmed by the fact that	7	absurd to say that the referendum should include some
9 Ngok Dinka chiefdorns"; not seven, not three, no however 10 many may have been beneath the Kiir, but instead all 11 nine. It referred to all nine because it wanted to 12 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdorns. It didn't want 13 to include same of them or some indeterminate number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdorns. 16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka tribe: all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdorns under 19 a single paramount chief, whose witness statement you 20 have. The parties cought specifically in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdorns, not just some of them. I vould 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Page 201 17:08 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 6 powerfully - what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me, and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whase 19 question of whether they will go south or whether they 19 question of whether they will go south or whether they 20 question of whether they pull go noth. 21 Let's look now at how some other people have interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the Abrea there are an of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdorns with what I have been saying, precise	8	Article 1.1.2 included the phrase "the area of the nine	8	
11 nine., It referred to all nine because it wanted to 12 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. It didn't want 13 to include some of them or some indeterminate number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. 16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka people. That show you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka ribre; all mine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under 19 a single paramount chief, whose witness statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that their's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at 26 Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 27 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 28 of grammur that confirms what the words mean. But it's 39 a parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 40 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 41 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 42 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 43 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the 44 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the 55 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 46 powerfully - what the words that they used mean. 47 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 48 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the 49 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 50 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are 51 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose the confirms of the Abyei Protocol are 52 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose the certain which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose the certain	9	Ngok Dinka chiefdoms"; not seven, not three, not however	9	would be completely contrary to the basic purpose of the
12 include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. It didn't want 13 to include some of them or some indeterminate number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. 16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka tribe: all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under 19 a single paramount chief, whose witness statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I vouald 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at 26 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words that they used mean. 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005. because that confirms 6 powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 6 powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Prolessor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I say, they haver to armive definition of the Abyel Protocol are 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyel Protocol are 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyel Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose of the Abyel Protocol are 13 the Abyel Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyel Trectocol 18 development which is provided for in Article 8 of the 29 development which is provided for in Article 8 of the 20 development which is provided for in Article 8 of the 21 development which is provided for in Article 8 of the 22 left wind the main souther reserved for the Abyel Protocol are 23 referendum was, and great that these parties, the did there that the decident wow and agreed to that these parties, the form us the side, and the parties with the Bundy	10	many may have been beneath the Kiir, but instead all	10	referendum.
13 to include some of them or some indeterminane number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. 16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka pole. That's how you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka tribe: all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under 19 a single paramount chief, whose witness statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what they used mean. 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms 6 powerfully — what the words fream. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the 10 language that they gared to in the Abyei Area in 4 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Area will 16 Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 17 referendum was to perferendum conducted simultaneously 18 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's understant the man and the propose of the Abyei Area will 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 18 decide who would get to vote freely and democratically in the Abyei Protocol, and in the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC exper	11	nine. It referred to all nine because it wanted to	11	I note that the Government has not once said the
13 to include some of them or some indeterminate number, 14 but the parties wanted specifically to capture all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. 16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka prole. That's how you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka tribe: all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under 19 a single paramount chief, whose winess statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammur; that confirms what the words man. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms 6 powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are 11 Those purposes of bow to 12 decide who would get to vote freely and democratically 15 in the Abyei Arca was. 16 Avery force of the Abyei Arca in 16 Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 17 that were professor Crystal, they have not answered the 18 delections, in the reason of the Abyei Arca will 19 elections, in the referendum. 19 question of whether they will go south or whether they 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether the people of the Ngok Dinka 21 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 22 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or	12	include all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. It didn't want	12	word "referendum". They haven't referred to the
14 but the parties wamed specifically to capture all of 15 the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. 16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka ribie: all nime Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at 26 Fage 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar, that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 6 powerfully - what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the; 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol. 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei referendum was, and put it shoult what the form unable the strength of the strength of the Microsoft of the Abyei Area was. 17:11 1 given. 18:11 1 the powerfully - what the words mean and more importantly. I'd say, they have not answered the entire search of the mine suppose of the find of the Abyei Protocol are residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Protocol are residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Protocol are residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Protocol are qu	13	to include some of them or some indeterminate number,	13	•
16 As we've seen, they did that because those were the 17 Ngok Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngok 18 Dinka fribe: all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under 19 a single paramount chief, whose witness statement you 20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at 26 Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 6 powerfully what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as sthey didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they haven to answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose of how to 20 In the Abyei Protocol are 21 that Professor Crawford and Mr Bundy haven't addressed 22 this issue is because they dort have anything to say. 23 When you think about what the purpose of how to 24 the Abyei Protocol was the world and important appect 25 Article 1.1.2, there is no answer but that which I have 26 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 27 this is a subject where again, just as they didn't 28 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 29 moverfully what the words that they used mean. 30 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 31 the Abyei Protocol and the Abyei Area in 32 the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 33 transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their 34 meaning that the parties with the appeal of the Abyei Area in 35 transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their 36 meeting w	14	but the parties wanted specifically to capture all of	14	
17 Ngok Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngok Dinka tribe: all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under a single paramount chief, whose witness statement you have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to ensure that they caught the territory of all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. We also saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms powerfully — what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Craystal, they have not answered the answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Proto	15	the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms.	15	Government across the table from us, the SPLM/A on this
17 Ngok Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngok Dinka tribe: all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under a single paramount chief, whose witness statement you have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to ensure that they caught the territory of all of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. We also saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms – confirms powerfully – what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those words are very clear. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the language that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the language that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will province in 1905. It is unfailed. In the Abyei Area was and put it together with the have mything to say. In the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in	16	As we've seen, they did that because those were the	16	side, sat down and agreed to that language. They agreed
17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of grammar, that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that they used mean. 3 of grammar, that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms ownerfully - what the words that they used mean. 4 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 5 me the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the Abyei Area will referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the Abyei area will be entitled to participate in the Abyei Area will be elections, in the referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be elections, in the referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they agreed of the Abyei Area will be elections, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or a single processor of the man southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they agreed of the Abyei Area will be elections, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or a single provincies to the meeting in Agok on the meeting over the past decades that they belonged to the south or a single provincies to the meeting in Agok on the meeting in Agok	17	Ngok Dinka people. That's how you defined the Ngok	17	to that language basically for the purpose of how to
20 have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to 21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 NgxQ binka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 6 powerfully what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purpose recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 If's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 20 Those purpose are very clear. You can apply English rules 21 The words are very clear. You can apply English rules 22 The words are very clear. You can apply English rules 23 The words are very clea	18	Dinka tribe: all nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms under	18	decide who would get to vote freely and democratically
21 ensure that they caught the territory of all of the 22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that 'sa very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at 26 Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties mean in 2005, because that confirms >- confirms 6 powerfully what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't as answer Professor Crystal, when you have he pass were due; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the Abyei are awaill the entitled to participate in the Professor Crawford and Mr Bundy haven't andressed this issue is because they with the appear of the Myei Treferendum was, and put it together with the language of Article 1.1.2, there is no answer but that which I have 17:10 1 2 given. 17:11 1 2 qiven. 17:11 1 2 qiven. 17:11 1 2 qiven. 17:11 1 2 qiven.	19	a single paramount chief, whose witness statement you	19	in the Abyei referendum.
22 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would 23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at 26 Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms 6 powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they haven to answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 26 Varies in just as they don't have anything to say. 27 When you think about that the purpose of the Abyei are ferendem. 29 It's link that the purpose of the Abyei are in the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the sunticular the and the particular the and the particular the sunt	20	have. The parties sought specifically in doing that to	20	In those circumstances I would submit the reason
23 suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect 24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. 25 We also saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms - confirms 6 powerfully - what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they haven to answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Area will 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 17 be entitled to participate in the free democratic 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 25 When you think about what the purpose of the Abyei referendum was, and put it together with the language of 26 Article 1.1.2, there is no answer but that which I have 29 Earls 1.12. Those words are clear. 20 Those words are very clear. 21 Those words are very clear. 22 Those words are very clear. 23 Those words are very clear. 24 Cet's look now at how some other people have interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the defi	21	ensure that they caught the territory of all of the	21	that Professor Crawford and Mr Bundy haven't addressed
24 in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2. We also saw how it is important to not just look at Page 201 17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms for powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answered Professor Crystal, they have not answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 10 Importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic lections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan. 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 24 chief 1.1.2, there is no answer but that which I have bear along the Article 1.1.2, there is no answer but that which I have bear along the interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to definition of the Abyei Area will transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to definition	22	Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, not just some of them. I would	22	this issue is because they don't have anything to say.
17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms ~ confirms 6 powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol. 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 If's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or	23	suggest that that's a very powerful and important aspect	23	When you think about what the purpose of the Abyei
17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms – confirms 6 powerfully – what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol are 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 17 be entitled to participate in the free democratic 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 If's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 25 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	24	in giving meaning to Article 1.1.2.	24	referendum was, and put it together with the language of
17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms 6 powerfully what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 17 be entitled to participate in the free democratic 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or	25	We also saw how it is important to not just look at	25	Article 1.1.2, there is no answer but that which I have
17:08 1 the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear. 2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms 6 powerfully what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 17 be entitled to participate in the free democratic 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or		P 201		D 202
2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms 6 powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 2 Let's look now at how some other people have 4 definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' 4 transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's 4 delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how 4 they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: 10 Pour job is to define and demarcate the area of the 11 mine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 13 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal 14 province in 1905. 15 Precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 16 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 17 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 18 precisely consistent with what		rage 201		Fage 203
2 Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules 3 of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's 4 also, I would suggest, important to look at what the 5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms 6 powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or				
of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. 3 interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. 10 Ambassador Petterson said: 11 "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 18 the Abyei Protocol, Only residents of the Abyei 19 with the main southern referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok	17:08 1	the words of Article 1.1.2. Those words are clear.	17:11 1	given.
also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or	2	Those words are very clear. You can apply English rules		
5 parties meant in 2005, because that confirms — confirms 6 powerfully — what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 16 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 17 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 5 transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their 6 meetings with the parties, with the Government's 6 delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how 9 they referred to what the Abyei are was. 10 Ambassador Petterson said: 11 "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the 12 nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 13 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal 14 province in 1905." 15 Precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 16 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 17 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 18 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 19 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 10 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 11 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 12 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 13 the Abyei Protocol. An bassador	_	Those words are very clear. Tod can apply English rules	2	Let's look now at how some other people have
6 powerfully what the words that they used mean. 7 This is a subject where again, just as they didn't 8 answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and 9 more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the 10 language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. 11 Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are 12 clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in 13 the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose 14 residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei 15 referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the 16 Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will 16 abyei Protocol. Only residents of the free democratic 17 precisely consistent with what I have been saying, 18 elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously 19 with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the 20 question of whether they will go south or whether they 21 will go north. 22 It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or				
This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they life undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or	3	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's	3	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the
answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei Area will Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or Basic under the procedural framework set out for them, how they they referred to what the Abyei Area was. A do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. A mbassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Abyei Area was. 13 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." 14 province in 1905." 15 Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 18 the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: 20 " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan.	3 4	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the	3 4	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts'
more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they ligo north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or	3 4 5	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms	3 4 5	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their
language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they life unine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on lath April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan." Ambassador Petterson said: 11 "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 18 the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that 21 the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan." Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't	3 4 5 6	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's
Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the uill go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 11 "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan." Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't	3 4 5 6 7	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to
clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or	3 4 5 6 7 8	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and	3 4 5 6 7 8	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how
the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 13 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely consistent with what I have been saying. It is undisputed th	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said:
residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or It is undisputed to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan." Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the
referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or Precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely co	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was',
Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 18	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal
be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 18 the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18 the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 20 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that 21 the mandate of the ABC was: 22 " to define and demarcate the area of the nine 23 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to 24 Kordofan." 25 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905."
elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 18 the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18 the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18 the Government didn't say anything then in objection. 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 20 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that 21 the mandate of the ABC was: 22 " to define and demarcate the area of the nine 23 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to 24 Kordofan." 25 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal
with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 19 Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan." Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying,
question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 20 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan." 24 Kordofan." 25 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but
will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 21 the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan." 25 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection.
It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei 23 referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 26 " to define and demarcate the area of the nine 27 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to 28 Kordofan." 29 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on
referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka 24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 28 Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to 29 Kordofan." 25 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that
24 chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said 25 over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 26 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was:
over the past decades that they belonged to the south or 25 Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to
Page 202 Page 204	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan."
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan."
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of grammar; that confirms what the words mean. But it's also, I would suggest, important to look at what the parties meant in 2005, because that confirms confirms powerfully what the words that they used mean. This is a subject where again, just as they didn't answer Professor Crystal, they have not answered me; and more importantly, I'd say, they haven't answered the language that they agreed to in the Abyei Protocol. Those purposes recorded in the Abyei Protocol are clear. The basic purpose for defining the Abyei Area in the Abyei Protocol was to specify that region whose residents would be entitled to participate in the Abyei referendum which is provided for in Article 8 of the Abyei Protocol. Only residents of the Abyei Area will be entitled to participate in the free democratic elections, in the referendum, conducted simultaneously with the main southern referendum in 2011, on the question of whether they will go south or whether they will go north. It's undisputed that the entire reason for the Abyei referendum was to permit the people of the Ngok Dinka chiefdoms, all nine chiefdoms, who had consistently said over the past decades that they belonged to the south or	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	interpreted the Abyei Protocol, and in particular the definition of the Abyei Area. This is the ABC experts' transcripts. It's how they, time and again, in their meetings with the parties, with the Government's delegation and with the SPLM/A, as they were expected to do under the procedural framework set out for them, how they referred to what the Abyei Area was. Ambassador Petterson said: "Our job is to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms that were [not 'which was', 'that were'] transferred to Kordofan from Bahr el Ghazal province in 1905." Precisely consistent with what Professor Crystal said, precisely consistent with what I have been saying, precisely contrary to what the Government now says, but the Government didn't say anything then in objection. Let's look at the meeting in Agok on 18th April 2005. Ambassador Petterson said there that the mandate of the ABC was: " to define and demarcate the area of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred to Kordofan." Again, precisely the same language. In the meeting

,			
17:13 1	on April 16th in Dembloya, he said again that what they	17:15 1	chiefdoms at the time they the chiefdoms were
2	were setting out to do was:	2	transferred to Kordofan in 1905. That is the definition
3	" determine the boundaries of the nine Ngok Dinka	3	of the Abyei Area.
4	chiefdoms as they existed 100 years ago."	4	With that we arrive at where Mr Bundy began
5	A different formulation, but every single time it	5	yesterday, when he addressed the issue of the definition
6	had the same essential meaning. It referred to the nine	6	of the Abyei Area.
7	Ngok Dinka chiefdoms which were transferred; not to some	7	You will recall that Mr Bundy began his presentation
8	specific territory that was transferred. Each time the	8	by addressing the reference to what he described as the
9	Government sat there, the Government didn't object,	9	Condominium orders of the 1905 transfer, which he said
10	didn't protest, didn't say, "That's wrong". The reason,	10	were before the Government and the SPLM/A when they
11	I would suggest and we are going to come on to it	11	negotiated the Abyei Protocol, and you can see
12	is because the Government knew perfectly well, and	12	I don't want to be accused of misstating what someone
13	didn't disagree that that's what the language meant.	13	said you can see here that he said:
14	That is one of the reasons that they picked the ABC	14	"Yes, the negotiators of the Abyei Protocol were
15	experts. They didn't pick people that might adopt	15	aware of the 1905 transfer documents."
16	a sort of abstract, cold, arbitrary provincial boundary	16	Preliminarily. Mr Bundy's reliance on the supposed
17	definition that the Government urges; they picked	17	negotiating history of the Abyei Protocol, on what was
18	experts that would evaluate historical evidence and they	18	before the negotiators of the Abyei Protocol, is a bit
19	put in with the greatest of respect to our mountains	19	of an about-face about the Government.
20	of evidence their own mountains of evidence.	20	The Government's initial position was that the
21	They put in 100 witnesses to talk not about	21	Tribunal did not need to pay attention to these
22	provincial boundaries, not to read on what Governor	22	so-called supplementary means of interpretation. You
23	Wingate said or didn't say, but to talk about the land,	23	will recall that our memorial put in a substantial
24	to talk about the people, to talk about the history, to	24	discussion of the drafting history, while the Government
25	talk about the traditional areas of both people, because	25	devoted essentially no attention to it because, pursuant
	Page 205		Page 207
17:14 1	that's what they had in mind.	17:17 1	to this paragraph from their memorial, they didn't think
2	They didn't object when Ambassador Petterson	2	it was appropriate, didn't think it was necessary.
3	provided these comments, and he didn't adopt any	3	In any case, about-face or not, Mr Bundy's
4	peculiar interpretation here; this is just what	4	discussion of the drafting history of the Abyei Protocol
5	Article 1.1.2 says in the English language.	5	is wrong. In fact, when you go and look at that
6	Even the Government's counter-memorial, when you	6	drafting history, it confirms it confirms
7	look at it, does not disagree that what	7	powerfully what the language said, what English
8	Ambassador Petterson said at these meetings was	8	grammar rules say, and what the purposes mean. It may
9	an acceptable interpretation of the mandate.	9	be a secondary means of interpretation, but it's still
10	Flipping back, even if Professor Pellet had answered	10	one that supports the primary means.
11	Professor Reisman's question differently and had said:	11	What we will see when we look at this drafting
12	yes, if they made a serious error in misinterpreting	12	history is the opposite of what Mr Bundy told you.
13	Article 1.1.2 that would be an excess of mandate, the Government conceives here that these were acceptable	13 14	Mr Bundy would have you think that the negotiators of the Abyei Protocol focused on Wingate's memorandum.
14	crovernment concerves here that these were acceptable	14	the Abyel Protocol locused on wingate's memorandum.
15	*	15	
15 16	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to	15 16	There's no evidence at all none that they even
16	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day	16	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even
16 17	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it.	16 17	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it.
16 17 18	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we	16 17 18	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the
16 17 18 19	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we see from the language of Article 1.1.2, what we see from	16 17 18 19	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the record clearly shows and as the Government has
16 17 18 19 20	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we see from the language of Article 1.1.2, what we see from the grammatical rules of the English language applied to	16 17 18 19 20	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the record clearly shows and as the Government has conceded repeatedly, even under Professor Crawford's
16 17 18 19 20 21	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we see from the language of Article 1.1.2, what we see from the grammatical rules of the English language applied to Article 1.1.2 and what we see from the purposes of	16 17 18 19 20 21	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the record clearly shows and as the Government has conceded repeatedly, even under Professor Crawford's standards for concessions what the parties focused on
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we see from the language of Article 1.1.2, what we see from the grammatical rules of the English language applied to Article 1.1.2 and what we see from the purposes of Article 1.1.2, and indeed of the whole	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the record clearly shows and as the Government has conceded repeatedly, even under Professor Crawford's standards for concessions what the parties focused on was Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128, and we will look
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we see from the language of Article 1.1.2, what we see from the grammatical rules of the English language applied to Article 1.1.2 and what we see from the purposes of Article 1.1.2, and indeed of the whole Comprehensive Peace Agreement, is a single, clear,	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the record clearly shows and as the Government has conceded repeatedly, even under Professor Crawford's standards for concessions what the parties focused on was Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128, and we will look at that too. What we will see is the Sudan Intelligence
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we see from the language of Article 1.1.2, what we see from the grammatical rules of the English language applied to Article 1.1.2 and what we see from the purposes of Article 1.1.2, and indeed of the whole Comprehensive Peace Agreement, is a single, clear, inescapable conclusion, and that is that Article 1.1.2	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the record clearly shows and as the Government has conceded repeatedly, even under Professor Crawford's standards for concessions what the parties focused on was Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128, and we will look at that too. What we will see is the Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128 talks about a tribal transfer of people,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we see from the language of Article 1.1.2, what we see from the grammatical rules of the English language applied to Article 1.1.2 and what we see from the purposes of Article 1.1.2, and indeed of the whole Comprehensive Peace Agreement, is a single, clear,	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the record clearly shows and as the Government has conceded repeatedly, even under Professor Crawford's standards for concessions what the parties focused on was Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128, and we will look at that too. What we will see is the Sudan Intelligence
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	interpretations. That is a concession we don't need to rely on. It's because Article 1.1.2 is as plain as day when you read it. So, if we can stop here for just a moment, what we see from the language of Article 1.1.2, what we see from the grammatical rules of the English language applied to Article 1.1.2 and what we see from the purposes of Article 1.1.2, and indeed of the whole Comprehensive Peace Agreement, is a single, clear, inescapable conclusion, and that is that Article 1.1.2	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	There's no evidence at all none that they even knew about it. There's no evidence that they even referred to it. Instead, as one would think, and as we will see the record clearly shows and as the Government has conceded repeatedly, even under Professor Crawford's standards for concessions what the parties focused on was Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128, and we will look at that too. What we will see is the Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128 talks about a tribal transfer of people,

17:21 You will recall on the first day of this hearing, in 2 2 and 10 of a shift from the Coverment's memorial, a comments here on the secrem - that:				
a hit of a shift from the Government's memorial, 3 Professor Crawford foot us — and you can see his 4 comments here on the screen — that: 5 "—, the travaurs of the Abyel Protecol can be 6 referred to in order to confirm the meaning arrived at 7 on an analysis of the text" 7 He then went to to say, as part of the travaurs of 8 He then went to to say, as part of the travaurs of 10 "Reference was specifically made to the Sudan 11 Intelligence Report of March 1905," one of the transfer 12 documents." 13 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss' the professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can 14 " specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report of March 1905." 15 Report [No. 128] of March 1905." 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can 17 look at the Government's, memorial, which is exactly 18 consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This is the Government's memorial, which is exactly 19 if the Government's memorial, which is exactly 20 "It was precisely this passage" 21 The passage there is no suggestion in the Government's memorial on the screen for you. This is the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 21 Tribunal." 22 Processed yiki passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 23 Tribunal." 24 Vou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 25 Sodan Intelligence Report No. 128: 26 Tribunal." 27 Page 209 28 Vou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 29 procisely this passage which held to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 21 Tribunal." 29 Page 209 20 The scale of the	17:18 1	You will recall on the first day of this hearing, in	17:21 1	about a slave raid by Homr Arabs which had carried off
4 comments here on the Screen — that: 5 ", the travaux of the then went to to say, as part of the travaux of the then went to to say, as part of the travaux of the Abyel Protocol, that: 8 He then went to to say, as part of the travaux of the Abyel Protocol, that: 9 the Abyel Protocol, that: 10 "Reference was specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report of March 1905, one of the transfer documents." 11 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 12 ratio and the comments of the standard in the Standard Intelligence Report of March 1905, one of the transfer documents." 13 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 14 ", specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report No 128 of the Government's memorial, which is exactly to consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This is the Government's memorial, which is exactly to consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This is the Government's memorial, which is exactly to consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This is the Government's memorial, and it said: 19 is the Government's memorial, and it said: 20 I't was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this that they referred to that resulted in a decision by the which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 17:20 I you can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 17:22 I't was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this tribute. 17:25 Tribunal." 17:26 I you can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 17:26 I reveal the many the process passage which led to the formulation of the screen in the continual	2		2	some 30 Dinka and 1,000 of their cattle."
5 " the travaux of the Abyei Protocol can be referred to in order to confirm the meaning arrived at 7 on an analysis of the text" 8 He then went on to say, as part of the travaux of the Abyei Protocol, that: 10 "Reference was specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report of March 1905". 11 Intelligence Report of March 1905". 12 documents." 13 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 14 " specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report Mon 128 of March 1905". 15 Report [No. 128] of March 1905". 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can 17 look at the Government's memorial, which is exactly consistent with it. If so mhe screen for you. This 19 is the Government's memorial, and it said: 10 "I'was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." 17 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 18 Professor Crawford comments, there is no suggestion in 19 Professor Crawford comments, there is no suggestion in 19 Professor Crawford comments, there is no suggestion in 19 Professor Crawford comments, there is no suggestion in 19 Professor Crawford comments, there is no suggestion in 19 Professor Crawford comments, there is no suggestion in 19 Professor Crawford in the formulation of the mode has the protocol. 17 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the cartle and shave raid. 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the cartle and shave raid. 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the cartle and shave raid. 3 The was precisely this passage. 4 The manufacture and was a state of the cartle and shave raid. 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in 19 Professor Crawford's comments,	3	Professor Crawford told us and you can see his	3	It's only a small fraction of the 60,000 or so that
6 referred to in order to confirm the meaning arrived at 7 om a malysis of the text" 8 He then went on to say, as part of the travaux of 9 the Ahyer Protocol, that: 10 "Reference was specifically made to the Sudan 11 Intelligence Report of March 1905, one of the transfer of 22 occuments." 13 Let me repeat that so hat we don't miss it: 14 " specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report (No. 128) of March 1905." 15 Report (No. 128) of March 1905. 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can 17 look at the Government's memorial, which is searchy 18 consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This 18 is the Government's memorial, and it said: 19 is the Government's memorial and it said: 20 "If was precisely this pussage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 22 memorial on the ABC's mandate and that of this 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 24 formulation of the transfer in 25 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 21 Tribunal." 22 Tribunal." 23 Turn and the special process of the transfer of a tribunal." 24 Tribunal." 25 Tribunal. 26 Tribunal. 27 To Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in the 26 formulation of the transfer in 19 the processor case greated and synthing but Sudan 11 the Intelligence Report No. 128. Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. The report of the ABC's mandate and that of this 24 to large the processor specially the spasage which led to the formulation of the transfer in 24 tribunal." 26 To Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in the 26 formulation of the transfer in 25 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. The spasage that is the text that the parties a did not an appeal to a special processor processes that the processor processes the spasage which led to the formulation of the transfer in question was not a transfer of a tribuny. The spasage that led to the formulation of the transfer in question was not a transfer of a tribuny. The spasage that led to the formulation of the pasage which led to the formulation of th	4	comments here on the screen that:	4	we heard about. Then the record says:
The ten went on to say, as part of the travatux of the Abyei Protocol, that: 10 "Reference was specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report of March 1905, one of the transfer documents." 11 Intelligence Report of March 1905, one of the transfer documents." 12 documents." 13 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 14 "specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence 15 Report [No. 128] of March 1905." 16 Professor Crawford dioht make that up. You can look at the Government's memorial, and it said: 17 look at the Government's memorial, which is exactly consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This is the Government's memorial, and it said: 18 professor from the first of the screen's placed together under a single administrative authority. The passage there just above the quote, the passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mundate and that of this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mundate and that of this 22 Tribunal." 1720 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 pracisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mundate and that of this 23 Tribunal." 1720 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 processely first passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mundate and that of this 24 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about the three is no suggestion in 4 to 5 to	5	" the travaux of the Abyei Protocol can be	5	"Two runners who arrived at Fashoda on
on an analysis of the text" 8 He then went on to say, as part of the travaux of the Abyei Protocol, that: 10 "Reference was specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report of March 1905, one of the trunsfer documents." 11 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 12 documents." 13 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 14 " specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence Report [No. 128] of March 1905." 15 Report [No. 128] of March 1905." 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can foot at the Government's memorial, which is exactly consistent with it. K's on the sercen for you. This is the Government's memorial, and it said: 17 If was precisely this passage "It was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 22 which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 17 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 22 that the two peoples, then it would be less likely that the two peoples, and in particular the multieur process of the tribes together under a single authority. 17 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 23 has a star in the state of the star that the parties a disputed text. The pecies passage that we are a talking about is the definition of the transfer in a star in the professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in the professor Crawford's com	6	referred to in order to confirm the meaning arrived at	6	13th September from the Dinka district reported on the
8 He then went on to say, as part of the travaux of 9 the Abpei Protocol, that: 9 There was the in January 1905, a comment. For a comment is a comment of the Condominium authorities about a similar kind of rails. As well as the Condominium authorities about a similar kind of rails. Shell kilk him made to the Sudan Intelligence Comments." 13 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 14 "", specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence. 15 Report [No. 128] of March 1905." 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up, You can look at the Government's memorial, which is exactly comments. The passage there is the other well as a comment of the complaints and the rails that they referred to that resulted in a decision by the Sudan Government's memorial, and it is a comment. The passage there is the street of the communication of the ABC's mandate and that of this 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 24 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 25 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 2 1 Twould note that there is no suggestion in the 27 Government since the process of the condominium andiocities about a similar kind of the Condominium authorities about a similar kind of the condominium andiocities about a similar kind of the condominium andiocities about a similar kind	7		7	cattle and slave raid."
9 the Abyel Protocol, that: 10 "Reference was specifically made to the Sudan 11 Intelligence Report of March 1905, one of the transfer 12 documents." 13 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 14 "specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence 15 Report [No. 128] of March 1905. 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can 17 look at the Government's memorial, which is exactly 28 consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This 19 is the Government's memorial, and it said: 20 "It was precisely this passage" 21 The passage there just above the quote, the passage 22 which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 23 "It was precisely this passage which led to the 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 Vou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the 2 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 3 bid an Intelligence Report No. 128. 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 5 Sudan Intelligence Regort No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government Memorial, there's no suggestion in the 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in the 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in the 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Apple Protoco. 13 That is what the travaus refers to; that is what the 14 Government and it, if we are going to look at travaus, we 15 have to look at. So let's go look at travaus, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at travaus, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at travaus, we 17 In September of 1903 residents of the village of 28 Sheikh Roh Jie had either been demoted or promoted, I've 29 creer figured out quite which, from Sudan Rohl jin the 20 Creer for Governer and an order that the protocol of this 21 Sheikh Roh Jie had either been demot	8		8	I would like to move on from that for just a second.
the Condominium authorities about a similar kind of raid. Sheihk Rihan made the complaints, and you can see them on the screen there. I won't read it out because it is, list the point of the complaints and the raids them on the screen there. I won't read it out because it is, list the point of the complaints and the raids them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen them. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen them. I won't read it out because them on the screen them. I won't wan the scoping of the though about its it exactly the scaled of the screen there. I won't read it out because them on the screen them. I won't wan the traids that the traids the traids the the parties had in from of them when the professor play, the world's leading authority. The rational was that five it was precisely this passage which the do the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that we are a laking about is the definition of the transfer in a support the species passage that we are a laking about is the definition of the transfer in and the spread to the spread to place the missing authority. The rational was that five precises passage that we are a laking about is the definition of the transfer in and the spread to place and the spread	9		9	There was then, in January 1905, a similar report from
the Condominium authorities about a similar kind of raid. Sheink Riham made the complaints, and you can see them on the screen there. I won't read it out can see them on the screen there. I won't read it is, is the point of the complaints. It is the Cowerment them controlla, and it said: It is the Cowerment the the complaints and the raids that they referred to that resulted in a decision by the Sudan but they can deferred to the transfer in the two peoples, and in particular the northern Arabs, and	10	"Reference was specifically made to the Sudan	10	the Twic Dinka, who complained, as Sultan Rob had, to
13 Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it: 14 "" specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence 15 Report [No. 128] of March 1905." 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can 17 look at the Government's memorial, which is exactly 18 consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This 19 is the Government's memorial, which is exactly 20 "It was precisely this passage" 21 The passage there just above the quote, the passage 22 which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 23 "It was precisely this passage which led to the 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the dispated text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I Vould note that there is no suggestion in the 6 I Vould note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in the 8 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. 19 placed together under a single administrative authority. The rationale was that if a top kan the power of the complaints. As we know, it was the both the victims, the Sudan obscerement to shart, with the three is no suggestion to the 19 placed together under a single administrative authority. The rationale was that it about he to him, were 19 placed together under a single administrative authority. The rationale was that it about he to him, were 10 placed to the formulation of the raw, and the test passage 22 which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 17 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 24 precisely this passage which he do order as single administrative authority. The lack mow, it was the both the victims, the Sudan formulation of the raw, and the toric that the travel test that the two peoples, and it was the three in the surge and the season with the formulation of the same that the synchetic than the sum, with the	11	Intelligence Report of March 1905, one of the transfer	11	the Condominium authorities about a similar kind of
14 " specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence 15 Report [No. 128] of March 1905." 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can 17 look at the Government's memorial, which is exactly 18 consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This 19 is the Government's memorial, and it said: 20 "It was precisely this passage which led to the 21 The passage there just above the quote, the passage 22 which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 23 "It was precisely this passage which led to the 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in front of them when they thought about the language in 11 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 12 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at 8. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall—and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, hat we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too - Condominium records reported that: 21 The September of 1903 residents of the village of Shikh Rob [the had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 21 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabas, and it has therefore been considered advisable to place them under the same governor as the Arabs of whose co	12	documents."	12	raid. Sheihk Rihan made the complaints, and you can see
15 Report (No. 128) of March 1905." 16 Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can 1906 at the Government's memorial, which is exactly 20 "It was precisely this passage" 21 The passage there just above the quote, the passage 22 which quotes Studan Intelligence Report No. 128: 23 "It was precisely this passage which led to the 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 29 precisely this passage which led to the 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 29 precisely this passage which led to the 6 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Man Intelligence Report No. 128. 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 29 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 29 student that the reis no suggestion in the 39 professor Crawfords comments, there's no suggestion in 49 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 110 front of them when they thought about the language in 21 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyel Protocol. 31 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 30 cortexts. First, you will recall — and we have had 22 context. First, you will recall — and we have had 22 context. First, you will recall — and we have had 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had	13	Let me repeat that so that we don't miss it:	13	them on the screen there. I won't read it out because
16	14	" specifically made to the Sudan Intelligence	14	it's just the point of the complaints.
17 look at the Government's memorial, which is exactly 18 consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This 19 is the Government's memorial, and it said: 19 is the Government's memorial, and it said: 20 "It was precisely this passage" 21 The passage there just above the quote, the passage 22 which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 23 "It was precisely this passage which led to the 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyel Protocol. 13 That is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 14 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 15 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall — and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too — Condominium records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Shekh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted. I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 26 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 27 The passage that led to obe from Unitary is on the Kirr River, and Sheihk Riban: 28 The professor Crawford advisable to place them 29 The professor Daly, but we can look at th	15	Report [No. 128] of March 1905."	15	As we know, it was these complaints and the raids
18 consistent with it. It's on the screen for you, This is the Government's memorial, and it said: 20 "It was precisely this passage with passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this disagnated text. The precisely specially and the same of the disputed text. The precise passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that he does not be disputed text. The precise passage that he the variety of the disputed text. The precise passage that he definition of the transfer in 4 to disting about its the definition of the transfer in 4 Government has disting about its the definition of the transfer in 4 Government has morial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in 19 front of them when they thought about the language in 19 place the tribace of the Abyel Protocol. 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 10 mandate. It makes it unmistakably clear that the transfer of a people. 11 In a Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall—and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record don't any anything different; and 19 place the tribace had in 19 place the wine they thought about the language in 19 place the wine they thought about the language in 19 place the wine they thought about the language in 19 place the wine they thought about the language in 19 place the wine they thought about the language in 19 place the wine they be passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's 19 place the wine they be about a place the wine they be about a place the wine they be look at it. 19 place the wine they be look at it. 19 place the wine they be look at it. 19 place the wine they be look at the distinct the northern 19 place the wine they be look at the transfer on a mean place that the t	16	Professor Crawford didn't make that up. You can	16	that they referred to that resulted in a decision by the
19 is the Government's memorial, and it said: 20 "It was precisely this passage" 21 The passage there just above the quote, the passage which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 22 which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 23 "It was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that we are talking about is the definition of the trunsfer in 2 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 3 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in 4 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion anywhere clse in the record that anything but Sudan 1 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in front of them when they thought about the language in 1 That is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 16 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall — and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 22 an look at the record for ourselves too — Condominium 1 records reported that: 23 That is what the record for ourselves too — Condominium 22 an look at the record for ourselves too — Condominium 22 an look at the record for ourselves too — Condominium 22 an look at the record for ourselves too — Condominium 22 an look at the record for ourselves too — Condominium 23 also blink hold he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 D	17	look at the Government's memorial, which is exactly	17	Sudan Government to ensure that both the victims, the
20 "It was precisely this passage" 21 The passage there just above the quote, the passage which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 22 "It was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that we are talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in Professor Poly, but we can see it on the screen there, and we look at the passage which the Government has said is that is what the travatux refers to; that is what the Government said, it didn't say anything different; and that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at 5 the years of the passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate. It makes it unmistisably clear that the transfer of an erae, but the transfer of a tribe, the transfer of an erae, but the transfer of a tribe, the transfer of an erae, but the transfer of a people. "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country [yes, he had a country] is on the Kiir River, and Sheihk Riban of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan people." "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Riban of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan people." "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Riban of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan people." "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Riban of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan people." "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Riban of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan Arabs, and it has therefore been considered advisable	18	consistent with it. It's on the screen for you. This	18	Ngok and the Twic, and the perpetrators, the Homr, were
21 The passage there just above the quote, the passage which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 22 which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: 23 "It was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 5 I would note that there is no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion in 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the Government way this may that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall — and we have had 20 can look at the record from professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record from the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the screen: 3 So, with that background, let's look now at what the Government has said is the text that the parties — these parties, the Even part	19	is the Government's memorial, and it said:	19	placed together under a single administrative authority.
which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128: "It was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this Tribunal." Page 209 Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the disputed text. The precise passage that we are talking about is the definition of the transfer in Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government's memorial on the screen: Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. Tyou can see the Government in the transfer in the transfer of the transfer of the transfer of the parties. The separties, the SPLM/A and the Government — had in front of them when they negotiated Article 1.1.2. We can see the Government in the transfer of the said is the text that the parties. The separties, the SPLM/A and the Government — had in front of them when they negotiated Article 1.1.2. We can see the Government in the screen: We can see the Government in the screen: Tyou on this subject-matter, describe that purpose very clearly this morning. So, with that the two proposed and the text that the parties. We can see	20	"It was precisely this passage"	20	The rationale was that if you had the same governor
23 "It was precisely this passage which led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 2 clearly this morning. 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 1	21	The passage there just above the quote, the passage	21	looking after both peoples, then it would be less likely
24 formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this 25 Tribunal." Page 209 17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 6 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in the 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion and 11 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the Government said, it didn't say anything different; and that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we have to look at. So let's go look at it. 16 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall — and we have had expert esterinory about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too — Condominium records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 24 to place the tribes to gether under a single authority We heard Professor Daly, the world's leading authority Page 211 25 to place the tribes together under a single authority Page 211 26 the subject-matter, describe that purpose very clearly this moming. 26 clearly this moming. 28 So, with that background, let's look now at what the Government has said is the text that the parties — 4 Government has said is the text that the parties — 5 these parties, the SPLMA and the Government — had in front of them when the pergotiated Article 1.1.2. We can see it on the screen there, and we look at the passage that led to the formulation of the ABC's mandate. It transfer in question was not a transfer of territ	22	which quotes Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128:	22	that the two peoples, and in particular the northern
17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 6 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Cravford's comments, there's no suggestion in 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 19 content of context. First, you will recall – and we have had 20 can look at the record for ourselves too – Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	23	"It was precisely this passage which led to the	23	Arabs, would do bad things to each other. The idea was
17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 6 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in the 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government has said is the text that the parties 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government has said is the text that the parties 15 these passage which the Government has said was precisely 10 the passage which the Government has said was precisely 11 transfer in question was not a transfer of territory, 12 not a transfer of an area, but the transfer of a tribe, 13 the transfer of an area, but the transfer of a tribe, 14 the transfer of a people. 15 that is what, if we are going to look at it. 16 Ave to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 18 of context. First, you will recall and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 26 Tirs perfectly clear that the object of this	24	formulation of the ABC's mandate and that of this	24	to place the tribes together under a single authority.
17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the travaux refers to; that is what, if we are going to look at it. 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 17:23 1 on this subject-matter, describe that purpose very 22 clearly this morning. 23 So, with that background, let's look now at what the 4 Government has said is the text that the parties - 4 these parties, the SPLM/A and the Government had in 6 front of them when they regotiated Article 1.1.2. 17 We can see it on the screen there, and we look at the parties had in 16 front of them when they regotiated Article 1.1.2. 18 the passage that led to the formulation of the ABC's 19 the passage that led to the formulation of the ABC's 10 madate. It makes it unmistakably clear that the 11 transfer of a preaph. 12 transfer of a preaph. 13 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 14 Look at the	25	Tribunal."	25	We heard Professor Daly, the world's leading authority
17:20 1 You can see the Government's memorial on the screen: 2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the travaux refers to; that is what, if we are going to look at it. 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 17:23 1 on this subject-matter, describe that purpose very 22 clearly this morning. 23 So, with that background, let's look now at what the 4 Government has said is the text that the parties - 4 these parties, the SPLM/A and the Government had in 6 front of them when they regotiated Article 1.1.2. 17 We can see it on the screen there, and we look at the parties had in 16 front of them when they regotiated Article 1.1.2. 18 the passage that led to the formulation of the ABC's 19 the passage that led to the formulation of the ABC's 10 madate. It makes it unmistakably clear that the 11 transfer of a preaph. 12 transfer of a preaph. 13 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 14 Look at the		Page 200		Page 211
2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 18 of context. First, you will recall—and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too—Condominum 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained		1 ugo 207		1 480 211
2 precisely this passage which led to the formulation of 3 the disputed text. The precise passage that we are 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 18 of context. First, you will recall—and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too—Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained				
3 So, with that background, let's look now at what the 4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 6 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at it. 16 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 17 Before we look at. So let's go look at it. 18 of context. First, you will recall and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	17:20 1	You can see the Government's memorial on the screen:	17:23 1	on this subject-matter, describe that purpose very
4 talking about is the definition of the transfer in 5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 5 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 6 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	2	precisely this passage which led to the formulation of	2	clearly this morning.
5 Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128. 6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 6 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in the 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 18 of context. First, you will recall—and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too—Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	3	the disputed text. The precise passage that we are	3	So, with that background, let's look now at what the
6 I would note that there is no suggestion in the 7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 18 of context. First, you will recall — and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too — Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	4	talking about is the definition of the transfer in	4	Government has said is the text that the parties
7 Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in 8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 18 of context. First, you will recall and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	5	Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128.	5	these parties, the SPLM/A and the Government had in
8 Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion 9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 18 of context. First, you will recall and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	6	I would note that there is no suggestion in the	6	front of them when they negotiated Article 1.1.2.
9 anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan 10 Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in 11 front of them when they thought about the language in 12 Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. 13 That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the 14 Government said, it didn't say anything different; and 15 that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we 16 have to look at. So let's go look at it. 17 Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit 18 of context. First, you will recall and we have had 19 expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we 20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	7	Government's memorial, there's no suggestion in	7	We can see it on the screen there, and we look at
Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in front of them when they thought about the language in Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the Government said, it didn't say anything different; and that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we have to look at. So let's go look at it. Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained "In September of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained or conduct that the transfer of an area, but the transfer of an area, but the transfer of a people. Look at the slide, look at what it says: "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country [yes, he had a country] is on the Kiir River, and Sheihk Rihan of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan people." "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan: "These people have on certain occasions complained of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it has therefore been considered advisable to place them under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct they complain." It's perfectly clear that the object of this	8	Professor Crawford's comments, there's no suggestion	8	the passage which the Government has said was precisely
front of them when they thought about the language in Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the Government said, it didn't say anything different; and that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we have to look at. So let's go look at it. Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	9	anywhere else in the record that anything but Sudan	9	the passage that led to the formulation of the ABC's
Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol. That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the Government said, it didn't say anything different; and that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we thave to look at. So let's go look at it. Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	10	Intelligence Report No. 128 is what the parties had in	10	mandate. It makes it unmistakably clear that the
That is what the travaux refers to; that is what the Government said, it didn't say anything different; and that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at the slide, look at what it says: "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country to she had a country] is on the Kiir River, and the transfer of a people. That is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we that is what, if we are going to look at the slide, look at what it says: "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country to so the Kiir River, and the transfer of a people. That is what it says: "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country to so the Kiir River, and the transfer of a people. That is what it says: "It he transfer of a people. It has the transfer of a people. It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country the kiir River, and the transfer of a people. It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country the kiir River, and the transfer of a people. It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country the kiir Rob and Sheihk Rihan: The transfer of a people. It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country the kier Rob and Sheihk Rihan:	11			-
Government said, it didn't say anything different; and that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we have to look at. So let's go look at it. Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 14 Look at the slide, look at what it says: "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country 15 "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country 16 [yes, he had a country] is on the Kiir River, and 17 Sheikh Rihan of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan 18 people." 19 "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan: 20 "These people have on certain occasions complained 21 of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it 22 has therefore been considered advisable to place them 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 24 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 15 "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country 16 [yes, he had a country] is on the Kiir River, and 17 Sheihk Rihan of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan 18 people." 20 "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan: 21 of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it 22 has therefore been considered advisable to place them 23 under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct 24 they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
that is what, if we are going to look at travaux, we have to look at. So let's go look at it. Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained "It's perfectly clear that the object of this "It has been decided that Sultan Rob, whose country [yes, he had a country] is on the Kiir River, and Sheikh Rihan of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan "These people." "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan: "These people have on certain occasions complained of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it has therefore been considered advisable to place them under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct they complain." It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
have to look at. So let's go look at it. Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 16 [yes, he had a country] is on the Kiir River, and 17 Sheihk Rihan of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan 18 people." 19 "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan: 20 of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it 21 has therefore been considered advisable to place them 23 under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct 24 they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
Before we look at it, though, let's put it in a bit of context. First, you will recall and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 17 Sheikh Rihan of Toj are to belong to the Kordofan 18 people." 19 "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan: 20 "These people have on certain occasions complained 21 of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it 22 has therefore been considered advisable to place them 23 under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct 24 they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
of context. First, you will recall and we have had expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 18 people." 19 "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan: 20 "These people have on certain occasions complained 21 of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it 22 has therefore been considered advisable to place them 23 under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct 24 they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this		-		
expert testimony about this from Professor Daly, but we can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium records reported that: "In September of 1903 residents of the village of Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained "Are", those: Sultan Rob and Sheikh Rihan: "These people have on certain occasions complained that therefore been considered advisable to place them under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct they complain." It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
20 can look at the record for ourselves too Condominium 21 records reported that: 22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 20 "These people have on certain occasions complained 21 of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it 22 under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct 23 they complain." 24 they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
records reported that: 21 of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it 22 has therefore been considered advisable to place them 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 21 of raids made on them by southern Kordofan Arabs, and it 22 has therefore been considered advisable to place them 23 under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct 24 they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
22 "In September of 1903 residents of the village of 23 Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've 24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 22 has therefore been considered advisable to place them 23 under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct 24 they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
Sheikh Rob [he had either been demoted or promoted, I've never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 23 under the same governor as the Arabs of whose conduct they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				-
24 never figured out quite which, from Sultan Rob] in the 25 Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 24 they complain." 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
Dinka district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained 25 It's perfectly clear that the object of this				
Page 210 Page 212	25	DINKA district of Gnok [presumably Ngok] had complained	25	it's perfectly clear that the object of this
		Page 210		Page 212

,			
17:24 1	transfer, the 1905 transfer, the thing, the object or	17:27 1	Twic Dinka people. That's what the language of the
2	the subject that was transferred in 1905, was the	2	report says, that's what the purpose of the decision was
3	Ngok Dinka and Twic Dinka people, and not a defined	3	meant to be.
4	territorial area, not an area.	4	It is, as I said and I'll no doubt be accused of
5	That's plain when you read the language. It refers	5	being unduly adversarial in my advocacy style but it
6	to, "These people have on certain occasions"; it refers	6	is absurd, quite literally absurd, to say that it was
7	to placing "them", not "it", under the same governor.	7	just Sheihk Rihan and Sultan Rob that were transferred.
8	Beyond any conceivable doubt it was Sultan Rob,	8	No. It's right that people were transferred; it's wrong
9	Sheihk Rihan and their people who were to belong to	9	that it was those two people. It was the Ngok Dinka
10		10	people and the Twic Dinka people.
11		11	I shouldn't in a sense even have to do all this.
12	-	12	I shouldn't have to be harsh. I should be able to be
13		13	understanding, because the Government agreed with me.
14		14	Let's look at what their memorial said. The invention
15		15	that we heard just recently of a transfer of Sultan Rob
16		16	and Sheihk Rihan or of an area isn't what the Government
17		17	said before. You can look in their written submissions.
18		18	The Government said:
19		19	"It was decided in early 1905 to transfer the latter
20	Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128 did not transfer	20	groups [ie the Ngok Dinka and the Twic Dinka] to
21	just Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan. It was not some sort	21	Kordofan."
22	of late 19th century/early 20th century witness	22	The Government didn't say to transfer Sultan Rob and
23	protection programme. This was a transfer of the	23	Sheihk Rihan; didn't say an area. They said it was
24	people. When we look at what happened before the	24	decided in early 1905 to transfer "the groups". Then,
25	transfer, when we look at what the transfer said, when	25	just to make sure we didn't miss the point, they said it
	Page 213		Page 215
	1 age 213		1 age 213
17:26 1	we look at why the transfer was done, we will see that	17:29 1	again:
2	that is inescapably true.	2	"Apparently investigations were carried out and
3	First, it doesn't make much sense in the English	3	a decision was promptly made to transfer both the Ngok
4	language and perhaps that's why Mr Bundy said he	4	and the Twic to Kordofan."
5	wasn't a grammarian to refer to just two individuals	5	They couldn't have put it much more clearly.
6	as people in this context. People is a broader concept	6	Perhaps they could have, actually; they could have just
7	in the English language.	7	referred to Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128, which
8	More fundamentally, though, the Condominium	8	itself is crystal-clear. But just to make sure we
9	- · ·	9	didn't miss the point, the Government said it in the
10		10	plainest of language.
11	-	11	There can be no doubt from the language of 128, no
12		12	doubt from the language of the Government's memorial, no
13		13	doubt from any reasonable interpretation of the purposes
14		14	and the context of this that what was happening was
15		15	a tribal transfer of the Ngok people.
16		16	Exactly the same interpretation of the relevant
17		17	Sudan Intelligence Report and the Condominium decision
18 19			was made by the L-evernment during the ARI' precentations
. 19		18	was made by the Government during the ABC presentations.
	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide	19	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen
20	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide that said two runners did, two Ngok Dinka runners went	19 20	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen in its memorial which its counsel might now want to
20 21	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide that said two runners did, two Ngok Dinka runners went and did. Those people complained, the Ngok Dinka	19 20 21	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen in its memorial which its counsel might now want to explain away. No. Here's what the Government said to
20 21 22	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide that said two runners did, two Ngok Dinka runners went and did. Those people complained, the Ngok Dinka complained.	19 20 21 22	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen in its memorial which its counsel might now want to explain away. No. Here's what the Government said to the ABC experts. Let me read it out from the slide:
20 21 22 23	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide that said two runners did, two Ngok Dinka runners went and did. Those people complained, the Ngok Dinka complained. It wasn't Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan who by	19 20 21 22 23	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen in its memorial which its counsel might now want to explain away. No. Here's what the Government said to the ABC experts. Let me read it out from the slide: "The decision to transfer the Ngok Dinka and Twic to
20 21 22 23 24	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide that said two runners did, two Ngok Dinka runners went and did. Those people complained, the Ngok Dinka complained. It wasn't Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan who by themselves were placed under the Kordofan government; of	19 20 21 22 23 24	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen in its memorial which its counsel might now want to explain away. No. Here's what the Government said to the ABC experts. Let me read it out from the slide: "The decision to transfer the Ngok Dinka and Twic to Kordofan"
20 21 22 23	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide that said two runners did, two Ngok Dinka runners went and did. Those people complained, the Ngok Dinka complained. It wasn't Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan who by themselves were placed under the Kordofan government; of	19 20 21 22 23	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen in its memorial which its counsel might now want to explain away. No. Here's what the Government said to the ABC experts. Let me read it out from the slide: "The decision to transfer the Ngok Dinka and Twic to
20 21 22 23 24	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide that said two runners did, two Ngok Dinka runners went and did. Those people complained, the Ngok Dinka complained. It wasn't Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan who by themselves were placed under the Kordofan government; of	19 20 21 22 23 24	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen in its memorial which its counsel might now want to explain away. No. Here's what the Government said to the ABC experts. Let me read it out from the slide: "The decision to transfer the Ngok Dinka and Twic to Kordofan"
20 21 22 23 24	Condominium officials; that's why I showed you the slide that said two runners did, two Ngok Dinka runners went and did. Those people complained, the Ngok Dinka complained. It wasn't Sultan Rob and Sheihk Rihan who by themselves were placed under the Kordofan government; of course not. It was the Ngok Dinka people and the	19 20 21 22 23 24	It wasn't that the Government made some slip of the pen in its memorial which its counsel might now want to explain away. No. Here's what the Government said to the ABC experts. Let me read it out from the slide: "The decision to transfer the Ngok Dinka and Twic to Kordofan" It didn't say, "The decision to transfer the area

17:30 1	beneath the Kiir to Kordofan", as Mr Bundy would have	17:33 1	On Monday Mr Bundy said:
2	you say. That's what they said there: the decision to	2	"I shall discuss each of these documents in turn,
3	transfer the Ngok Dinka and Twic to Kordofan. Those are	3	but before doing so I might just note in passing that it
4	tribes, those are people; that's not an area.	4	is absolutely extraordinary in the Government's view
5	Let's look at the next slide. The Government then	5	that the ABC experts referred to none of these four
6	said:	6	documents in connection with the transfer in their
7	<u> </u>	7	report, despite the fact that all of them had been
8	Kordofan"	8	submitted to the experts by the Government"
9		9	It's a bit like Professor Crawford's accusation of
10	•	10	a scientific shambles. And, like Professor Crawford's
11		11	accusation, when you go and look at the report with even
12		12	the slightest care, it's wrong.
13		13	Let's look. Far from ignoring the transfer
14	,	14	documents, the ABC experts' final report refers directly
15		15	and specifically to Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128.
16		16	You can see that on the screen, you can read the
17	<u> </u>	17	footnote, you can read it on the text. Mr Bundy didn't
18		18	do it for you, but let me take you to it.
19		19	The experts said specifically that the Sudan
20	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	20	Intelligence Report provides:
21		21	" the official principal reason for the transfer
22		22	of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms"
23 24	9	23	This is the part of the report that supposedly
		24	didn't exist. This is the thing which, extraordinarily
25	It did not, as Mr Bundy sought to do, describe this	25	in the Government's view, the experts never paid
	Page 217		Page 219
17:31 1	as a transfer of territory and an area. They took the	17:34 1	attention to. When you look at what the experts did,
2	•	2	they did just what everybody else who's ever looked at
3	1 1 0	3	this document concluded: they said that it was the
4	• '	4	principal reasons for the transfer of the nine
5	1 23	5	Ngok Dinka chiefdoms to Kordofan, again a tribal
6	y y	6	transfer.
7	-	7	If you don't read the experts' report with any care,
8		8	maybe then you say it's a scientific shambles, maybe
9		9	then you say they didn't even bother to refer to the
10	•	10 11	transfer documents. But if you do read it what you see
11 12		12	is the same thing that the SPLM/A has said, the same thing that I have said, the same thing the Government's
13	•	13	memorial has said, the same thing the Government's
14		13	presentation to the experts said.
15		15	In addition, if you go and look at proposition 7 in
16		16	the experts' report, they described the full context of
17		17	the Sudan Intelligence Report. They ended with another
18		18	conclusion that this was a tribal transfer, not
19		19	a territorial one. They said that the Ngok people were
20		20	regarded as part of the Bahr el Ghazal province until
21		21	their transfer "their transfer" in 1905.
22		22	So I don't think there really can be any doubt about
23		23	it. It's completely clear that the transfer decision in
24		24	1905, which is recorded in Sudan Intelligence Report
25		25	No. 128, which is precisely the passage that the parties
	Page 218		Page 220

17:36 1	had before them when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol,	17:39 1	the provincial boundary in the next years. Contrary to
2	and as to which that's no evidence that they had any	2	the Government's claims, Kordofan's boundaries were not
3	other passage, any other document in front of them, that	3	extended to encompass any particular area, any specific
4	this passage, precisely the passage which formulated	4	area in 1905; again, because it was only the
5	their views, shaped their views, was a transfer of the	5	administration of the Ngok people, and not a defined
6	tribes.	6	territory, that had been transferred.
7	That's what Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128 said.	7	In 1905, as we've seen, the Condominium officials
8	That's, when you go and look at the ABC report, what the	8	had no idea about what territory the Ngok Dinka
9	ABC experts said. That's what Professor Daly said.	9	inhabited. Mr Bundy said this, and I will, with all
10	That's what Mr Schofield said. That's what the	10	respect, stick to my interpretation of what he said.
11	Government's presentations to the ABC experts said.	11	In 1905, as we've seen, the Condominium officials
12	That's what the Government's memorial said. The only	12	had no idea about what territory the Ngok Dinka
13	person who has said something different is Mr Bundy, and	13	inhabited. Mr Bundy said this and I will, with all
14	he is just plain wrong on this issue.	14	respect, stick to my interpretation of what he said
15	Mr Bundy then went on and addressed the question of	15	very clearly when he made the statement in his opening
16	the provincial boundaries. He treated the references to	16	comments that:
17	the provincial boundaries in the annual reports as some	17	"It is self-evident that as of 1905 Government
18	sort of extraordinary revelation. He emphasised how	18	officials would have had no knowledge of tribal
19	there was a reference to changes in the provincial	19	locations"
20	boundaries.	20	The qualification that he added [earlier] didn't
21	That's hardly surprising; it's not surprising in the	21	change the substance of it, but if it did, it doesn't
22	at least. It's obvious that if you transfer a people,	22	matter. You saw from the evidence, you heard from the
23	especially if you transfer a large and widely dispersed	23	evidence, you heard from Professor Daly that the
24	people like the Ngok Dinka, there will be territorial	24	Condominium couldn't have begun to define the territory
25	consequences. A transfer of people will at some point	25	of the Ngok Dinka in 1905; they had no clue, quite
	Page 221		Page 223
17:37 1	entail or at least potentially entail, depending on	17:40 1	literally, about where the Ngok Dinka's territory might
2	where they are territorial consequences. That's what	2	start and where it might stop. Professor Daly confirmed
	happened here: after the transfer decision there were	_	
3	Habbelled here, after the transfer decision there were	3	that. What they did was wherever the Ngok were, they
3 4	= =	3 4	that. What they did was wherever the Ngok were, they put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the
4	territorial consequences.	4	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the
	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the		put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple
4 5 6	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was	4 5	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason.
4 5 6 7	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial	4 5 6 7	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next
4 5 6	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the	4 5 6	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason.
4 5 6 7 8 9	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area.	4 5 6 7 8	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the
4 5 6 7 8	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the	4 5 6 7 8 9	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory
4 5 6 7 8 9	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as	4 5 6 7 8 9	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes:
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905."
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports. We can see references in the annual reports to the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab. Mr Bundy also acknowledged this point clearly in his
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports. We can see references in the annual reports to the changes to the boundaries, but it's useful to look at	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab. Mr Bundy also acknowledged this point clearly in his oral submissions on Monday, when he said and you can
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports. We can see references in the annual reports to the changes to the boundaries, but it's useful to look at them as well. They refer in both cases to the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab. Mr Bundy also acknowledged this point clearly in his oral submissions on Monday, when he said and you can see it on the slide:
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports. We can see references in the annual reports to the changes to the boundaries, but it's useful to look at them as well. They refer in both cases to the Ngok Dinka people, the Dinka Sheikhs: Sultan Rob and	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab. Mr Bundy also acknowledged this point clearly in his oral submissions on Monday, when he said and you can see it on the slide: "The southern limits of the transferred area, and
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports. We can see references in the annual reports to the changes to the boundaries, but it's useful to look at them as well. They refer in both cases to the Ngok Dinka people, the Dinka Sheikhs: Sultan Rob and Sultan Rihan Gorkwei are now included in Kordofan.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab. Mr Bundy also acknowledged this point clearly in his oral submissions on Monday, when he said and you can see it on the slide: "The southern limits of the transferred area, and hence the new post-transfer Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports. We can see references in the annual reports to the changes to the boundaries, but it's useful to look at them as well. They refer in both cases to the Ngok Dinka people, the Dinka Sheikhs: Sultan Rob and Sultan Rihan Gorkwei are now included in Kordofan. Again, this is the territorial consequence of the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab. Mr Bundy also acknowledged this point clearly in his oral submissions on Monday, when he said and you can see it on the slide: "The southern limits of the transferred area, and hence the new post-transfer Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal boundary, were not precisely established in 1905."
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports. We can see references in the annual reports to the changes to the boundaries, but it's useful to look at them as well. They refer in both cases to the Ngok Dinka people, the Dinka Sheikhs: Sultan Rob and Sultan Rihan Gorkwei are now included in Kordofan. Again, this is the territorial consequence of the previous tribal transfer. That's exactly how the Condominium officials treated	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab. Mr Bundy also acknowledged this point clearly in his oral submissions on Monday, when he said and you can see it on the slide: "The southern limits of the transferred area, and hence the new post-transfer Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal boundary, were not precisely established in 1905." That's a bit of an understatement. Far from precisely established, they weren't established at all.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	territorial consequences. But critically, the critical passage before the parties when they negotiated the Abyei Protocol was a tribal transfer that only subsequently had territorial consequences. It was the tribal transfer of the Ngok Dinka people that defined subsequently the area. That is not a case of the Condominium officials, as Mr Bundy has said and as the Government has argued, defining some area beneath the Kiir or somewhere else. They had no idea of what sort of area they might be transferring; they didn't think about it. What they transferred, as everybody said, including the Government, was a people: the Ngok Dinka people. Mr Bundy relied in particular on the annual reports. We can see references in the annual reports to the changes to the boundaries, but it's useful to look at them as well. They refer in both cases to the Ngok Dinka people, the Dinka Sheikhs: Sultan Rob and Sultan Rihan Gorkwei are now included in Kordofan. Again, this is the territorial consequence of the previous tribal transfer.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	put administration of the Ngok in the hands of the Governor of Kordofan, and they did it for a very simple and logical practical reason. When you look at what actually happened in the next years, the Condominium took no steps to delimit the territory because they didn't know what the territory might be. The Government concedes: "The southern limit of the transferred area remained to be delimited in 1905." Likewise the Government says that it was only in 1912, seven years after the transfer, that a provincial boundary line was established between Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal and then, AS we've seen, never more than 25 kilometres from the Bahr el Arab. Mr Bundy also acknowledged this point clearly in his oral submissions on Monday, when he said and you can see it on the slide: "The southern limits of the transferred area, and hence the new post-transfer Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal boundary, were not precisely established in 1905." That's a bit of an understatement. Far from

17:41	1	It makes perfect sense for the reasons that we've	17:44 1	Ngok don't really live anywhere: they're not north,
	2	discussed that they couldn't have. They didn't have any	2	they're not south of the Kiir. But people do live
	3	idea about the territory of the Ngok Dinka, who not	3	somewhere, and if you transfer a people there will be
	4	what, who they had transferred.	4	territorial consequences.
	5	Even after 1912, the southern boundary of Kordofan	5	But the essential question that the Government tries
	6	remained indeterminate and ill-defined because the	6	to confuse is that what Article 1.1.2 refers to is
	7	Government didn't even at that stage know where the Ngok	7	a transfer of people. That's what Sudan Intelligence
	8	really were, and you can see what Mr MacDonald called	8	Report No. 128, which was precisely the passage that was
	9	the spaghetti bowl of different boundaries that were	9	used to formulate Article 1.1.2, said. There were
	10	there.	10	subsequent territorial consequences, but the essential
	11	It's also instructive to consider how the	11	guiding point is that there was a transfer of a people,
	12	Twic Dinka, who we haven't heard that much about and who	12	which is just the way the English language of the
	13	were transferred along with the Ngok, were treated by	13	Abyei Protocol reads.
	14	the Government.	14	Again, as the Government describes it here, it's
	15	In 1929 the Twic Dinka, who had been tribally	15	a transfer of people, the Twic, not of a territory. If
	16	transferred as a people in 1905, were retransferred back	16	that's not clear enough, we can also look at how the
	17	to Bahr el Ghazal. That's undisputed between the	17	Government has described this retransfer.
	18	parties. Again, everybody treated the Twic's retransfer	18	Let's look at their memorial. They talk there about
	19	just the way they had treated their transfer: namely, as	19	the retransfer of the Twic Dinka to Bahr el Ghazal.
	20	a tribal transfer of people, not of areas.	20	They don't talk about a territory. They use that phrase
	21	We can see and this is the best version of the	21	multiple times in their memorial and you can see it in
	22	document that's in the record; it comes from the	22	the slide.
	23	Government's presentation to the ABC experts. It's the	23	Professor Crawford said the same thing when he
	24	published gazette notice of the alteration of the	24	talked about this part of the case in his submissions.
	25	boundaries of Kordofan and Upper Nile provinces. Just	25	He said: a retransfer of the Twic. Again, just
		D 225		D 227
		Page 225		Page 227
17:43	1	parenthetically I note that this is how boundary changes	17:45 1	inevitably lapsing in his case into the plain English
	2	and boundary creations were noticed in the Sudan. If	2	language of what the transfer was: it was a transfer of
	3	there was a boundary, it was noticed in the gazette, the	3	people and tribes. The retransfer of the Twic was
	4	way this is done.	4	exactly on the model of the original transfer of the
	5	It is important to look at this report, and look at	5	Twic, and the original transfer of the Ngok Dinka, not
	6	it closely. It refers as you can see to the transfer of	6	of abstract pieces of territory.
	7	the Ruweng Ajubba, the Ruweng Await and the Ruweng Alorr	7	The simple point is that the description was
	8	sections of Dinka from Kordofan to Upper Nile province.	8	precisely parallel to the earlier transfer decision that
	9	Those are transfers of people. What follows from that	9	we saw in the Sudan Intelligence Report.
	10	transfer of people? As a result then there are certain	10	Finally Mr Bundy took us to what he would have
	11	territorial consequences which if you look at the	11	defined the ABC defined the Abyei Area. He took
	12	gazette notice are described.	12	us to Governor-General Wingate's memorandum, and in
	13	Note down at the bottom of the page the Government's	13	particular to the statement that:
	14	comment on this:	14	"The districts of Sultan Rob and Okwai, to the south
	15	"By then the Twic were already returned to	15	of Bahr el Arab, and formerly a portion of the
	16	Bahr el Ghazal, probably in 1929."	16	Bahr el Ghazal province, have been incorporated into
	17	It's a sequence. You can look at it up there.	17	Kordofan."
	18	There's a transfer of people, a tribe, the Ruweng, which	18	This is treated as some extraordinary revelation
	19	has a consequence of result as a consequence of	19	also. That frankly has no more weight than the province
	20	transferring people which is to alter the boundaries.	20	boundary references previously discussed.
	21	It's no revelation that after you transfer a people	21	Of course there would be consequences from the
	22	there will then subsequently be a boundary adjustment or	22	transfer of the people. Those consequences would be the
	23	a territorial consequence; of course. People have to	23	incorporation of an as yet unspecified area of the Ngok
	24	live somewhere.	24	and Twic territories into Kordofan. That in no way
	2-			
	25	The Government I think seems to believe that the	25	changed of course the fact that the 1905 transfer was
			25	
		The Government I think seems to believe that the Page 226	25	changed of course the fact that the 1905 transfer was Page 228

17:47 1	a transfer of the Ngok people, not a transfer of	17:50 1	grammar; Professor Crystal has told us what that means.
2	a particular area.	2	We look at the purposes, the purposes in 2005; not,
3	Wingate did not try to define the boundaries of	3	as the Government would try to have you do, the purposes
4	an area that was supposedly transferred; no, far from	4	in 1905. Those weren't the purposes of the Government
5	it. He didn't try to define the way that the provincial	5	and the SPLM/A in 2005. You look at the purposes of the
6	boundaries would be changed, because they didn't know,	6	Abyei referendum in interpreting the Abyei Protocol.
7	it would have been impossible.	7	Then, if you're going to have recourse to the
8	As Mr Bundy told us yesterday, the Condominium	8	travaux, as we think you can, you pay attention to what
9	officials didn't know what the area of the Ngok Dinka	9	it was they paid attention to, what the Government told
10		10	you they paid attention to. That was not Wingate's
11	it from the actions of the Condominium officials	11	memorandum, that was not what Mr Bundy told you about.
12	between 1905 and 1911, when they didn't try to change	12	Instead, as has been repeatedly said by the Government
13	the boundary.	13	itself, indeed on Saturday, precisely the passage they
14	•	14	paid attention to was Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128.
15		15	Therefore, even if you were to redo what the experts
16		16	looked at it's not an excess of mandate question, but
17	what Wingate meant by the reference to the Bahr el Arab,	17	even if you were to redo it you would reach exactly
18	whether it was the Ngol or the Kiir. He made that very	18	the same question that everybody else had.
19		19	I'd like to move on from that briefly to the
20	full memorandum, not just the bits that we were taken	20	question of boundaries. We had a lot of discussion
21	to.	21	about it this morning. You'll excuse me if I'm
22	More fundamentally, though, in referring to the	22	cartographically challenged in this. I'll do my best to
23	Bahr el Arab Wingate was merely describing the general	23	try to explain my understanding of the boundaries, and
24	location of the Ngok and the Twic. He was not	24	if I make mistakes I'm sure you'll ask questions so
25	purporting to define the extent of some territory that	25	I can correct myself.
	Page 229		Page 231
	1 age 229		1 age 231
17:48 1	had been transferred. No. He was simply referring back	17:51 1	The Government's case is that there's
2	to what the territorial consequence would be of the	2	a well-established provincial boundary in 1905 between
3	tribal transfer. Of course there was a territorial	3	Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal, which was located on the
4	consequence, but nobody would know what that would be	4	Kiir/Bahr el Arab. The Government argues that the 1905
5	until 1911.	5	transfer, as we've seen, was a transfer of a specific
6	Of course Wingate's memorandum played no role at all	6	area, from south of the boundary to north of the
7	in the 2005 negotiations of the Abyei Protocol. We've	7	boundary.
8	seen what did play a role in those negotiations. What	8	As we've seen, the Government concludes that the
9	did play a role was Sudan Intelligence Report No. 128.	9	purported provincial boundary is decisive to the
10	That is what reference was specifically made to, that	10	definition of the Abyei Area, because only territory
11	was the passage that was precisely relied on by the	11	south of the boundary could have been transferred north
12	parties. There was no hint of Wingate's memorandum in	12	of the boundary to Kordofan.
13	those discussions.	13	For all the reasons that I've already explained,
14	There was frankly virtually no hint of Wingate's	14	that argument is irrelevant. That is not what the
_			
15	memorandum in the Government's memorial. When you go	15	Abyei Protocol in Article 1.1.2 refers to. You don't
16	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the	16	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly
16 17	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of	16 17	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead
16 17 18	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in	16 17 18	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka
16 17 18 19	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus	16 17 18 19	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms.
16 17 18 19 20	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus was on the transfer decision, the transfer of the	16 17 18 19 20	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. But even if we did try to look at the Government's
16 17 18 19 20 21	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus was on the transfer decision, the transfer of the people, not on some supposed territorial transfer.	16 17 18 19 20 21	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. But even if we did try to look at the Government's boundary, the Government's boundary that plays such
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus was on the transfer decision, the transfer of the people, not on some supposed territorial transfer. In sum, where all that takes us is back to where we	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. But even if we did try to look at the Government's boundary, the Government's boundary that plays such a decisive role in its analysis, we'd see that its
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus was on the transfer decision, the transfer of the people, not on some supposed territorial transfer. In sum, where all that takes us is back to where we started. If we're going to interpret Article 1.1.2 of	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. But even if we did try to look at the Government's boundary, the Government's boundary that plays such a decisive role in its analysis, we'd see that its argument is wrong. Even if it were a relevant issue,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus was on the transfer decision, the transfer of the people, not on some supposed territorial transfer. In sum, where all that takes us is back to where we started. If we're going to interpret Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol, we start with the language. We've	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. But even if we did try to look at the Government's boundary, the Government's boundary that plays such a decisive role in its analysis, we'd see that its argument is wrong. Even if it were a relevant issue, the Government's claim that there was some sort of
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus was on the transfer decision, the transfer of the people, not on some supposed territorial transfer. In sum, where all that takes us is back to where we started. If we're going to interpret Article 1.1.2 of	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. But even if we did try to look at the Government's boundary, the Government's boundary that plays such a decisive role in its analysis, we'd see that its argument is wrong. Even if it were a relevant issue,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus was on the transfer decision, the transfer of the people, not on some supposed territorial transfer. In sum, where all that takes us is back to where we started. If we're going to interpret Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol, we start with the language. We've	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. But even if we did try to look at the Government's boundary, the Government's boundary that plays such a decisive role in its analysis, we'd see that its argument is wrong. Even if it were a relevant issue, the Government's claim that there was some sort of
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	back and look at that memorial, and you can see on the screen the references to it, there was no argument of the sort that Mr Bundy has made. It was the same as in the previous presentations to the ABC experts: the focus was on the transfer decision, the transfer of the people, not on some supposed territorial transfer. In sum, where all that takes us is back to where we started. If we're going to interpret Article 1.1.2 of the Abyei Protocol, we start with the language. We've seen what that language means. We pay attention to the	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	need to look you can't look, frankly, if you properly interpret Article 1.1.2 to that boundary. Instead you look at the territory of the nine Ngok Dinka chiefdoms. But even if we did try to look at the Government's boundary, the Government's boundary that plays such a decisive role in its analysis, we'd see that its argument is wrong. Even if it were a relevant issue, the Government's claim that there was some sort of "established provincial boundary" simply isn't correct.

,			
17:52 1	There wasn't in 1905 any determinate or defined	17:56 1	two."
2	Kordofan/Bahr el Ghazal boundary. That's because no	2	You can see the rest of his answer there on the
3	such boundary had been established; and because, even if	3	slide.
4	there had been some reference to the Bahr el Ghazal as	4	We also heard how Bahr el Ghazal had only been
5	a real boundary, that wouldn't have meant anything.	5	established as a province in 1902, less than three years
6	I'll briefly look at both points. Again, we've	6	before the tribal transfer. No boundary between
7	heard testimony on this from Professor Daly and from	7	Kordofan and Bahr el Ghazal was included on any
8	Mr Schofield, who have addressed it specifically. I'll	8	Government map before 1914, nine years after the
9	try to summarise as best I can what's in the evidence.	9	transfer. Even when that happened and there's the
10	Their expert testimony on it I would suggest is much	10	cartographic evidence in the record, referred to in our
11	more to the point, much more decisive.	11	memorials it was only referred to as an approximate
12	Preliminarily, it's clear that in 1905 any	12	provincial boundary.
13	provincial boundary in Sudan was approximate and	13	The Government claimed that there's not a single
14	uncertain. Professor Daly explained it. You'd just had	14	mention in the record of any boundary, other than the
15	17 years of civil war, and Sudan was just coming to	15	Bahr el Arab, between the two provinces before the 1905
16	grips with peace. Nobody was paying attention to trying	16	transfer; you can see the cite to that in the previous
17	to establish boundaries. There were no constitutional,	17	slide.
18	there were no legislative, there were no executive	18	In fact there were multiple references, that
19	pronouncements. There was no gazette that announced the	19	Mr Schofield referred to, to other boundaries that had
20	existence of a boundary.	20	been albeit in a very indeterminate and uncertain
21	There are a couple of references in annual reports	21	way referred to in the preceding years. I won't
22	to how governors approached their particular	22	bother to take you to each of them, but Kordofan was
23	territories. But I would suggest that's not enough to	23	described during the Turkiyya as:
24	create a real provincial boundary of the sort that the	24	" towards the south. No definite confines can be
25	Government has relied on.	25	described, as the extent of these dominions increases or
	Page 233		Page 235
17:54 1	You can tell that in part from the cartographic	17:57 1	decreases."
2	evidence. I'm challenged on it, no doubt, but I'm	2	The same kinds of references were made in the 1877
3	comforted because Mr MacDonald agreed with me. The only	3	general report; and, if we go on to the next slide, in
4	Sudan Government cartographic evidence in the record of	4	similar discussions in 1884; and in Gleichen's handbook,
5	any provincial boundaries is after 1905. If you look in	5	where it's said that the mudiria was vaguely described,
6	the transcript Day 3, page 166, Mr MacDonald	6	but may be described as enclosing the entire district
7	acknowledges under cross-examination that there wasn't	7	watered by the southern tributaries of the Bahr el Arab
8	any Sudan Government map that identified a provincial	8	and the Bahr el Ghazal regions.
9	boundary at that time.	9	The truth of the matter is there was historically
10	We can see how there wasn't a provincial boundary in	10	a huge degree of uncertainty, not surprisingly, about
11	the Gleichen map. This, as he discussed, was a set of	11	where the boundaries might be between whatever the
12	chapter headings; it was not a provincial boundary. It	12	political entities in this area was. The suggestion by
13	wasn't even until 1907 that the Sudan Intelligence	13	the Government that the three or four, two or three
14	Office even began the process of trying to establish	14	however many there were references in annual reports
15	provincial boundaries in Sudan.	15	by the governors created a boundary is simply untenable.
16	You can see a lengthy quote. I'm not going to try	16	There was a process by which boundaries could be
17	to read it, because I'd probably get it wrong. But	17	established. That was a process that hadn't begun, much
18	you'll keep it, and it draws attention to it. This is	18	less ended, by 1905.
19	how Mr Schofield explained the provincial boundary issue	19	Beyond that, even if one took those references that
20	before you this morning, and he did it very well.	20	the Government seizes on so assiduously to the
21	Professor Daly said the same thing. He said:	21	Bahr el Arab as a boundary, that itself doesn't work,
22	"It should come as no surprise to the Tribunal that	22	because the Bahr el Arab, that reference, those three
	with no administration in Kordofan in 1905, and no	23	words didn't convey a meaning that was definite or
23			
23 24	administration in the northern Bahr el Ghazal, there was	24	determinate to the Condominium officials. They didn't
		24 25	determinate to the Condominium officials. They didn't have the same understandings of what those words meant.
24	administration in the northern Bahr el Ghazal, there was simply no need for a provincial boundary between the		
24	administration in the northern Bahr el Ghazal, there was		

17:58 1	We've seen numerous references from Professor Daly	18:01 1	that was identified by 1905, and that's contradicted by
2	and Mr Schofield to the different meanings. I went	2	essentially all the evidence in the record. The experts
3	through some of the different meanings from Wilkinson	3	correctly concluded that the confusion lasted until at
4	and Percival and Lloyd and others.	4	least 1907. If I can quote:
5	The Government has suggested that this was	5	"1905 and [1906] surveys correctly identified the
6	an isolated error by Wilkinson; that was its first	6	Kiir as the Bahr el Arab and the Ragaba ez Zarga/Ngol
7	characterisation. It's since become somewhat less	7	for what it actually was (and labelled it the
8	isolated: it's in Wilkinson and Percival, and now Mahon	8	Bahr el Homr). It was not until 1908, however, that the
9	and Lloyd and O'Connell and others. But it wasn't	9	local administrators in Kordofan consistent described
10	an error that had been rectified, as the Government puts	10	the Ragaba ez Zarga as Bahr el Homr in their official
11	it, by 1905. On the contrary, nobody knew what the	11	reports."
12	situation was, nobody knew what the Bahr el Arab was in	12	The historical record, if we go through it
13	1905 in the Condominium Administration.	13	briefly Mr Schofield did this and I hesitate to
14	Preliminarily and moving on to the next slide	14	repeat it too much, but Mr Schofield did it. If we go
15	it was the ABC experts who identified this confusion.	15	through the historical record, we will see that was
16	We've heard a lot of criticism of their work, but the	16	precisely confirmed. It wasn't just Wilkinson and it
17	experts said:	17	wasn't just Percival who made the mistake; everybody was
18	"Wilkinson was not alone in erroneously demarcating	18	confused.
19	geographic features in the Sudan other reports make	19	You can see how Percival referred to the Ngol in
20	it clear that administrative officials mistook the	20	May 1905, two months after the transfer of the
21	Ragaba ez Zarga/Ngol for the Bahr el Arab and thought	21	Ngok Dinka people. He said that the wildlife was thick:
22	the Kiir was a different river."	22	" between the Lol, Kiir and Bahr el Arab."
23	This is the report that has been castigated in such	23	He thought still in May 1905 that they were two
24	harsh terms, but this was something that the experts	24	separate rivers.
25	themselves identified in their archival research. They	25	That's the same reference that Percival had used
	·		
	Page 237		Page 239
18:00 1	identified not just a single error by Wilkinson, as the	10.02 1	
10.00		18:03	earlier in his reports in 1905, when he referred to the
2		18:03 1	earlier in his reports in 1905, when he referred to the
2	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread	2	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The
3	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion.	2 3	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson
3 4	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion.	2 3 4	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake.
3	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was	2 3 4 5	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the
3 4 5 6	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon,	2 3 4 5 6	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which
3 4 5	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate	2 3 4 5 6 7	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the
3 4 5 6 7 8	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the
3 4 5 6 7 8	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular provisions because I'm worrying about my time, but you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't know which river they had reached. Indeed, Mr MacDonald acknowledged the same thing. You can see the language that was used in his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't know which river they had reached. Indeed, Mr MacDonald acknowledged the same thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular provisions because I'm worrying about my time, but you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't know which river they had reached. Indeed, Mr MacDonald acknowledged the same thing. You can see the language that was used in his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular provisions because I'm worrying about my time, but you can see the references there that Mr Schofield took you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't know which river they had reached. Indeed, Mr MacDonald acknowledged the same thing. You can see the language that was used in his cross-examination on the current slide: that it would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular provisions because I'm worrying about my time, but you can see the references there that Mr Schofield took you to. He talked about the much-vexed question of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't know which river they had reached. Indeed, Mr MacDonald acknowledged the same thing. You can see the language that was used in his cross-examination on the current slide: that it would be very difficult to identify the course of any particular	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular provisions because I'm worrying about my time, but you can see the references there that Mr Schofield took you to. He talked about the much-vexed question of the Bahr el Arab and the Bahr el Homr. Much of the course
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't know which river they had reached. Indeed, Mr MacDonald acknowledged the same thing. You can see the language that was used in his cross-examination on the current slide: that it would be very difficult to identify the course of any particular river.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular provisions because I'm worrying about my time, but you can see the references there that Mr Schofield took you to. He talked about the much-vexed question of the Bahr el Arab and the Bahr el Homr. Much of the course of these rivers is still unknown. Doubt still exists,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't know which river they had reached. Indeed, Mr MacDonald acknowledged the same thing. You can see the language that was used in his cross-examination on the current slide: that it would be very difficult to identify the course of any particular river. The Government tries to pretend that this confusion over what the Bahr el Arab was was a short lived mistake	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular provisions because I'm worrying about my time, but you can see the references there that Mr Schofield took you to. He talked about the much-vexed question of the Bahr el Arab and the Bahr el Homr. Much of the course of these rivers is still unknown. Doubt still exists, he said. Then, moving on, he also talked about the "various
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Government would have had us believe, but a widespread error and a widespread confusion. The experts were right in reaching this conclusion. As you've seen from our reply memorial, it was a confusion that was shared by Percival, Mahon, Boulnois, Gleichen, Lloyd, O'Connell and Wingate himself, whose reports between 1903 and 1907 all proceeded on the premise that the Ngol was described as, referred to as, the Bahr el Arab. That's not surprising when you think about it. The MENAS report explains why that would be the case. Professor Crawford referred to a "featureless plain" on the first day of the proceedings. That in some sense was right. It's completely understandable, given the nature of the watercourses, that the Condominium officials wouldn't know where the rivers were, wouldn't know which river they had reached. Indeed, Mr MacDonald acknowledged the same thing. You can see the language that was used in his cross-examination on the current slide: that it would be very difficult to identify the course of any particular river. The Government tries to pretend that this confusion	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ngol as what he took to be the Bahr el Arab. The Government essentially concedes that not just Wilkinson but Percival made that same mistake. Then the Governor of Kordofan, O'Connell, in the 1906 annual report for Kordofan located Hasoba, which everybody agrees is on the Ngol, on what he called the Bahr el Arab. Again, that reference to the Bahr el Arab plainly meant the Ngol, that reference in 1906 by the Governor of Kordofan. The Government put Governor-General Wingate's memorandum front and centre in its case. Mr Schofield walked you through what was in that memorandum and explained how Wingate himself in that memorandum continued to be confused about what the Bahr el Arab was. That confusion was reflected and explained well by Mr Schofield. I am not going to take you through those particular provisions because I'm worrying about my time, but you can see the references there that Mr Schofield took you to. He talked about the much-vexed question of the Bahr el Arab and the Bahr el Homr. Much of the course of these rivers is still unknown. Doubt still exists, he said.

,			
18:04 1	waterways, known locally as the Arab [the Bahr el Arab],	18:08 1	I'd like to finally turn to two points about the
2	the Lol, the Kiir"; treating the Kiir and the	2	witness testimony.
3	Bahr el Arab as separate rivers.	3	I made reference this morning to Whittingham's
4	Again, if you look at the map that accompanied the	4	sketch map which we put in. I was searching desperately
5	Gleichen text we can see this is the map that Wingate	5	for the Ngok Dinka dugdug and couldn't find it on my
6	would have had in front of him, this was the map that	6	slide. I've now found it. Here you can see on the map,
7	was created in 1904, this was the map that Mr MacDonald	7	just to the south of the Ngol, a reference to
8	was questioned about when you look at the map and how	8	a Ngok Dinka dugdug. You can just see it in the second
9	it labels the rivers, you will see how the Ngol is	9	white box there.
10	referred to as the Bahr el Arab, the Ngol, the	10	There's no question but that this was the Ngol
11	Ragaba ez Zarga.	11	river. Obviously this is one dugdug; one dugdug does
12	It's hard to read on this I guess we don't have	12	not a kingdom make. On the other hand, given the
13	a blowup but the Ngol Ragaba ez Zarga continues on	13	extraordinarily sparse and fragmentary nature of the
14	the 1904 map, which wasn't replaced until well past	14	record, this provides yet another piece of the puzzle,
15	1907, as the Bahr el Arab.	15	another piece of the evidence that contradicts
16	Actually here we have the blowup and it's a little easier for all of us to see. You can see there how the	16	Professor Crawford's repeated assertion that there's not any documentary evidence that shows Ngok Dinka on the
17		17	•
18	Bahr el Arab is clearly referred to as the Ngol.	18 19	Ngol or north of the Ngol. Here you have a Ngok Dinka dugdug exactly on the Ngol.
19 20	So the only official map that the Government had at its disposal at the time when the 1905 transfer occurred	20	I would remind you that this is the map that the
20	left undecided and indeterminate, because of the	20	Government didn't produce. They produced other parts of
22	confusion that Wingate referred to, what the	22	this map; this is the piece they didn't produce. This
23	Bahr el Arab really meant. We've also seen the	23	is the piece that we had to go to the Survey Department
24	statements by Boulnois and O'Connell and Wingate.	24	and copy on the world's worst copying machine and try
25	I'd like to move quickly on to what all this	25	and put in front of you. I apologise for the quality,
23	To like to move quickly on to what an ans	23	
	Page 241		Page 243
18:06 1	geographical confusion meant, and then to end.	18:09 1	but it's the best that they would give us.
2	This geographic confusion on this relatively small	2	Finally turning, as I promised, just briefly to the
3	part of the case, I would suggest, meant that the	3	witness evidence. We heard a question to Dr Poole this
4	references by the Government to the provincial boundary	4	morning, Professor Crawford put to Dr Poole the
5	didn't have any force, they didn't have any impact.	5	following question:
6	Even if there had been a provincial boundary that had	6	"Question: ' the community mapping project,
7	been established, which there wasn't, the references to	7	shows permanent Ngok Dinka villages were located
8	the Bahr el Arab were confused; they didn't have any	8	throughout the Bahr region extending north to
9	determinate or definite meaning in 1905.	9	latitude 10°35' north, both in 1905 and for decades
10		10	thereafter.'
11	case on the notion that something was taken from beneath	11	"There are two different issues here. One is the
12		12	Bahr region. But I'm am interested in the aspect of
13		13	that statement that says 'extending north to
14		14	latitude 10°35". Do you accept the accuracy of the
15	•	15	statement that you showed that the Ngok Dinka villages
16		16	extended to 10°35' north in 1905?"
17	to approach this from the perspective of the	17	Then we heard in his submissions just a few moments
18		18	ago how Professor Crawford said: and look,
19 20		19	Professor Poole admitted on cross-examination that the
20	wasn't a boundary in 1905 that had the significance that	20 21	community mapping report didn't get you up to 10°35'. The truth of the matter was: Dr Poole was dead
21 22		21 22	straight honest. He got asked that question,
22 23		22 23	Professor Crawford read it out to him from our
23	•	23	rejoinder, he answered honestly and transparently.
25	Bahr el Arab, and that didn't, as we saw, mean anything.	25	You heard, he said: no, my report didn't go up to
23	2 and of 1 and that then it, as we saw, mean anything.	23	200 nears, no said. no, my report didn't go up to
Ī		1	
	Page 242		Page 244

			1
18:11 1	10°35'; I examined a study area that didn't go that far;	18:14 1 ac	complished in legal terms. Different possibilities
2	I couldn't go that far. That's an honest answer,		e imaginable, starting from the displacement of
3	an honest answer to a question that was a little		ersons to the extension of personal jurisdiction or
4	different, to be honest.		rritorial jurisdiction, or both, to these people.
5	Let's put up what our rejoinder said at paragraph 5,		So in your view which meaning is conveyed by this
6	and let's blow it up. Here's what Professor Crawford		rm applied in our case, by this term of "transfer"?
7	didn't read to you. He read to you just the last bit.		nank you very much.
8	In fact, here's what we said, and it sort of sums up our		BORN: Thank you very much, Professor Hafner. I'm
9	case:		ying to look at the transcript as we speak to make
10	"In sum, as a fair reading ['a fair reading'] of (a)		re that I had the question properly understood.
11	the pre-1905 and post-1905 documentary records, (b) the		I think, though, that the answer is best understood
12	cartographic evidence, (c) the environmental and		the context of the Condominium administration. What
13	cultural evidence (including the MENAS expert report),		as transferred was the administration of the people.
14	(d) the testimony of Professor Cunnison"		nat's what you see when you look at the purposes of the
15	Who the Government could have put on a video link,		ansfer: it was how the Condominium authorities would
16	and who was well enough to give two witness statements,		pervise, would oversee the respective people, the Homr
17	and who at 86 I think could have come here, or at least		d the Ngok Dinka. What was transferred was the Ngok
18	been on a video link:		om the administration of one place, one governor, to
19	" and Mr Tibbs, (e) the Ngok Dinka witness		e administration of another governor. Therefore the
20	testimony [all 26 statements, and all 48 statements to		ansfer referred to the oversight and administration of
21	the experts], and finally (f)"		e Ngok Dinka tribe. Thank you.
22	And this is where Professor Crawford started reading		E CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. No other questions.
23	to Mr Poole:		So this closes the reply phase on the delimitation
24	" the Community Mapping Project, shows permanent		sue. Tomorrow, Thursday, will be our very last day.
25	Ngok Dinka villages were located throughout the Bahr		'e start again at 9 o'clock, and we finish the hearings
23	rigor Dinka vinages were located unoughout the Dain	25 **	e start again at 7 0 clock, and we finish the fical figs
	Page 245		Page 247
18:12 1	region extending north to the goz and latitude		at 12 o'clock, which means that each side, including the
2	10°35' north, both in 1905 and for decades thereafter."		0 minutes left to the Tribunal for asking questions,
3	I would suggest that you have to read that		will have 75 minutes. I thank you very much.
4	sentence just like you have to read the record as		R BORN: Thank you, Mr President.
5	a whole completely, carefully and fully. When you do		[6 pm)
6	it you see we put the evidence together. We don't pluck		he hearing adjourned until 9.00 am the following day)
7	out soundbites and snippets; we put it together.	7	
8	When Professor Crawford put to Dr Poole that that	8	
9	was what his report said, that wasn't right. Dr Poole	9	
10	put it right: that's not what he said. It's not what we	10	
11	said either. You have to look at the whole record.	11	
12	When you do look at the whole record I would suggest it	12	
13	says exactly what we said there.	13	
14	With that, I'll stop. Thank you.	14	
15	THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much, Mr Born.	15	
16	There is one question on the part of Professor Hafner.	16 17	
17	FIOIESSOI FIAIHEI.	17	
10		10	
18	(6.14 pm)	18	
19	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL	19	
19 20	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL PROFESSOR HAFNER: Counsel, you've put quite a lot of	19 20	
19 20 21	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL PROFESSOR HAFNER: Counsel, you've put quite a lot of emphasis on the expression of "transfer". In	19 20 21	
19 20 21 22	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL PROFESSOR HAFNER: Counsel, you've put quite a lot of emphasis on the expression of "transfer". In particular you say that there was a transfer of	19 20 21 22	
19 20 21 22 23	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL PROFESSOR HAFNER: Counsel, you've put quite a lot of emphasis on the expression of "transfer". In particular you say that there was a transfer of peoples and not of territory. This is only a point of	19 20 21 22 23	
19 20 21 22 23 24	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL PROFESSOR HAFNER: Counsel, you've put quite a lot of emphasis on the expression of "transfer". In particular you say that there was a transfer of peoples and not of territory. This is only a point of clarification which I want to raise.	19 20 21 22 23 24	
19 20 21 22 23	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL PROFESSOR HAFNER: Counsel, you've put quite a lot of emphasis on the expression of "transfer". In particular you say that there was a transfer of peoples and not of territory. This is only a point of	19 20 21 22 23	
19 20 21 22 23 24	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL PROFESSOR HAFNER: Counsel, you've put quite a lot of emphasis on the expression of "transfer". In particular you say that there was a transfer of peoples and not of territory. This is only a point of clarification which I want to raise.	19 20 21 22 23 24	Page 248
19 20 21 22 23 24	(6.14 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL PROFESSOR HAFNER: Counsel, you've put quite a lot of emphasis on the expression of "transfer". In particular you say that there was a transfer of peoples and not of territory. This is only a point of clarification which I want to raise. I would like to know how this transfer was	19 20 21 22 23 24	Page 248

INDEX	
PAGE	
Submissions by MR BORN (continued)1	
MR DENG CHIER AGOTH (affirmed)56	
Examination-in-chief by MR LINDSAY56	
DR PETER POOLE (called)74	
Presentation by DR POOLE75	
Cross-examination by PROFESSOR CRAWFORD90	
PROFESSOR MARTIN DALY (called)98	
Presentation by PROFESSOR DALY98	
Cross-examination by MR CRAWFORD108	
MR RICHARD SCHOFIELD (called)118	
Presentation by MR SCHOFIELD118	
Cross-examination by MR BUNDY128	
Submissions by MR BORN (continued)133	
Questions from THE TRIBUNAL136	
Reply to the Tribunal by MR BORN137	
Reply to the Tribunal by PROFESSOR143	
CRAWFORD	
Submissions by MR BUNDY145	
Submissions by MR CRAWFORD169	
Submissions by MR BORN196	
Questions from THE TRIBUNAL246	

	224:1 225:3,12	academic 75:13	act 121:21 161:8,13	101:15 122:25	225:18 227:14,25
A 170.2	227:18,20,24	accept 97:10,23	163:6	149:3,10 158:2	233:6 240:8 241:4
abandoned 170:2	231:11,21 236:10	129:12 130:7,12,15	acting 2:9	160:24 161:8,13	247:25
ABC 5:17 9:8 22:3,11	238:11 240:15,19	130:16 131:16	acting 2.7 action 122:6 123:1	163:6 164:8,11	against 93:2 147:12
47:4,21 54:19,20 56:1,2 60:20 64:4	240:21,25 241:8	133:1 136:16 143:1	124:17 132:17	211:19 237:20	191:12
68:2 133:23 134:11	243:1	170:21,24 174:2	actions 120:13 229:11	administrator 150:19	Agany 65:9
135:2,13,18 150:25	about-face 207:19	175:2,20 180:9	active 100:9	administrators 33:7	age 65:1,2
151:5 154:5,10	208:3	188:8 244:14	activities 94:1	36:14 99:24 112:16	agency 82:20
172:16 175:11	above 10:6 12:2,18	acceptable 206:9,14	activity 91:12 169:22	149:15 151:8,10	ago 43:8 78:13 119:5
179:6,7,14 180:4	14:14 18:4,6 25:11	accepted 124:2 136:11	actor 191:14	152:20 156:2,8	150:7 205:4 244:18
204:4,21 205:14	27:13 29:12 34:4	173:4 182:9 190:5	acts 102:18	183:22 239:9	Agok 83:10,18 204:19
216:18,22 217:22	46:21 63:10,17	192:15,23 194:2	actual 57:14 82:5 99:7	admission 124:4	AGOTH 56:6 249:4
218:9 219:5,14	98:25 138:5,5	accepts 96:3 182:10	100:9 123:3 147:17	182:12	agrarian 14:6
221:8,9,11 225:23	140:13,16 209:21	access 30:17,24 55:12	147:19 156:12	admit 182:14	agree 40:18 113:12
228:11 230:19	242:12	67:9 86:18 87:14 89:19 90:21	166:15 177:4 194:8	admitted 244:19	114:9 115:25 132:1
237:15	absence 189:22 absent 106:20	accessible 85:24	actually 10:19,23 12:14 13:20 19:15	Adol 65:22 adopt 143:8 205:15	133:5 173:1 195:13 agreed 5:7 35:11
ABC's 47:7 151:2	absenteeism 132:6	accommodate 79:17	37:4 53:5,15,18	206:3	45:22 199:17,19
209:24 212:9	absolute 157:21	142:13,17,19	75:14 81:25 121:3	adopted 179:18	202:10 203:16,16
able 7:19 19:3 50:11	absolutely 84:1	accompanied 33:23	125:1 129:5,10	advanced 100:15	215:13 234:3
54:24 57:4,12 72:19	122:23 124:14	241:4	147:20 152:2,13	149:8	agreeing 54:19
73:25 74:13,14 139:9 140:6 215:12	130:15 184:7 219:4	accompany 85:19	161:7 170:1 187:7	advantage 89:11	agreement 1:2 35:15
about 6:15 11:18	abstract 9:23 205:16	accompanying 36:22	187:21 193:15	adversarial 215:5	69:22 144:22
12:16 21:13,16	228:6	52:13	195:16 216:6 224:7	adverse 188:16	194:10 197:9
22:19 24:20,25 25:2	absurd 106:20 203:7	accomplish 155:17	239:7 241:16	advisable 212:22	198:21 206:23
26:3 27:25 28:20	214:10 215:6,6	accomplished 101:23	adapted 173:24	advocacy 215:5	agreements 35:9,10
29:6 35:8 36:13	Abu 186:20,25 187:5	247:1	add 91:7 149:18 194:7	advocate 147:11	52:24
40:7,8,9 44:17,24	187:20	accordance 1:1 75:1	added 223:20	affirmation 74:24	agrees 178:11 240:7
45:3 50:9 53:6,13	Abut 29:24	98:19 108:23	addition 194:21	118:16	agricultural 9:18 10:1
53:13 55:6,11,22	Abyad 33:14 38:10	118:20 141:6 160:21	220:15	affirmed 56:6 249:4	25:17 28:13 31:9,10 42:8 175:23 181:2
56:16 63:18 64:1,9	Abyei 1:3 13:19 14:3 17:20 20:9 27:13	according 146:1	address 69:11 73:1 74:20 75:5 79:10	affirms 140:1 145:1 afraid 6:24 104:12	agriculture 41:22
64:15 67:23 70:3,12	29:23 31:21 35:9	160:25 168:9	98:13 118:12	Africa 87:9	181:14
71:2,8 75:20,20	45:15,16,16,22 46:4	172:11 184:17	133:21 134:2,4,12	Africa 67.7 African 68:4,4 156:4	agro-pastoral 170:7
76:5,17,19,22 77:12	47:17,18 48:7 49:10	account 1:11 4:15,17	170:1 193:9 196:24	after 7:19 12:21 30:22	Ah 15:5 18:3 97:15
77:13 78:2,2,9,13	49:25 50:5 51:4,7	33:9 67:24 68:19,20	197:18	44:4 58:7 75:23	Ahany 62:13
79:8,23 83:3,23 86:5,16 88:22 89:1	52:24 53:18 54:21	83:25 181:1 195:18	addressed 41:19	78:9 83:4 91:4 95:9	AHMED 2:2
90:21,25 91:7 92:1	57:1,13,15 59:3	accounted 104:3	126:16 196:12	101:12 116:20	aimed 74:2 103:21
92:15 96:3 99:18	61:14 62:1 63:9	accounts 5:2 145:20	203:21 207:5	136:5,13 144:18	airborne 76:18
100:25 102:19	64:19 65:10,11,17	150:17 161:24,24	221:15 233:8	147:23 152:1	Ajak 65:4
104:10 105:11	81:6 83:10,18 87:1	accuracy 83:23 97:10	addressing 207:8	159:18 165:25	Ajubba 226:7
106:6,12 109:4	95:7,8,22 96:7	244:14	adequately 131:13	181:25 184:10	Akonon 94:6
110:12 111:23	101:1,14 103:1,4,11	accurate 81:1 86:1	adjacent 100:13	185:6 211:21 222:3	Akuei 66:20
112:12 113:5,7	103:14,24 106:18	112:20 193:17	adjoining 129:3	224:14 225:5	ALAIN 2:3
116:3 119:4 120:23	107:13,14 115:16 123:23 134:1,18,19	accurately 11:1 accusation 135:18	adjourned 137:1,4 248:6	226:21 234:5 235:8 239:20	albeit 235:20 Alei 61:14,15,17,19
121:3 122:14	134:20,22 137:19	219:9,11	adjustment 226:22	239:20 afternoon 147:1	63:5 65:13 66:20,25
126:12,15 128:17	138:19 139:12,17	accused 198:8 207:12	administer 183:23	151:16,21 193:6	94:7,10
131:18 134:10,11	141:6 142:6 143:7	215:4	administer 163.23	afterwards 15:21	alien 156:10
136:16 141:23,24	143:23 180:5 181:2	Achak 12:20 13:3,4	161:1,4	again 1:9,10 3:2 8:25	Allan 25:1 37:14
141:24,25 142:1,14 151:2 152:13 155:4	181:13,16,19 195:3	61:22 62:6,7 64:24	administering 100:23	10:17 12:25 13:12	38:12 40:16,18
157:4 158:24,25	196:11,16,20 197:8	achieve 155:22	administration 99:4,9	21:1 24:25 25:9	42:23 51:13 128:17
161:21 162:13	197:10,19 198:5,17	achieved 89:21 95:21	99:12 100:9,12	26:24 28:12,23	153:8 162:1 173:3
165:23 176:25	199:5,6,9,12,14	96:6 172:2	101:19,20 103:2	29:14 32:4 34:17,20	Allan's 120:9
177:13 178:14,14	202:10,11,12,13,14	Achueng 62:24 63:5	105:8,13 108:8,12	35:4,17 41:16 42:21	alleged 151:24 182:5
178:21 181:6	202:16,16,22	65:4,7,12	110:3 111:15 121:2	54:11 62:14,16 66:2	allegedly 152:24
183:13,23 186:3,21	203:13,19,23 204:3	acknowledge 124:7	124:11 127:25	66:22 69:21 73:17	allocate 121:11 156:3
189:9 191:5 192:5	204:4,9 207:3,6,11	acknowledged 20:22	130:4,7 146:10	74:10 75:24 97:17 103:13 123:8 125:1	allocated 130:2
193:4,7,11 194:16	207:14,17,18 208:4 208:14 209:5,9	52:25 125:2,4 158:8 198:11 224:18	153:24 160:2,25 161:3 163:8 167:14	103:13 123:8 125:1 126:3 127:1 130:22	allocates 121:10 allocating 123:2
194:22 199:15	210:12 221:1 222:6	238:19	189:22 190:19,25	143:7 159:7 176:24	allocation 121:9
203:23 205:21,23	227:13 228:11	acknowledgement	191:5 213:10	183:2 185:23	122:13,16 127:21
205:24,24,25	230:7,24 231:6,6	184:3	218:14,19 223:5	192:17 196:13	allow 60:12
207:19 208:16,24	232:10,15	acknowledges 213:16	224:4 234:23,24	199:21 202:7 204:5	allowed 72:2 145:4
210:4,11,19 211:1,4 211:11 218:6,12,12	Abyei's 51:9	234:7	237:13 247:12,13	204:25 205:1 216:1	172:21 183:10
211:11 218:6,12,12 218:17 220:22	Abyior 56:21 61:5,6	acknowledging 44:8	247:18,19,20	217:9 218:22 220:5	allows 25:14
222:14 223:8,12	61:10 64:17 65:1	across 203:15	administrative 101:13	222:23 223:4	alluded 88:24 127:5
222.11 223.0,12					

127:16 131:7	197:4	233:5 242:25	162:12 163:21	106:18,24 107:15	argument 13:17 160:6
					C
almost 46:16 52:16	anglicised 124:5	anyway 82:21	164:2,15,22,25,25	110:14 117:4	170:1,24 173:23
101:5 126:21	Anglo-Egyptian 99:4	anywhere 50:12	165:3,9,10,10,11,19	122:17,17 134:1,19	176:3 180:10,17
137:15 170:2	99:20 100:21	185:13 210:9 227:1	166:16,21 168:17	134:20,22,25 135:1	191:8 230:17
alone 19:11 237:18	104:18 105:20	apart 13:21 148:10	168:21,25 170:12	136:15 137:19,19	232:14,23
along 21:24 32:21	166:11 182:18	151:3 242:20	170:14 176:15	137:23,23 139:12	arid 37:21
34:24 35:2 49:13	angry 138:13	apologise 30:22 49:17	179:11 182:23	140:7,12 141:6,13	arise 44:22
52:22 59:4 63:4	animals 183:21	63:12 118:5 243:25	183:3,15,18 184:11	141:23 142:6,11,13	arises 172:23
84:9 95:19 99:10	annex 69:19,21	apparently 37:11	184:12,21,21 185:9	142:20 145:16,23	armed 104:15
120:3 125:17	194:12,13	108:20 181:15	185:11 186:7,7,13	145:25 148:3	Arop 28:25 56:18
126:25 130:4	announced 109:8	194:2,21 216:2	187:2,13,16 189:1	149:10 150:3,18	61:18 62:22 64:19
132:13,16 146:20	233:19	Appeal 198:16	189:19 192:4	152:13,22 153:13	arose 102:12
150:4 170:11,13	announcing 107:5	appear 6:5	193:22 194:17	153:19,21,23 155:1	around 12:13 15:6
185:23 186:6,9	annual 111:23 112:10	appeared 2:4,7,9	197:6 214:13	155:14,19 157:9	28:4 33:2 34:5
225:13		122:15		-	
	112:14 115:2,5		224:17 228:15	159:6,16 160:3	35:18 43:20 44:3
alongside 59:11	125:20 126:1,5,22	appears 20:13 124:9	229:14,17,23 232:4	162:21 165:14	63:24 73:10 84:2
Alor 61:5	130:8,12,12 132:22	applicable 120:21	235:15 236:7,21,22	166:1 167:5,19	95:6 100:24 107:24
Alorr 226:7	150:15 152:6,8	applied 200:8,10	237:12,21 238:10	168:16,16,23,24	110:14 118:22
ALOYSIUS 2:9	158:6 162:7 165:8	206:20 247:6	238:25 239:6,22	169:22,23 170:3	119:6 138:19 176:8
already 15:1 28:11	165:17 221:17	apply 156:4 160:23	240:2,8,8,15,22	171:12 172:8,9,14	176:15 181:13
55:17 63:18 64:13	222:17,18 233:21	202:2	241:1,1,3,10,15,18	172:15,15,17	187:12
83:3,13 86:5 87:2	236:14 240:6	appreciate 27:8	241:23 242:8,25	174:18 176:6,6,7,11	Arouth 57:20,21,23
87:18 107:11,17	another 1:13 13:4,8	appreciated 160:21	Arabian 119:14	176:15,20,24	57:24 58:4,6,11,12
135:4,5 138:3 154:1	19:13 28:9,16 29:9	appreciation 187:23	Arabic 89:14,14 114:1	178:15 179:5,6,12	58:20
155:20 159:20	31:5 33:6,19 42:12	approach 55:14 151:9	114:4	179:14,22,23 180:1	arranged 4:25 84:25
167:17 172:2	61:22 63:15 83:24	151:15.17 242:17	Arabs 7:9 14:24 15:5	180:3,5,10,12,13,17	arrangements 178:3
177:12 182:14	84:3 92:24 102:6	approached 83:5	17:1 37:7 39:13	180:18 181:13,19	arrested 3:20 4:1,7
191:10 217:20	104:25 106:25	161:9 233:22	41:6 57:22 59:11,12	183:8,18 184:14	arrival 44:4 46:14
226:15 232:13	125:15 131:6,8,10	appropriate 83:12	109:4 113:10,17	189:1 193:1,8,15,22	arrive 207:4
alter 226:20	140:8 149:11	108:22 125:10	148:22 175:8,18	193:22,25 194:23	arrived 104:6 209:6
alteration 225:24		208:2		-	
	155:15 159:12		183:16 191:23	195:3,4 196:12,16	211:5
although 30:15 39:14	163:1,3 179:19	appropriately 100:3	211:1,23 212:21,23	196:21 197:8 198:5	article 1:1 39:11,25
41:9 121:16 124:14	187:17 194:15	approval 160:11	Arab's 128:3	198:18 199:5,9,22	40:7,25 41:18 45:24
151:1 158:14	220:17 243:14,15	approve 93:11,21	arbitral 56:11	200:1,4,21 201:8	47:16 48:6 134:3
170:22 194:20	247:19	approved 93:12,14,19	arbitrary 205:16	202:12,16 204:4,9	143:7 170:5,8
213:15	answer 9:10,12 74:19	93:20	ARBITRATING 1:4	204:11,22 206:25	174:20 175:6
always 36:1,2 50:3	90:18 93:22 109:12	approximate 233:13	arbitration 1:1,2,4	207:3,6 212:12	196:20 197:16,24
79:22 82:9 86:17	109:13,14 112:8	235:11	2:10 73:22 134:24	213:4,4 215:16,23	198:3,5,18,20 199:2
88:20 103:9 139:13	117:15 129:14,18	approximately 28:3	198:20	216:25 217:4,9	199:16,25 200:17
139:15 171:5	130:1 132:8 137:8	April 1:7 1:1 204:20	arbitrators 69:15	218:1 222:9,12,13	200:19 201:2,8,24
AL-KHASAWNEH	143:13 202:8	205:1	architectural 183:9	223:3,4 224:11,21	202:1,15 203:4,25
1:11	203:25 235:2 245:2	Arab 1:15 3:20 4:1,7	archival 237:25	228:11,23 229:2,4,9	206:5,13,16,19,21
al-Zarga 117:8	245:3 247:11	4:14 5:6,9,11 6:17	Arctic 75:16,19 76:3	232:6,10 236:12	206:22,24 210:12
Amakok 11:3	answered 9:7 41:24	6:25 7:11 14:23,25	76:18	245:1	212:6 218:4 227:6,9
amazing 183:22	143:18 173:3	16:19 20:16,16,21	area 1:3 7:7,13 8:19	areas 7:23 8:3,14 18:1	230:23 232:15,17
Amazon 76:22 86:17	197:12 202:8,9	20:23,24,25 21:7,25	10:12,24 11:14	20:9 27:11 29:22	242:14,15,19
	206:10 218:24		13:23 17:18,20	36:11 42:17 44:6	articulated 148:20
Ambassador 2:2		23:6 24:9,13,16,18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
204:10,20 206:2,8	244:24	25:7 26:4,6 27:16	19:11,17,19,24 20:5	47:9 50:11 51:9,10	asked 76:2 83:15
American 76:1 121:8	answering 129:21	27:19 29:3,6,7	20:6,10,14 21:23	51:11 55:7 59:5,11	90:19 92:5 93:9,21
132:3	anthropological	32:17,20 34:8,25	23:24,25 25:23	59:13 62:4 70:17,18	126:23 128:16
Ameth 57:11,14	170:22 171:1,2,19	35:2 38:8 39:6,7,10	27:13 28:13 29:12	71:3,10 86:20 104:1	132:9 137:6 178:2
Amiet 62:14	195:7	39:16,20,21,24 40:3	29:18 30:20 31:2,4	104:2 106:21 121:1	188:4 189:11
among 15:20 66:25	anticipated 98:12	41:13 43:20 52:11	31:8,21 32:2 34:3	140:15,17,25 141:8	192:15 244:22
67:25 136:20	anticipation 46:15	52:21 61:2 104:16	35:1 37:2,11,15,17	141:10 149:13,24	asking 93:13,19,20
138:21 188:25	Antila 50:3,6 52:5	106:14 113:11,14	38:5 39:8,14 40:2	152:15,23 153:15	108:6 111:7 248:2
amongst 144:6,20	61:8,8 138:22	115:4,12 119:22	41:17 43:18,20,24	153:24,25 154:20	aspect 97:8 186:4
177:13	anybody 84:21 93:6	122:19,21,23,24	44:2 45:4 46:2	155:15,18,20	201:23 244:12
amount 20:13 81:4	anymore 175:12	124:2,11,19 125:3,8	47:18 50:3,16 54:22	156:16 164:1 167:9	aspects 8:21 37:8 41:1
85:13 181:11	anyone 106:9 107:16	125:11,17,23	58:5,6,6 61:14 63:9	167:11,13 168:4	asserted 157:10
amounted 143:20	118:24 122:3 181:5	126:13 127:1,2,7,13	70:24 71:15 72:19	177:2,4 181:6	161:17
amounting 171:15	anything 15:24 30:3	127:19 129:9	73:11,24 74:5 82:14	189:14 193:3	assertion 128:2 176:4
amounts 161:2	46:16 79:24 85:11	130:18 132:24	82:17,19 84:5 85:8	205:25 225:20	243:16
analysis 3:5 200:16	88:13 104:10	136:12 137:22,22	85:22 86:25 90:20	argue 116:9 196:19	assess 72:12
209:7 232:22	117:16 167:17	138:5,13 141:11,20	90:23 95:10,11	argued 42:18 196:15	assessing 149:21
anarchy 148:11		146:18 150:5	96:17 97:18 98:1,2	213:12 222:11	assessing 149.21 assessment 159:15
•	173:12,13 181:5		•		162:20
ancestors 73:16 89:8	195:22 203:22	152:16 155:7,7,25	99:6 100:14,24,25	argues 18:5 34:19	
ancestral 138:12	204:18 210:9,14	157:17 158:17	101:1 103:1,4,24	159:13 232:4	assiduously 236:20

	I				
assistance 72:3 74:4	42:18 43:12 46:24	129:9 130:11,18,18	basis 5:1 18:9 63:20	195:18 200:20,21	139:2
associated 169:25	back 1:8 8:4,13 17:12	132:24 136:12	63:25,25 67:13 85:2	215:5	biggest 63:7
191:3	34:2 35:7 44:20	137:22 138:25	94:19 150:15	Belbel 66:19	biggish 13:3
association 76:10 82:2	48:5 51:7,19 60:6	139:1,25 140:3	173:16 176:11	Belgians 105:2	Bimbashi 16:3
assuage 7:19	60:14 63:15 77:23	141:11 145:24	180:24 191:6	Belgium 50:16 73:25	biography 133:9
assume 84:7 95:1	78:9 80:14 81:16	146:17,18 148:23	193:25 198:3,14,25	170:16	Biong 56:18 61:5,18
161:14 180:17,19	83:15 86:12 87:9,25	149:1,24 150:5,16	batches 88:17	belief 75:2 98:20	62:22 85:5 92:19
1			Bavarian 123:9	118:20	
assumed 181:9,10	89:4 91:5,9,9 95:25	152:16,17 153:18			birthplaces 65:5
assuming 84:6 172:13	110:12 116:10	153:22 154:1 155:7	Bayldon 16:4 115:3	believe 45:11 49:7	bit 9:20 16:5 24:22
assumption 92:24	119:1 120:18	155:7,16,18,25,25	154:19,21 155:1,1,4	92:17 108:25 119:4	28:15 36:8 51:7
95:3 171:3 193:25	122:12 126:24	157:6,17 158:17	163:23 164:16	159:15 200:5	54:9 60:15 62:1
assurance 195:21	139:24 140:22	162:12 163:8,15,20	165:2 189:13	226:25 238:2	90:17 96:13 98:11
Atem 136:6 138:6	142:14 143:22	164:2,5,15,22,23,25	Bayldon's 158:15,25	believed 47:10 56:2	113:22 140:8
140:1 141:17	160:9 172:19	164:25 165:3,9,10	189:16	believes 170:17	197:17 207:18
142:18	180:11 182:25	165:10,11,19	bear 98:22 107:1	Beliu 65:4	209:2 210:17
Atem's 137:12,17	183:1 186:25 193:4	166:13,16,21	bearing 71:18 184:13	belong 56:20,21 185:3	213:12 217:15
138:1,15 139:3	195:23 196:23	167:12 168:6,17,18	bears 101:14 168:14	194:1 212:17 213:9	219:9 224:24 245:7
197:13	197:12 198:1 201:4	168:21,25 170:12	became 61:23 79:9	belonged 193:24	bits 81:21 144:3
attached 194:11	206:10 225:16	170:14 171:13	83:24	194:2 202:25	229:20
attaches 242:22	230:1,16,22	173:12,17,17,21,22	become 44:16 237:7	belonging 24:7 167:9	bizarre 143:8
attempt 116:17	background 75:13	173:24 176:14,15	becomes 107:9 166:9	belongings 45:7	black 39:1 40:13
attempts 73:14	82:11 212:3	179:11,24 180:1	becoming 76:7	belongs 173:18	68:25 174:19,25
attend 177:20,22	backward 116:12	182:23 183:3	before 1:1,10 2:24	below 193:22	175:1,13,16,21,23
attention 22:8,9 49:1	backwards 24:19,21	184:12 185:9,11	5:16 13:14,16 32:24	beneath 18:2,3 34:8	176:1 177:3
77:1,7 101:10	back-burn 9:15 10:7	186:7,7,13 187:2,13	45:17 55:4 56:1,18	69:10 142:11	blank 77:21
120:13 135:21	back-burning 10:14	187:16 189:1,19	60:18,23 63:14,19	201:10 217:1	blessing 190:2
165:21 187:18	43:15	190:23 192:4,20	67:25 71:8 90:9,14	222:12 242:11	blood-dimmed 148:12
207:21,25 220:1	bad 75:22 89:19	193:22 194:17	90:19 91:18 94:5,8	benefit 172:22	blow 25:4 245:6
230:25 231:8,9,10	177:14 211:23	204:13 220:20	99:13 103:21 105:1	beside 57:23	blowup 241:13,16
231:14 233:16	badly 133:22	224:16,17 225:17	106:18 107:15	best 53:25 60:25 74:18	Blue 115:17
234:18 242:18	Baffin 76:9	226:16 227:19	116:11 132:22	82:9 117:2 119:15	board 78:19
attested 120:10	baggage 44:22	228:15,16 229:14	135:2,13 136:14	148:14 168:15	body 150:22 194:22
attitude 169:25	Baggara 37:7,8 41:1,6	229:17,23 232:3	137:7 138:18	225:21 231:22	Bok 52:19
attributable 171:13	148:21 175:18	233:4 234:24 235:4	139:21 141:9,11	233:9 244:1 247:11	bold 162:16
attributes 80:19	Bahr 1:20 3:20,24 5:6	235:7,15 236:7,8,21	143:6 159:18	bestowed 108:18	Bolivia 87:10
attuned 46:9	5:9 10:10 14:10,19	236:22 237:12,21	162:22 164:13	Beth 58:13,13	Bombo 184:16
Australian 112:6	14:23,25 20:6,16,18	238:10,25 239:6,8	167:17 181:10	better 129:2 148:24	Bongo 13:10 62:11,12
authorities 79:2 85:3	20:21,23 21:7 22:22	239:10,22 240:2,8,8	189:15 195:23	between 1:2,4,15 6:4	64:24
211:11 247:15	22:25 23:4,6,23	240:15,22,22 241:1	201:3 207:10,18	6:12 20:5 21:10	book 33:24 41:6 49:19
authority 20:14 94:18	24:9,13,15,16,18	241:3,10,15,18,23	210:17 213:24	25:20 27:16 30:20	110:19 111:6
98:25 106:4 121:2	25:7,18 26:18 27:16	242:8,25 244:8,12	215:17 218:10	34:3 35:10 36:3	books 37:3,3,4
149:3 160:12	27:19 31:7,8,14	245:25	219:3 221:1 222:5	37:25 38:2 39:8,9	book-length 32:10
211:19,24,25	32:17 33:1,13,22	band 14:18	234:20 235:6,8,15	39:17,23 40:5 45:17	border 115:18
availability 183:23	35:2 38:1,2,4,8,11	bank 21:25 31:20 49:8	began 2:18 11:11	48:1 49:24 57:11	bordering 42:19 58:15
available 76:7 177:20	38:15,15,24 39:6,7	185:24 186:8,9	110:8 181:10 207:4	70:6 75:21 80:23	borderland 131:12
181:12	39:7,8,13,16,16,20	banks 6:8 8:3 20:17	207:7 234:14	83:18 89:13 92:6	borderland 131.12 borderlands 114:2
average 90:24	39:24 40:3,10,18,22	32:21	begin 119:17 145:6,14	101:22 110:22	120:3,4 122:1 128:6
avoid 44:20	41:8,13,16,21,25	Bara 29:24 30:20	175:4 177:3 197:24	120:6 127:10	131:12
Await 226:7	42:4,17,22,22 43:16	31:21	beginning 91:20	128:20 131:10	borders 51:6
Awak 61:7 64:25	43:18,19,20,23 44:9	barely 34:7	139:16 189:13	146:2 161:16	bore 180:3
award 160:14	45:5 46:14,14,18	Bari 29:24	beginnings 99:9	162:24 164:3,5	born 2:5 1:3,4,5 27:4
aware 92:4,9 93:8	47:9,18 48:16 52:1	barracks 102:11	begins 17:15 38:15	167:23 168:25	27:8,9,10 56:22,23
109:4 128:16	52:11,21 53:9 69:8	barrier 47:25	51:6 145:9 182:19	179:15 190:21,23	56:24,25 57:1,5,8,9
132:19 156:19	71:12 97:4,8 99:1	base 63:9 83:16 89:19	begun 10:9 126:14	194:6 224:15	57:10,18,20 59:23
163:25 207:15	99:13,18,22,22,25	based 6:14 23:3 34:21	223:24 236:17	225:17 229:12	59:25 60:3,5,10,11
away 8:11,14 16:21	100:16 101:21	36:6 52:1 86:13,14	behalf 2:4,7 197:14	232:2 234:25 235:6	64:17,19 65:4,14,23
17:5 43:6 46:19	102:7,25 103:17	103:15 161:23	behind 153:20 167:7	235:15 236:11	65:24 96:11 98:11
58:19 102:4 103:11	106:14 107:23	169:15 173:20	being 2:22,24 8:2	238:8 239:22	111:4,6,11 114:17
107:7 141:14 143:4	110:23 113:11,14	181:2 190:8	12:13 22:25 27:8,17	beyond 22:2 131:18	118:2,5 129:13,21
186:10 201:1,4	114:23,23 115:4,12	basic 150:7 187:10	28:7,8 37:25 49:19	132:21 139:2	132:8,9 133:15,16
216:21	115:19,20 119:22	202:12 203:9	68:7 86:14,23	141:20 143:20	135:23 136:4 137:2
AWN 1:11	122:19,21,23,24	basically 22:6 70:24	121:22 122:10	172:2 213:8 236:19	137:7,9,10 146:7
Awol 58:13 63:3	124:2,10,11,18,19	77:25 110:4 111:14	129:10 157:17	Bial 57:10,11,14	147:1 169:16,17
24W01 50.15 05.5	124:24,25 125:3,8	182:21 196:19	161:1 164:24	bias 93:2,3	170:18,23 174:20
B	125:11,17,23 126:6	203:17	173:24 183:7,15	Biero 35:4 39:16 40:4	175:5 177:10,23
	126:13 127:7,10,12	basics 120:18	184:21 193:11	52:23	183:4 185:6,18
b 8:22 31:11 245:11	127:13,19 128:3,20	basin 99:18 115:12	194:3,14,20,21	big 3:9 77:21 91:9	186:18 187:22
Babanusa 37:16,21	121.13,19 120.3,20	Da3111 77.10 113.14	174.5,14,20,21	uig 3.7 //.21 71.7	100.10 107.22

191:2 194:9 195:23	137:21 146:2,4,5,6	build 8:6,9 139:22	camps 29:6,13 34:18	172:6 222:20	Chak 20:15,15 113:19
191.2 194.9 193.23	150:6 154:8 159:11	140:5	43:12 51:3	castigate 134:8,9	113:19
1 1					
247:8 248:4 249:3	159:13,17 160:4	built 39:1 58:7	Canada 67:11 75:25	castigated 237:23	challenge 66:6,7 73:17
249:15,17,21	161:16,22 162:5,11	bullet 114:5	76:14	categorically 158:10	74:11 93:5 122:4
Born's 147:18 169:10	162:13,19,19,24	bundle 69:15 113:4	Canadian 54:3,8 73:2	cattle 2:10 6:23 7:13	171:15 200:12
both 2:1 9:2 16:3,5	163:2,11 164:3,4,6	Bundy 2:3 59:20	75:16,19 76:4	8:22 10:15,20,21,22	challenged 40:16
19:21 20:17,21 22:3	164:19 165:4,6,9,12	128:12,14 129:15	CANNU 2:9	11:2,5,5,5,7,9,16,19	42:24 63:19 74:16
27:12 35:20 45:19	165:13,18,20 166:1	129:22 130:7 132:9	canyon 15:25	11:25 12:3,4,21,22	133:25 135:17
47:4 74:16 97:6	166:5,6,9,10,15,18	133:10 145:10,12	capable 122:10	12:25 15:3 18:13,14	193:12 231:22
98:24 114:17	166:20,21 168:3,4	145:13 169:5	capacity 80:8 174:12	18:14 21:11,11	234:2
121:19 123:6	168:11,12,20,25	196:15 199:6	capital 100:20 101:9	34:17 37:7 41:12,18	Chambers 2:2
124:17 127:11	179:14 190:22	203:21 207:4,7	108:15 110:15	41:23 43:14 50:7,8	chance 30:18 60:13,20
134:6 136:5 148:1	192:4 193:19 194:3	208:12,13 213:12	Captain 4:14	51:3 59:4,7,8	64:4
159:18 160:7 161:9	194:5,9,18,25 195:2	214:4 217:1,25	caption 94:6	139:12,19,23 140:6	chances 76:2 176:22
165:8 174:4 190:3	195:18 196:18	218:24 219:1,17	capture 71:25,25	140:11,18,19,19	change 79:16 80:14
192:21 196:15	205:16 223:1	221:13,15 222:11	201:14	169:19,20 173:23	88:12 112:5 149:11
		T		· ·	
205:25 211:17,21	224:15,23 225:5	222:17 223:9,13	care 5:21,23 7:2 21:2	174:4,5,7,13 176:3	168:11 223:21
216:3 222:20 233:6	226:1,2,3,22 228:20	224:18 228:10	67:16 72:11 75:10	176:7 179:20 189:2	229:12
244:9 246:2 247:4	229:13,15 232:2,6,7	229:8 230:18	88:4 219:12 220:7	189:3 211:2,7	changed 106:3 228:25
bother 220:9 235:22	232:9,11,12,17,21	231:11 249:14,19	career 105:25	cattle-owning 175:18	229:6
bottom 18:21 94:11	232:21,25 233:2,3,5	Bundy's 207:16 208:3	careful 22:8,9 192:10	caught 201:21	changes 159:24
123:19 226:13	233:13,20,24 234:9	buoy 136:18	carefully 3:14 8:18	caused 9:5,10 10:4	162:13,16 163:17
Boulnois 124:4 238:7	234:10,12,19,25	Burakol 2:14,19,25	15:7 23:8 35:24	136:9 138:9 141:12	163:18 164:21
241:24	235:6,12,14 236:15	3:18 4:5 13:10,18	73:15 187:5 188:22	cavalry 61:2	165:18 168:20
boundaries 22:2	236:21 242:4,6,12	14:2 17:15,19 26:6	246:5	ceased 111:22	221:19 222:19
102:24 110:5,21,22	242:12,21,23	28:25 113:5,8	carpet-bombing	census 116:6,13	226:1
111:19,24 112:12	boundary's 121:5	191:15,21	182:13	central 75:25 99:11	channel 176:21,21
119:12,19 120:12	bowl 225:9	bureaucratic 105:21	carried 156:8 159:1	123:1 127:21	chapter 23:3 234:12
120:14,24 124:15	box 130:23 170:14	burial 74:7 94:3 95:6	168:24 211:1	132:16	character 46:6 181:5
130:14,23 132:19	243:9	burning 10:1,11 86:19	214:15,16 216:2	centralised 124:16	characterisation
134:7,8,21 135:4	boys 214:16	bush 43:1	carry 163:5	centrality 120:14	170:21 237:7
138:21 146:8	breadth 107:10	buy 44:21 191:23	carrying 165:2	centre 14:6,14 49:25	characteristic 31:22
149:12 157:12	break 60:3,8,23 71:1,8	buying 189:3	cars 95:2	148:10 151:2	33:17 34:17 169:24
159:24,25 160:24	137:7 196:3,5	byres 50:7	cartographic 182:2	175:16 240:12	171:14 183:7
	bridge 45:17,18,19	byres 30.7	234:1,4 235:10	centred 65:16	characteristically
161:4 162:9,16	0				
163:5,17 164:8,9,12	48:6		245:12	centres 189:4	170:22
164:21 165:24	brief 103:19,19 147:1	c 245:12	cartographical 171:15	century 8:10 54:8,10	characteristics 79:21
166:13 172:7,9	briefly 20:12 43:13	Cairo 105:16	187:6	104:21 110:15,21	169:13
193:4 195:17 205:3	61:13 69:11 121:5	calculated 82:15	cartographically	122:16 150:7	
205:22 221:16,17		culculated 02.13			charitable 127:14
	134:4 193:6 196:25	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8	133:25 135:17	213:22	check 95:14 111:12
221:20 222:19	231:19 233:6		231:22	century/early 213:22	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21
	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1			check 95:14 111:12
221:20 222:19	231:19 233:6	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3	231:22	century/early 213:22	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11	231:22 cartography 125:12	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 cheek-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,89,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,67,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14 127:10,20 128:4,20	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16 45:3,20 48:5	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3 190:12 197:12	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,67,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24 195:3,15 208:3	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1 117:23 118:13,16	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12 201:15,18,22
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,89,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14 127:10,20 128:4,20 128:23,24,25 129:4	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16 45:3,20 48:5 brothers 44:18 45:8	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,67,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24 195:3,15 208:3 222:10 227:24	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1 117:23 118:13,16 128:9 133:12	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12 201:15,18,22 202:24,24 203:5,8
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14 127:10,20 128:4,20 128:23,24,25 129:4 129:6,18 130:2,2,3	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16 45:3,20 48:5 brothers 44:18 45:8 48:21,22	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3 190:12 197:12	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24 195:3,15 208:3 222:10 227:24 228:1 232:1 238:12	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1 117:23 118:13,16 128:9 133:12 135:23 136:25	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12 201:15,18,22 202:24,24 203:5,8 204:12,23 205:4,7
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14 127:10,20 128:4,20 128:23,24,25 129:4 129:6,18 130:2,2,3 130:5,17,17,21	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16 45:3,20 48:5 brothers 44:18 45:8 48:21,22 brought 37:1 82:21	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3 190:12 197:12 Camel 4:15 189:19	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24 195:3,15 208:3 222:10 227:24 228:1 232:1 238:12 240:12 242:3,11,20	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1 117:23 118:13,16 128:9 133:12 135:23 136:25 137:2,6,10 143:11	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12 201:15,18,22 202:24,24 203:5,8 204:12,23 205:4,7 207:1,1 219:22
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14 127:10,20 128:4,20 128:23,24,25 129:4 129:6,18 130:2,2,3 130:5,17,17,21 131:2,4,11,15,20,22	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16 45:3,20 48:5 brothers 44:18 45:8 48:21,22 brought 37:1 82:21 141:17 162:13	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3 190:12 197:12 Camel 4:15 189:19 camels 6:19	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24 195:3,15 208:3 222:10 227:24 228:1 232:1 238:12 240:12 242:3,11,20 245:9 247:6	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1 117:23 118:13,16 128:9 133:12 135:23 136:25 137:2,6,10 143:11 143:12 145:6 169:5	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12 201:15,18,22 202:24,24 203:5,8 204:12,23 205:4,7 207:1,1 219:22 220:5 232:19
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14 127:10,20 128:4,20 128:23,24,25 129:4 129:6,18 130:2,2,3 130:5,17,17,21 131:2,4,11,15,20,22 132:6,12,13,23	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16 45:3,20 48:5 brothers 44:18 45:8 48:21,22 brought 37:1 82:21 141:17 162:13 194:14	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3 190:12 197:12 Camel 4:15 189:19 camels 6:19 camera 88:11	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24 195:3,15 208:3 222:10 227:24 228:1 232:1 238:12 240:12 242:3,11,20 245:9 247:6 cases 78:22,22 86:4,6	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1 117:23 118:13,16 128:9 133:12 135:23 136:25 137:2,6,10 143:11 143:12 145:6 169:5 196:1,7 246:15	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12 201:15,18,22 202:24,24 203:5,8 204:12,23 205:4,7 207:1,1 219:22 220:5 232:19 242:16
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14 127:10,20 128:4,20 128:23,24,25 129:4 129:6,18 130:2,2,3 130:5,17,17,21 131:2,4,11,15,20,22	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16 45:3,20 48:5 brothers 44:18 45:8 48:21,22 brought 37:1 82:21 141:17 162:13	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3 190:12 197:12 Camel 4:15 189:19 camels 6:19 camera 88:11 cameras 88:7,8,8	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24 195:3,15 208:3 222:10 227:24 228:1 232:1 238:12 240:12 242:3,11,20 245:9 247:6	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1 117:23 118:13,16 128:9 133:12 135:23 136:25 137:2,6,10 143:11 143:12 145:6 169:5	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12 201:15,18,22 202:24,24 203:5,8 204:12,23 205:4,7 207:1,1 219:22 220:5 232:19
221:20 222:19 223:2 225:9,25 226:20 229:3,6 231:20,23 233:17 234:5,15 235:19 236:11,16 boundary 20:15,16 21:17,18 24:8,12,17 26:4 27:16 38:14 39:21 47:24 49:6,14 49:24 52:12 81:13 101:22,23 102:3,12 102:13,16,20 106:7 106:8 117:4 119:12 120:18,21 121:11 121:21,22,24 122:5 122:7,8,9,10,17,18 122:21,25 123:3,5 123:10,15 124:12 124:13,20 125:14 127:10,20 128:4,20 128:23,24,25 129:4 129:6,18 130:2,2,3 130:5,17,17,21 131:2,4,11,15,20,22 132:6,12,13,23	231:19 233:6 239:13 244:2 bring 45:13 63:15 brings 148:6 Britain 119:15 British 29:17 62:6 99:14,24 101:7,12 101:15 102:4,8,9 103:4,6,11,14,15,20 104:1,5,6,7,12,14 104:25 105:8 106:17,22 107:3 108:8 112:16 114:3 115:9,14 190:21 218:14 broader 74:15 144:10 193:18 201:3,5 214:6 broadly 183:1 brotherhood 44:16 45:3,20 48:5 brothers 44:18 45:8 48:21,22 brought 37:1 82:21 141:17 162:13 194:14	call 57:23 58:2,3 79:8 98:15 113:13 114:1 134:7 137:21 169:3 199:11 called 2:2,14 4:15 11:3 12:20 13:6,7 27:20 34:16 42:13 43:18 57:10,20 65:16 69:19 74:22 98:17 99:22 100:2 103:22 111:9 118:15 133:4 139:3 140:18 151:13 161:18 187:22 225:8 240:7 249:6,9,12 calls 41:16 183:2 Cambridge 120:11 came 29:12 43:12 58:8 59:3 62:7 74:5 77:23 85:19 87:6 88:17 94:23 95:3 190:12 197:12 Camel 4:15 189:19 camels 6:19 camera 88:11 cameras 88:7,8,8 camp 44:14 45:5	231:22 cartography 125:12 cartoon 69:14 case 19:14,18 21:20 29:19,19 40:23,24 43:5 44:24 45:10 47:2 48:14 71:24 83:20 85:3,22 86:17 91:2 92:16,21 93:10 100:16 112:10 137:16,17,18 141:7 141:24 145:19 157:14 158:19,22 160:10,11,20 162:5 164:13 165:11,13 170:20 171:2,6,7,13 172:11,13,24 174:9 177:15 185:15,16 189:20 190:4,21 191:7 192:8,24 195:3,15 208:3 222:10 227:24 228:1 232:1 238:12 240:12 242:3,11,20 245:9 247:6 cases 78:22,22 86:4,6	century/early 213:22 ceremony 148:13 certain 20:13 62:23 106:24,24 166:19 166:22 172:4 178:17 192:7 212:20 213:6 226:10 certainly 103:1 105:6 111:21 114:2 115:11,13 118:18 122:10 123:18,21 128:24 143:16 147:11 154:13,17 157:14 158:13 162:1 191:20 Chairman 1:3 27:4,9 59:19,20,21,25 60:2 60:4,6,10 74:23 89:23 98:7,15 108:1 117:23 118:13,16 128:9 133:12 135:23 136:25 137:2,6,10 143:11 143:12 145:6 169:5 196:1,7 246:15	check 95:14 111:12 checked 83:4 84:21 191:12 192:10 checks 147:17,19 check-to-jowl 19:23 Chel 170:11 chief 1:19 14:8,13,17 28:24 56:17 60:17 61:4,18,19 62:11,24 64:20 65:4 66:20 103:22 184:12 201:19 chiefdom 65:13,15 85:8 94:23 chiefdoms 55:21 56:20 61:11,23,25 62:5 117:4 134:14 138:20 145:16 154:7,13 196:22 199:22 200:1,5,20 200:22,23 201:9,12 201:15,18,22 202:24,24 203:5,8 204:12,23 205:4,7 207:1,1 219:22 220:5 232:19 242:16

Day 3				vi cano	suay, 22nu April 200
chieftaincy 66:21	218:16,24 223:15	81:6 82:8 90:19	complementary 81:24	conditions 153:1	129:5 145:22 148:5
chief's 66:24	224:18 241:18	148:8 151:5 190:1	complete 80:17	189:7	157:4 237:15 238:3
Chier 56:4,6 249:4	climate 173:24	233:15	170:19 189:22	Condominium 1:8	238:6,24 239:3
childish 71:16	climatic 153:1	command 114:22	193:15	4:13 7:21 16:16,19	240:16 241:22
children 59:4	clinging 136:18	157:22	completely 11:7 19:22	17:4 19:23 21:4	242:1,2,23
choice 179:3	clinic 103:7	commences 174:25	23:8 26:11 29:5	22:6 25:25 26:7	Congo 79:12,16
choices 80:23	close 49:1 165:21	comment 97:14 120:2	70:14 86:18 115:17	32:13 36:14 98:14	congratulated 68:5
Chol 61:18 66:20,21	186:9	147:1 226:14	144:5 203:9 220:23	99:20 105:20	congregate 51:3
choose 54:1 193:20	closely 96:14 226:6	commented 132:2	238:15 246:5	109:21 110:3	congregated 181:23
200:11 203:1	closes 247:23	191:10	completion 91:20,21	111:13,20 123:2,24	connected 38:7
chose 6:25	closest 102:11	comments 84:19	complex 76:12 114:7	127:22 128:22	connection 153:1
chosen 68:5	closing 133:21 134:4	104:13 114:15	120:9 149:14	129:16 132:25	165:24 168:10
chunk 138:25 139:2	140:22 154:11	206:3 209:4 210:8	complicated 116:11	145:23 146:22	219:6
circumstances 28:19	clouds 9:3	223:16	136:19 148:19	148:2,17,19 149:6	conscience 75:1 98:19
160:22 192:13	clue 223:25	committed 25:8	149:16 171:20	149:14,23 150:3	118:19
203:6,20	cluster 14:8,14 18:23	common 5:10 9:1	Comprehensive	151:13,22 152:1	consequence 190:13
citations 23:7	clustered 19:4	78:25 113:4	206:23	153:6,10 154:17	222:23 226:19,19
cite 147:12 235:16	clusters 49:11	commonplace 79:9	compressed 171:4	155:12 156:7	226:23 230:2,4
cited 10:20 160:10	clutch 184:20 185:2	common-sense 200:10	comprised 152:15	157:11 158:12	consequences 197:1
174:20	Co 2:2	communicate 112:17	compromise 144:14	159:9,19 161:23	221:25 222:2,4,8
cites 23:13 27:15	coexisted 179:24	113:21	144:18	162:4 163:10,21,25	226:11 227:4,10
citing 13:15 175:5	coexistent 194:5	communicated 112:23	computer 80:12 81:21	167:3 168:24	228:21,22
civil 100:4 157:22	coincide 68:2	112:24	conceal 17:6	175:25 185:2 190:1	conservation 75:20,22
233:15	coincides 139:8 141:4	communications	concede 180:19	207:9 210:20	consider 64:4 132:24
civilian 76:7 105:23	cold 205:16	76:14 114:21	conceded 208:20	211:11 214:8,19	225:11
Civsec 69:12,19	Cole 181:1,3	communities 48:2,4	229:10	216:17 218:11	considerable 32:18
180:10,12,13,18	collaborate 81:10	75:18 79:1,14 80:1	concedes 224:10 240:3	222:10,25 223:7,11	33:12 144:20
194:11	colleague 87:2 127:6	community 63:15	conceivable 213:8	223:24 224:8 229:8	177:24 194:4
claim 26:11 80:5	152:11	72:3,4,19,22,23,25	conceived 102:12	229:11 236:24	considerations 156:7
135:12 170:3	colleagues 75:11 78:1	73:12,12,13 74:8,17	conceives 206:14	237:13 238:16	160:23
173:19 198:2,4,15	93:10 156:20	75:7 76:8 78:14	concentrate 84:4	247:12,15	considered 50:3
232:24	collected 102:1	79:18,22 80:21 81:3	86:25	condominiums 142:16	119:24 128:23
claimed 23:5 99:6	collecting 81:15	81:11,23,25 82:2,7	concept 74:17 178:21	Condominium's	129:4 153:10
186:19 235:13	collection 82:6 184:1	84:25 85:16 87:8	214:6	131:14 156:15	156:17 164:11
claims 1:14 25:24 79:8	collectively 60:24	90:13,15 91:5 94:22	concepts 77:14,14	conduct 76:2 212:23	212:22
223:2	200:2	94:22 95:18 97:3,18	156:9	conducted 63:24 72:9	considering 98:23
clarification 119:2	Colombia 78:3	97:20,23 98:3,4	concern 102:23 114:8	74:18 192:12,14	132:25 152:19
246:24	colonial 54:2 99:4	144:10,20 173:2	115:8,16 158:11	202:18	164:2
clarifying 190:15	101:24 102:18,20	192:6,7,11,19,25	189:9	confess 13:17	consist 196:16
classic 110:19	103:10 104:18	244:6,20 245:24	concerned 61:12 70:6	confesses 106:15	consistent 2:8,23 4:9
classroom 84:9 clay 38:16 39:1 40:13	156:2 189:24,24	community's 105:5	104:24 105:4	confidence 81:5	8:5 11:14 12:6
•	191:5 colonialism 189:25	community-based	155:13,14,17	confident 84:5 confines 235:24	13:14 21:8,18 22:11
174:23 clays 38:6	combination 191:7	76:16	158:11 183:23	confirm 56:9 58:16,18	23:19 24:14,25 28:8 29:14 32:25 33:17
clays 38:0 clean 116:23	combined 86:24	company 76:4 189:19 compared 151:5	concerning 16:7 concerns 7:19 100:5	209:6	33:18 34:6 35:25
	come 4:6 8:12 45:5	181:15		confirmation 28:12	
clear 2:13 3:18,25 4:19 7:25 12:11	56:12 59:13 61:24	comparison 87:20	101:3 159:10 169:11,14 188:11	confirmed 5:13.14	37:13 42:9 46:25 47:1,16 48:16,17
20:19 27:18 31:17	70:21 87:9,17,25	compels 10:15	concession 187:25	20:21 153:8 162:2	69:5,6,7 71:1 89:16
39:20 58:4 83:6	101:18 111:16	compendium 4:18	192:14 206:15	200:6 201:7 224:2	144:5 167:20
139:2 144:9 152:19	127:9 140:22	22:15,19 23:9 24:1	concessions 208:21	239:16	198:13 204:15,16
155:8 156:23 159:3	143:22 171:17	24:5 25:3 26:2	conclude 55:23	confirms 3:22 28:23	209:18 239:9
161:25 167:7	172:19 176:20	competence 131:18	concluded 220:3	91:16 127:5 202:3,5	consistently 36:3,3
171:21 178:15	180:11 182:25	competing 79:5	239:3	202:5 208:6,6	202:24
189:13 190:1	185:5 193:4 195:23	compilation 91:4	concludes 41:14 232:8	conflict 136:9 138:18	consisting 39:15
192:24 200:19	196:23 199:13	compile 79:3,3	concluding 18:9	conflicts 59:9,14	consists 39:17 175:16
202:1,2,12 206:23	205:11 218:8	compiled 105:22	conclusion 10:15 16:1	conforming 191:25	constitute 123:1 130:5
212:10,25 220:23	234:22 245:17	complain 55:11	22:10 48:11 117:2	confronted 58:12	164:3
227:16 229:10,19	comes 47:22 80:20	212:24	127:9 128:17,19	203:14	constituted 1:1 129:6
233:12 237:20	115:5 186:22,25	complained 64:9	138:8 146:4 161:14	confronting 89:18	constitutes 172:16
clearance 115:22	225:22	155:2 210:25	166:25 168:22	confuse 227:6	constitutional 233:17
clearest 168:15	comfortably 176:4	211:10 212:20	200:19 201:6,6,7	confused 124:19	constructed 191:7
clearing 126:13,15	comforted 234:3	214:18,21,22	206:24 220:18	126:21 127:12,15	consultants 187:6,18
clearly 2:20 18:20	coming 4:10 6:11 7:15	complaint 150:11	238:4	239:18 240:15	consultation 178:1
44:8 105:10 127:2,9	11:20,21 12:2,4,18	160:1	conclusions 25:15	242:8	contain 162:8
138:14 141:8 157:2	17:11 28:1,4,5	complaints 109:3	28:20 48:19 55:1	confusing 39:19	contained 193:15
158:7 163:13	48:20 56:14 59:23	148:20 211:12,14	68:9 167:6	confusion 106:12	contains 38:8 64:12
208:19 212:2 216:5	61:9 62:2,2 64:1	211:15	concordance 191:25	120:5 121:16 123:4	contemporaneously

150:20	Corps 4:15 189:19	cows 12:23	cultivates 31:7,7	dark 38:6,15	deference 68:15
contemporary 107:15	correct 93:17 110:2,9	cracking 38:6,16	cultivates 31.7,7 cultivation 31:2,18	data 80:18 86:10	define 105:14,15
156:15 161:24	126:8 154:14	Crawford 2:2 6:6	42:10 46:23,24 52:7	87:10,19 91:1	199:9 204:11,22
contempt 55:5,15	231:25 232:25	12:12 22:18 26:25	74:7 135:1 176:2	192:11,11	218:20 223:24
content 80:13 93:15	corrected 125:6	27:6 32:1 33:21	186:13	date 75:14 84:12	229:3,5,25
133:3	correctly 147:14	38:18 45:10,23 53:5	cultural 245:13	117:6 147:23	defined 40:13 43:25
context 11:18 92:4	158:16 164:15	53:17,22 55:23	culture 14:7,20 39:2	169:14 170:19	47:25 49:24 123:19
110:24 127:4	239:3,5	69:13 70:15 89:25	41:22	dated 33:24 91:23	123:24 131:3,13
129:23 145:3	cost 76:17,17 82:15	90:2,4 96:11,15	cultures 62:5	126:2	137:19 199:21
169:17 172:6 177:8	counsel 2:9,9,9 90:5	98:6 108:4,5 111:5	Cunnison 14:12 23:19	dates 94:13 171:3,5	201:17 213:3 222:9
177:14 184:22	96:3 126:3 128:15	111:13 114:18	25:1 33:18 34:10	dating 150:6	223:5 228:11,11
194:15 195:8 201:3	136:4 143:24 144:3	117:21 120:11	36:20,20,25 38:11	Dawas 29:23 138:22	233:1
201:5 210:18 214:6	147:4,8,12,24	133:22 143:15,16	38:17,21 40:18,20	day 5:3 58:22 70:15	defines 39:5 176:13
216:14 220:16	151:16 154:4,16	145:18 148:1	40:24 41:6,14,19	83:8 89:3 110:20	179:24
247:12	157:9 173:15	154:10 169:4,6,8,9	42:7,25 44:7,11,25	125:5 158:4 161:25	defining 123:1 202:12
contexts 192:7 200:11	174:20 178:9,10	196:1,15 197:5	45:12 46:5 47:3,6	188:13 206:16	222:12
contingent 6:18 61:1	181:1 182:8,10	203:21 209:3,16	47:19 48:24 50:21	209:1 234:6 238:14	definite 102:20 129:4
155:10	184:17 190:9,20	227:23 238:13	51:12,17 53:14 69:5	247:24 248:6	182:12 235:24
continual 88:22 91:12	193:5 195:12	244:4,18,23 245:6	70:20 71:10 139:9	days 5:5 29:13 54:20	236:23 242:9
continually 46:10	216:20 246:20	245:22 246:8 249:8	176:13 177:7,16,21	54:21 55:6 58:14	definitely 25:20
continued 1:4 12:19	counsel's 150:11	249:11,18,20	178:10,11,13 179:2	59:9 83:3 103:16	definition 120:20
15:17 123:23	198:9	Crawford's 3:23 34:2	188:21 245:14	104:14 123:25	122:14 123:18
133:15 171:14	counter-memorial	35:8,17 51:20 197:8	Cunnison's 39:4 43:9	125:20 195:11	130:6 171:21,22
240:15 249:3,15	69:19,22 146:20	208:20 210:8 219:9	48:9,12 51:24	197:21	172:18 173:16
continues 39:4 241:13	206:6	219:10 243:16	Cunucunuma 76:21	de 121:7	196:11 197:1 198:4
continuous 59:7	countries 78:16	create 233:24	curious 69:17	dead 15:25 19:20,25	198:17 199:5 204:4
176:22	country 6:4 12:21,22	created 47:5 236:15	curiously 182:15	244:21	205:17 207:2,5
continuum 87:12	16:8 20:14 21:23	241:7	current 1:16 2:15 4:24	deal 79:4 93:3 102:21	210:4 232:10
contracted 123:11	29:23 32:18 37:17	creations 226:2	26:21 54:11 61:6	136:9 143:23 182:3	definitive 102:17
contradict 26:11	38:10 78:23,23	critical 120:2 170:19	62:10 63:8,11 64:1	dealing 76:12 102:10	degree 3:2 121:24
contradicted 239:1	102:23 153:16	222:5	238:21	159:24	172:4,5 176:17
contradicts 40:23	157:1,3,5 167:21	critically 222:5	customs 104:9	dealt 188:12	236:10
243:15	170:15 175:8	criticise 67:7 72:8	Cutler 2:6	debunks 1:13	degrees 119:19
contrary 12:12 16:9	185:24 186:1,2,3	criticised 15:8,9		decade 76:1 129:10	delaying 84:3
17:3 18:11 21:19	212:15,16	criticism 237:16		decades 97:6 192:22	delegation 204:7
28:7 33:20 45:22	couple 91:8 197:21	criticisms 64:7 71:22	d 245:14	202:25 244:9 246:2	deliberate 132:15
53:21 154:25 203:9	233:21	73:19	Dagak 63:2	decamp 44:5	deliberately 177:10
			Dugun 03.2		
204:17 223:1	course 1:10,25 5:18	Critique 42:14	daily 4:25 69:15	December 4:16 113:2	delimit 224:8
204:17 223:1 237:11	course 1:10,25 5:18 6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8	Critique 42:14 crop 173:21 174:12	daily 4:25 69:15	December 4:16 113:2 decide 67:23 203:18	delimit 224:8 delimitation 119:23
	*	_	146:21		
237:11	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8	crop 173:21 174:12	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21	decide 67:23 203:18	delimitation 119:23
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinated 79:13	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinates 84:22	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinated 79:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinated 79:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16 coordinator 92:19	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11 cover 84:5,6 105:21	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6 crystal-clear 216:8	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8 175:16	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18 decreases 236:1	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18 demarcation 77:10
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16 coordinator 92:19 copies 28:17	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11 cover 84:5,6 105:21 106:2,6,15 136:17	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examine 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6 crystal-clear 216:8 cult 31:2	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8 175:16 Darfur 24:10 49:6	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18 decreases 236:1 decidesione 13:25 212:15	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18 demarcation 77:10 121:15
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversant 77:16 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinated 79:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16 coordinator 92:19 copies 28:17 copy 28:18 116:23	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11 cover 84:5,6 105:21 106:2,6,15 136:17 161:17,19,19	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6 crystal-clear 216:8 cult 31:2 cultivable 181:11	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8 175:16 Darfur 24:10 49:6 100:17 164:5	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18 decreases 236:1 decree 146:9 deduce 71:15	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18 demarcating 237:18 demarcation 77:10 121:15 Dembloya 205:1
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinated 79:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16 coordinator 92:19 copies 28:17 copy 28:18 116:23 243:24	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11 cover 84:5,6 105:21 106:2,6,15 136:17 161:17,19,19 covered 77:24 86:9	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6 crystal-clear 216:8 cult 31:2 cultivable 181:11 cultivate 41:21 42:3	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8 175:16 Darfur 24:10 49:6 100:17 164:5 165:15 166:17	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18 decreases 236:1 decree 146:9 deduce 71:15 deemed 161:5 171:5	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18 demarcation 77:10 121:15 Dembloya 205:1 democratic 79:11
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16 coordinator 92:19 copies 28:17 copy 28:18 116:23 243:24 copying 30:23 243:24	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11 cover 84:5,6 105:21 106:2,6,15 136:17 161:17,19,19 covered 77:24 86:9 193:1	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6 crystal-clear 216:8 cult 31:2 cultivable 181:11 cultivate 41:21 42:3 46:17,18	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8 175:16 Darfur 24:10 49:6 100:17 164:5 165:15 166:17 192:4 194:9,17,25	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18 decreases 236:1 decree 146:9 deduce 71:15 deemed 161:5 171:5 deep 89:6	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18 demarcating 77:10 121:15 Dembloya 205:1 democratic 79:11 202:17
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinated 79:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16 coordinator 92:19 copies 28:17 copy 28:18 116:23 243:24 copying 30:23 243:24 corner 38:10 175:9	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11 cover 84:5,6 105:21 106:2,6,15 136:17 161:17,19,19 covered 77:24 86:9 193:1 covering 105:16	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6 crystal-clear 216:8 cult 31:2 cultivable 181:11 cultivate 41:21 42:3 46:17,18 cultivated 31:2,4,8	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8 175:16 Darfur 24:10 49:6 100:17 164:5 165:15 166:17 192:4 194:9,17,25 195:2	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18 decreases 236:1 decree 146:9 deduce 71:15 deemed 161:5 171:5 deep 89:6 deeply 38:6,15 92:9	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18 demarcating 77:10 121:15 Dembloya 205:1 democratic 79:11 202:17 democratically 203:2
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16 coordinator 92:19 copies 28:17 copy 28:18 116:23 243:24 copying 30:23 243:24	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11 cover 84:5,6 105:21 106:2,6,15 136:17 161:17,19,19 covered 77:24 86:9 193:1	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6 crystal-clear 216:8 cult 31:2 cultivable 181:11 cultivate 41:21 42:3 46:17,18	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8 175:16 Darfur 24:10 49:6 100:17 164:5 165:15 166:17 192:4 194:9,17,25	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18 decreases 236:1 decree 146:9 deduce 71:15 deemed 161:5 171:5 deep 89:6	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18 demarcating 77:10 121:15 Dembloya 205:1 democratic 79:11 202:17
237:11 contrast 2:19 160:1 contribute 85:4 contribution 88:16 control 80:13,17 99:6 99:7 110:16 155:15 161:10 controlled 148:24 controversial 148:18 convenient 102:11 conversation 88:22 conversations 88:24 convey 236:23 conveyed 67:6 247:5 conviction 148:14 213:13 convinced 89:5 coordinate 95:13 coordinated 79:13 coordinates 84:22 96:19,21 193:16 coordinator 92:19 copies 28:17 copy 28:18 116:23 243:24 copying 30:23 243:24 corner 38:10 175:9	6:6,10 16:12 25:7,8 30:8 36:9 43:19 63:4 67:16,18 87:16 92:4 109:23 113:24 121:3,14 123:3,4 125:16 126:7,11 127:7 137:8,18 140:13 145:1 157:7 166:16 171:24 173:15 174:1 176:7 182:17 184:13 186:12,14 187:11 187:14 190:17 191:13 195:9 214:25 226:23 228:21,25 230:3,6 238:22 240:22 court 1:4 2:10 54:4,8 56:12 67:11 73:2,3 74:8 78:8 198:16 courtesy 143:18 court's 160:11 cover 84:5,6 105:21 106:2,6,15 136:17 161:17,19,19 covered 77:24 86:9 193:1 covering 105:16	crop 173:21 174:12 crops 9:15 10:1 31:13 61:20 crossed 8:25 186:7 crosses 83:20 crossing 184:11 cross-examination 90:2 108:4 110:25 128:12 218:13,21 218:23 234:7 238:21 244:19 249:8,11,14 cross-examine 73:18 74:10 200:12 cross-examined 42:23 crowded 19:18 crucial 169:14 171:6 185:14 195:17 crudely 71:3 Crystal 200:7,8 202:8 204:15 231:1 Crystal's 201:6 crystal-clear 216:8 cult 31:2 cultivable 181:11 cultivate 41:21 42:3 46:17,18 cultivated 31:2,4,8	146:21 Daly 98:13,15,17,21 108:1,5 111:11 117:21,25 118:2,6 127:6 133:4 146:10 146:11 152:7 157:20 158:7 161:17 162:10 188:2,6 189:11,21 190:5 210:19 211:25 218:10,21 221:9 223:23 224:2 233:7,14 234:21 237:1 249:9,10 Daly's 157:25 158:9 damp 40:14 173:24 Danforth 142:7 144:14 Dar 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1,16 27:25 28:2 32:16 34:1 52:13 175:6,8 175:16 Darfur 24:10 49:6 100:17 164:5 165:15 166:17 192:4 194:9,17,25 195:2	decide 67:23 203:18 decided 131:25 212:15 215:19,24 decision 47:7,21 48:2 86:12,24 105:10,14 136:16 148:18 153:4,7,12 155:10 156:11 158:20 161:12 168:2 211:16 214:14 215:2 216:3,17,23 216:25 217:2,16,17 217:23 218:16 220:23 222:3 228:8 230:20 decisions 67:12 decisive 151:14 152:3 154:5 168:9 232:9 232:22 233:11 242:13 declare 74:25 98:18 118:18 decreases 236:1 decree 146:9 deduce 71:15 deemed 161:5 171:5 deep 89:6 deeply 38:6,15 92:9	delimitation 119:23 119:25 121:4,13,19 122:5,12 127:22 128:4,25 132:15 134:1 145:8 154:14 156:21 169:10 171:7,24,25 172:1,3 172:6 190:22 195:8 247:23 delimited 119:23 120:19 122:2 125:13 127:10 130:3 164:11 166:1 166:15 224:12 delimiting 1:3 102:2 134:22 demand 55:4 demarcate 76:24 134:24 204:11,22 demarcated 47:25 122:2,11 demarcating 237:18 demarcating 7:10 121:15 Dembloya 205:1 democratic 79:11 202:17 democratically 203:2

				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	sday, 22nd April 200.
demographer 116:4	53:3 64:16 70:2	Dhoul 58:13	184:14,16,18 186:3	85:10,12 94:24	67:8 68:17 107:8
demography 116:16	141:6 179:6 229:23	dictator 157:21	192:20 194:16	143:22 152:2	117:3 149:17
demonstrably 124:18	description 2:22 9:17	die 124:25 193:19	196:22 199:22	194:16 207:24	150:22 151:13,18
199:3	11:9 15:13 28:3	differed 78:23	200:1,4,23 201:9,12	208:4 231:20	243:17 245:11
demonstrate 177:5	38:18 39:4,24 49:22	difference 81:4	201:15,17,18,18,22	discussions 30:8 70:8	documented 150:10
185:7 195:10	51:25 52:3 63:7	different 5:15 55:21	202:23 203:4,5,8	230:13 236:4	documents 3:4 4:12
demonstrated 118:8	67:3 68:22 121:23	70:2 75:9,10 97:7	204:12,23 205:3,7	diseases 116:16	9:12 21:2 107:16
135:6 169:12	122:9 123:10	121:1 144:6 145:20	206:25 208:25	disk 88:12	132:14 150:12,24
229:16	130:24 131:1	149:7 154:22 172:7	210:25 211:2,6,10	dismiss 9:6 67:19	152:3,6 156:12
demonstrates 186:6	139:24 153:4,12	176:11 183:2	213:3,3 214:20,21	72:14	159:21,22 161:7
194:24	154:14 155:23	186:23 197:17	214:25 215:1,9,10	dispatched 154:20	167:2,2 168:8,9
demoted 210:23	157:8 159:5,6	205:5 210:14	215:20,20 216:23	dispersed 221:23	177:4 189:23,24,24
Dene 75:18	165:14,18 168:15	221:13 225:9 237:2	217:3 219:22 220:5	displacement 247:2	190:24 197:21
Deng 56:4,6 58:17,19	180:10 228:7	237:3,22 244:11	221:24 222:9,16,21	display 160:18 161:2	199:11 207:15
61:7 64:25 65:13	descriptions 25:6	245:4 247:1	222:21 223:8,12,25	displayed 160:13	209:12 219:2,6,14
66:20 94:6 136:7	32:24 53:12 55:20	differential 188:11	225:3,12,15 226:8	Displays 160:24	220:10
249:4	62:9,12 64:13	differently 127:2	227:19 228:5 229:9	disposal 241:20	dog 125:7
Deng-dit 59:17	183:16	206:11	232:18 239:21	dispute 72:13 149:5,7	doing 15:1 16:14 60:1
denied 136:11	deserve 68:19	difficult 18:25 28:20	242:15 243:5,8,17	167:22 186:1	64:15 67:24 68:7
denigration 159:5	design 82:6	33:6 35:22,23	243:18 244:7,15	disputed 157:18 210:3	75:9 76:16 79:18
deny 19:3 70:16 111:2	designated 125:14	134:14 171:23	245:19,25 247:17	disputes 1:4 59:10	80:6,6 117:19
134:15 185:10,13	designation 124:3	172:10 195:10 238:22	247:21 Dink es 11:1 22:24	70:6 150:6	156:16 186:6
191:11 192:6 Department 30:17,24	desirability 90:16 desperate 213:19	difficulties 138:9	Dinkas 11:1 22:24 23:5 27:17 113:8	disquiet 144:20,23 disregarded 146:19	201:20 219:3 dominant 3:23
32:9 33:10 243:23	desperately 243:4	181:4	148:22 170:10	dissembled 16:23	dominions 235:25
departmental 105:19	despite 150:11 156:13	difficulty 54:14	184:24,24	dissembling 15:10	done 3:5 67:19 73:10
depend 86:13	219:7	134:17 172:4,5	Dinka's 1:18 42:6	distance 56:13,13	73:17,23 80:5,7
depending 123:16	destroyed 100:20	digitise 82:5	224:1	180:21 194:4	87:4 90:13,25
222:1	detail 60:15 78:20	digitising 80:24,24	Dirdeiry 2:2,2	distances 13:23 84:7	104:17 131:17
depict 79:3	107:9 135:7 180:12	81:1	direct 16:19 50:4	distant 102:5	197:18 214:1 226:4
depicted 83:19	196:12,24	diligence 88:4	81:14 95:22 191:13	distinct 93:16	Dorr 2:6
depiction 123:14	detailed 51:24 53:11	diminish 151:1	direction 182:25	distinguished 127:2	dots 68:25
128:3	67:3 74:12 121:23	Dinka 2:8 4:20,22 7:8	directions 3:14 135:16	145:13	dotted 44:3 50:9 51:25
depictions 19:4	122:8 150:17	7:14 8:20 9:15,25	directly 98:13 118:10	distinguishes 39:6	69:8 186:3
derive 82:10	details 64:9 66:5	10:13 11:5,15,19,23	219:14	distinguishment	doubt 10:17 14:5 40:7
describe 3:19 5:1 46:7	105:10 119:8 155:5	11:24 12:4 19:23	director 75:15	131:10	105:22 126:8
57:12 66:15 67:24	218:16	21:6 23:14,22 24:5	disadvantaged 89:15	distorted 147:25 190:9	171:13 172:22,23
73:16 75:11 139:1,6 171:8 185:2 212:1	detective 3:3 9:1 10:18 151:23 169:16	24:15 27:2,12,14 28:2,12,24 31:9,15	disagree 161:23 205:13 206:7	distribute 40:2	182:15,15 213:8 215:4 216:11,12,13
217:25 218:9	187:22	31:18,19,22,24 32:2	disagreement 47:5	district 40:5 49:15	220:22 234:2
described 2:8 3:17 7:6	determinate 233:1	32:18 33:5,25 34:3	48:9	123:20 189:18	240:23
8:2 10:24,25 11:10	236:24 242:9	34:12,15,17 36:11	disagrees 40:19 47:3	210:25 211:6 236:6	down 6:3 12:5 17:11
20:11 23:20,20	determination 193:7	36:16 39:22 40:21	disappear 32:19	districts 100:8 146:16	24:21 25:7 28:4
32:14 33:18 34:7,10	determine 73:4 172:7	41:2,8,12,15 42:2	disappears 174:24	152:15 153:15	31:14 38:16,25
38:13,17 58:25	173:16 175:3 195:7	43:2,4 44:3,5,8,15	disbelieve 64:2	155:24 157:16	39:21 40:11 43:16
61:15,19 69:22	205:3	44:18 45:6 48:15,21	disciplined 87:22	163:7,12 164:22	43:25 46:18 53:18
71:11 121:20	determined 124:16	48:22 51:5,18 52:12	disclose 17:9 18:4,20	166:2,19,22 167:11	59:13 61:9 70:19
123:20 152:21	125:13 195:16	52:16 53:21 54:12	30:3,16,21 31:16	228:14	76:23 83:10 179:10
157:20 167:19	determines 173:12,13	55:21 56:19 57:24	32:5	disturbed 189:6	186:24 203:16
183:13 184:23	determining 121:21	58:1,10 60:17 61:2	disclosed 17:14,22	divide 122:15 156:2	226:13
186:11,17 207:8	122:6 172:12	61:10,12 64:20 70:4	18:2 30:1 32:6	176:10	downstairs 119:6
218:3,7 220:16	191:11 determinism 171:8	71:16 72:1,18 74:2	discloses 17:17 disconnected 188:9	divided 84:13 102:1 159:12	dozen 83:14 150:12
226:12 227:17 235:23,25 236:5,6	172:21 173:9	89:14 92:2 97:4,11 97:21 99:3,15 103:3	disconnected 188:9 discontinuity 160:17	divides 37:14 166:19	Dr 1:12 2:5 72:21,21 73:9,18,21 74:18,19
238:9 239:9	175:24 191:9	103:8 104:8,11	discover 16:7 115:9	166:22	74:22,23 75:3 90:3
describes 2:3 3:13	determinist 173:5	105:4 106:23 108:9	discovered 52:6 83:18	dividing 102:22	98:8 192:15 244:3,4
9:24 11:15 13:2	devalue 54:17	108:24 112:21,22	discretion 72:12	179:13	244:21 246:8,9
22:2 23:22 24:5	devaluing 67:14	117:4 134:13 135:7	discuss 145:18 219:2	Diyin 136:6	249:6,7
33:11 37:12,16,20	devastating 48:14	135:10,15 136:13	discussed 4:9 86:6	document 18:7,8,9	drafted 105:24
37:22,24 38:1,4,5	developed 73:1 75:12	138:2,18 139:22	94:25 107:18 170:5	22:13,16 24:24	drafting 199:13
40:20 44:11 46:5,8	76:15	140:21 142:8,17,23	171:1,9 194:20	153:9 155:8 162:2	207:24 208:4,6,11
46:11 48:14,20	development 50:24	142:24 143:4	199:24 225:2	182:16 194:11	draw 25:14 28:20 32:7
52:10 60:24 61:6	51:16 53:2,14 69:6	145:16 146:23	228:20 234:11	218:6 220:3 221:3	74:15 132:12 134:7
62:6,21 64:8 66:20	103:8 132:17	148:3,25 150:12	discusses 162:14	225:22	134:8,14 141:16
141:19 166:12	device 76:3	152:23 154:7,12,21	163:16	documentary 12:11	187:18
227:14 describing 23:4 52:20	devoted 207:25	155:12,18 179:15	discussing 1:6 24:14	33:20 35:8,18,20,22	drawing 30:14 120:13
describing 23:4 52:20	Dhony 58:13	179:15,16 184:12	discussion 22:14	35:23 48:18 51:21	132:6
L	<u> </u>				

	I				
drawn 85:7 120:12	122:13 131:7 136:7	132:24 136:12	emphasise 42:1	entirety 164:10	estimating 116:3
121:11 122:18	184:21 190:10	137:21,22,22 138:5	103:13	entities 236:12	Etai 184:25
137:14 179:13	223:20 228:8 240:1	138:13 141:11,20	emphasised 22:19	entitled 45:25 55:13	etiquette 177:13
draws 138:8 234:18	early 7:21 40:1 51:2	145:24 146:17,18	221:18	68:11 130:13 162:9	Europe 62:2
drew 16:1 55:1,13	75:12 122:15	148:23 149:1,24	emphasises 151:17	162:16 164:20	European 105:6
70:10	129:10 180:2	150:5,16 152:16,17	emphasising 15:19	202:14,17	evaluate 205:18
drier 181:16	215:19,24	153:18,22 154:1	emphatically 26:16	entourage 114:3	evaluating 54:1
dries 32:18	easier 88:13 241:17	155:7,7,16,18,25,25	43:24	environment 79:2	even 8:10 10:9,12
driving 11:1,15,19,25	east 3:11 20:15 22:1,3	157:6,17 158:17	Empire 114:11,18	171:10,10 174:2	16:22 18:19,23 19:7
15:3 18:13 21:11	31:21 119:13	162:12 163:8,15,21	employment 179:16	environmental 8:5	24:4 26:16 44:16
50:17 83:9	138:20 165:15,15	164:2,5,13,15,22,23	empty 19:20,25 194:1	9:19 11:18 12:7,8	56:23 78:21 80:11
dropped 76:19	eastern 49:14,16	164:25,25 165:3,9	enable 79:4	12:16 14:11 20:1	81:18 94:16 99:21
dropping 147:24	east-west 101:2	165:10,10,11,12,13	enabled 180:4	21:18 22:12 23:15	100:7 102:5,19
drowned 148:13	easy 82:13 86:16	165:19 166:6,13,16	enclosing 123:20	23:18,21 25:2 29:10	106:13 124:17
dry 1:10 4:8,10,16 6:9	130:1 131:22	166:21 167:12	236:6	29:15 31:6 32:25	127:6 133:1 142:1
28:2 29:7,7 33:3,15	economic 103:8	168:6,17,18,21,25	encompass 223:3	33:19 34:6,10 47:1	142:13,19 149:25
43:12 44:5,10 51:2	edge 22:25	170:12,14 176:15	encounter 15:13	48:17 50:21 70:20	152:6,8 155:20
51:4 57:22 59:12	edges 172:12	179:11 182:5,23	encountered 5:1,3	139:25 153:2,11	156:20,22,25 158:7
70:21 103:12 120:7	educated 55:3	183:3,5 184:2,12	6:11 7:7 18:13 21:9	171:8 172:20,23	158:18 164:8 175:4
129:11 140:15	effect 43:9 47:7,21	185:9,11 186:7,7,13	21:11 186:12	173:5,8,18,19	182:8 184:24 186:5
180:11 183:21	48:3 91:16 99:3	186:16,17 187:2,13	encountering 10:25	174:12 176:3 191:8	197:3 198:25 206:6
186:18	108:8 129:8 138:10	187:16 189:1,19	11:1	191:8 245:12	206:10 208:15,16
dry-season 3:25 21:3	178:14	190:23 192:4	encourage 41:20	environmentally	208:20 215:11
21:17 34:21 70:17	effectuated 150:9	193:22 194:17	151:14	40:13	219:11 220:9 225:5
70:18 71:9,14,17	efficient 76:16	196:18 197:6	encouraging 78:18	epidemic 116:16	225:7 229:10
due 2:17 177:22	effort 3:7 105:13	204:13 220:20	encroaching 105:2	equal 79:5	231:15,17 232:20
dugdug 31:20 243:5,8	218:19 242:10	224:16,17,22	end 2:8 9:15 15:25,25	equalled 87:7	232:23 233:3
243:11,11,19	efforts 15:16 55:4	225:17 226:16	44:1 62:19 68:6	equally 165:12 176:2	234:13,14 235:9
dugdugs 31:22 34:15	100:23	227:19 228:15,16	70:15 76:1 85:16,18	176:12 229:10	236:19 242:6,16
34:17 50:8 52:8,18	Egypt 110:19 111:9	229:14,17,23 232:3	163:24 188:24	equating 108:25	evening 58:23
dung 169:19	eight 119:5 183:11	232:4 233:2,4	197:11 198:22	equatorial 100:18	event 82:21 134:2
Dupuis's 34:14,19	Eighth 168:19	234:24 235:4,7,15	242:1	equitable 156:4	143:18 187:10
52:17	either 10:22 16:14	236:7,8,21,22	ended 220:17 236:18	era 104:20	191:14 198:25
DUPUY 1:11	26:12 50:19 54:1	237:12,21 238:10	engaged 10:18 155:6	erroneously 237:18	events 55:22 152:21
dura 173:21 174:7	101:24 118:25	238:25 239:6,8,10	178:7	error 198:5,6,14,16	eventually 38:7 86:10
185:24	120:21 138:21	239:22 240:2,8,8,15	engages 3:7	206:12 237:6,10	ever 87:5 119:10
during 4:10 6:9 9:2	149:17 158:23	240:22,22 241:1,3	engaging 9:25 93:25	238:1,3 242:15	220:2 F
21:15 28:2 33:2	159:4 162:1 210:23	241:10,15,18,23	England 78:7	esoteric 9:20	Eversheds 2:3
36:7,14,17 37:18	246:11	242:8,25	English 89:12,12,14	especially 8:15 81:21	every 26:8 75:17
41:9 42:3 43:11 45:9 56:17 58:9	el 1:15,20 3:20,24 5:6 5:9,11 14:23,25	elaborated 138:17 elder 61:14,22 62:6	170:18 190:23 199:25 200:9 202:2	116:15 171:6 221:23	80:13 84:20 112:13 160:13,13 184:20
59:1,11 61:17 66:21	20:16,18,21,23,25	64:17 65:13,22	206:5,20 208:7	essential 21:1 149:19	205:5
75:17 78:9,14 85:5	21:7,25 22:22,25	144:9	214:3,7 227:12	165:22 205:6 227:5	everybody 119:7
88:21 94:25 100:20	23:4,6 24:9,13,16	elders 55:21 60:17	228:1	227:10	220:2 222:15
101:5 106:24,25	24:18 25:7 26:4,6	66:23 67:5 79:2	enjoyed 114:12	essentially 43:6	225:18 231:18
111:21 120:7,9	27:16,19 32:17 34:8	85:1,19,24 86:8	enormously 68:13	173:19 197:13	239:17 240:7
135:21 162:3	34:25 35:2 37:25	88:16 94:15,15,25	enough 72:10 119:24	207:25 239:2 240:3	everybody's 83:5
188:17 216:18	38:8 39:6,7,10,16	94:25 95:4	142:12,18,19 178:2	establish 117:12	everyone 5:7
235:23	39:20,21,24 40:3	elections 202:18	182:15 227:16	119:18 124:12	everything 23:11 30:9
dwelling 197:20	41:13 43:20 52:11	element 9:1 171:7	233:23 245:16	174:6,9 177:3,6	66:8 69:7 77:18
dwellings 186:3	52:21 99:1,13,18,22	192:5	enquire 92:1	192:25 233:17	112:3 171:4,11
d'être 156:10	99:22,25 100:16,19	elements 126:4 153:2	enquiry 92:12 199:1	234:14	185:19
	100:24 101:9,21	elicit 48:18	ensure 201:21 211:17	established 99:20	everywhere 148:12
E	102:5,7,25 103:16	eloquent 148:7	entail 222:1,1	100:19 103:6	evidence 4:9,19,22
e 245:19	103:17 106:14	eloquently 123:25	entailed 83:9	109:18 110:3	5:24 6:1 8:6,19 9:19
each 5:3 32:23 78:22	110:15,17,23	126:3	enter 40:4	111:15 117:18	9:21 10:14 11:18
84:15 85:1,22 88:10	113:11,14 114:23	elsewhere 34:20 44:23	enthusiastic 3:8	121:14 123:16	12:7,9,13,16 14:10
88:20 124:10	114:23 115:4,12,19	46:22 123:13	entire 22:6 37:14 53:9	125:15 146:8 189:3	14:11,12 18:5 20:1
128:13 134:25,25	115:20 119:22	email 92:22	74:16 99:25 123:20	192:16 224:15,23	21:19 22:12 23:21
134:25,25 144:5	122:19,21,23,24	embarrassed 140:9	139:17 171:1 201:2	224:25,25 232:25	24:14 25:2,22,25
145:8 150:16	124:2,10,11,18,19	embarrassment	202:22 206:25	233:3 235:5 236:17	26:10,15,17 29:10
160:20 172:19	124:24,25 125:3,8	136:18	236:6	242:7,23	29:15 31:6,17 32:3
185:15 205:8	125:11,17,23 126:6	emerge 167:6	entirely 16:11 26:13	establishes 117:7,17	32:25 33:19 34:6,10
211:23 219:2	126:13 127:7,10,12	emerged 147:23	33:10 52:16 103:25	establishing 120:14	35:18,20,22 38:22
235:22 248:1	127:13,19 128:3,6	emerging 127:25	115:18 132:1	122:6 123:2	40:16 47:1 48:17,24
earlier 1:14 88:24	128:20 129:9	emphasis 14:22	169:15 173:4 174:2	estimate 90:19 115:25	49:2 50:13,21 51:21
110:13 115:17	130:11,18,18	246:21	175:2 197:9	190:6,7,8	51:21 53:22 54:1

56:7 62:9 63:19	executive 121:20	240:14,16	172:15 176:16	fancy 16:2	figured 210:24
64:1,3 68:9 70:20	124:17 233:18	explaining 217:12	177:1,2 183:5	fantastic 176:9,12	filled 88:3
71:5,22 72:11,11	exercise 20:13 46:1	explains 11:4 64:18	185:14 187:7,12,14	180:23	filling 87:22
81:15 98:23 104:9	90:15 131:17	140:2 238:12	187:20,21 188:6	far 8:24 11:3 22:1,1	final 80:18 82:4 91:5,7
		explanation 6:16 7:20	193:3 237:21 239:6	25:10 34:9 48:18	147:24 193:8
106:9 107:12,22	153:15 160:15	12:6 141:3			219:14
115:8 117:3 119:4	179:21 195:9		239:10 241:11,13	50:15,19 51:5 56:12	
135:6 139:25 150:8	exercises 83:9	explanations 6:13		57:13 58:21 59:10	finally 22:5 30:15
150:23 151:18	exhaustive 32:9	explicit 7:1	F	59:23 61:7,16,16	31:24 36:18 38:3
152:19 156:6 167:3	exigencies 73:21	explicitly 41:14	f 245:21	62:14 70:11 95:8,10	81:3 87:17 141:2
171:10 177:11	exist 10:12 111:22	exploded 180:16,22	faces 54:11 134:16	97:16 101:2 102:4	168:22 228:10
178:7 180:20,24	135:5,5 161:5	exploiter 104:25	facie 169:21	104:24 113:8	243:1 244:2 245:21
184:8 185:12	219:24	exploration 126:6	fact 5:6 6:8 8:18,19	115:18 117:3	find 4:17 6:4 37:4
190:14,25 191:12	existed 18:17 50:20	explorations 158:25	13:22 14:15 19:5	126:18,24 133:8	49:13 85:23 95:7
191:16,18,18,25	128:20 161:15	explore 154:23 163:23	26:1 30:12 33:6	156:19 160:9 176:5	123:3 181:6 188:5,6
192:3 194:8,25	162:18 205:4	explored 155:5	35:12 36:13,22,24	179:10 183:17	243:5
197:3 200:13	existence 40:21 44:8	exploring 15:17	38:24 40:6 47:21	195:4 219:13	findings 116:8
205:18,20,20	48:15 64:10 100:7	express 79:15 178:20	49:5 57:14 58:14	224:24 229:4 245:1	finds 184:12 191:21
208:15,16 221:2	107:5,6 160:4	188:5,7	64:3,11 68:15 71:4	245:2	fine 96:15
223:22,23 233:9	233:20	expresses 144:17	72:22 75:21 80:7	farm 10:6 31:12	finish 1:3 129:13
234:2,4 235:10	existing 32:12 110:4,5	178:17	83:19 85:3 86:13,14	farming 31:11	247:25
239:2 243:15,17	110:6,9,10 181:19	expression 104:23	89:17 99:22 103:20	farms 42:16,21 43:3	finished 1:6 78:5
244:3 245:12,13	exists 126:8 240:23	246:21	104:18 108:20	farthest 58:19	fire 8:22,24 9:2,5,11
246:6	expanded 110:16,17	expressly 165:7	113:25 115:6 122:2	Fashoda 211:5	9:14,14,24 10:3
evidencing 153:10	expect 34:21 91:14	extant 172:17	125:3 136:10	fast 83:7	28:9,11 169:18,19
evident 126:13	116:14,18	extend 32:17 95:11	150:13,24 151:12	father 57:5,8,10,18,19	fires 15:3
evidentiary 73:1	expectation 91:17	114:21 142:24	155:4 156:13	57:20 58:9 59:1	firmly 123:15
evolution 121:6	expected 33:16 86:20	172:14		64:19 65:5,9 66:23	first 8:24 12:10 22:17
evolved 81:23	204:7	extended 97:12 135:5	160:13,17 162:5	fathers 89:9	30:2 31:1 36:23
exactly 4:8 5:19 11:24	expeditions 16:7	135:8 138:4 141:19	167:20 170:17,22	father's 57:17 58:9	37:12,16 43:13 61:4
17:3 18:18 24:19	expensive 82:15	149:24 171:12	171:1,19,20 175:3	59:1 65:1,18	61:9 64:16 66:10
25:18,23 28:5 29:1	experience 87:8 90:7	223:3 244:16	177:1,16 181:22	Fauwel 1:25 2:12,20	69:17,18 70:6 72:23
32:25 38:12 43:22	173:8	extending 20:6,14	185:14 187:19	183:17 184:10	76:7 77:11 82:8,25
46:25 47:1 50:15	experiment 76:2	22:1 23:22 24:8	194:23 195:7,10,13	185:3	83:9 87:5 88:7
68:2 73:1 91:6	experiment 70.2 expert 38:20 42:25	25:10 26:18 35:2	195:14,15,16	favour 78:13	114:20 116:25
139:1 143:10	119:10,11,21 160:2	41:17 52:13,19,21	199:13 201:7 208:5	favourite 37:9	120:4 125:23
			219:7 228:25	Fawel 138:23	
151:17 209:17	200:7 210:19	61:7 97:5,9,21	235:18 245:8		139:18 144:1,19
216:16 218:6,22	218:11 233:10	100:17 192:21	factor 83:24 84:3	fears 136:20	146:21 152:7
222:25 228:4	245:13	244:8,13 246:1	factors 86:24 116:17	feature 119:24 123:4	156:14,18 159:20
231:17 243:19	expertise 133:7	extends 34:5,7 38:16	147:23 153:7,11	129:5,9	162:25 164:7 167:7
246:13	experts 9:8,9 22:3,11	40:10 110:12	165:5 174:14	featureless 238:13	169:14 172:20
Examination-in-chief	46:3 47:4,13,22,24	extension 124:21	188:16 200:16	features 23:18 172:24	173:20 176:14
56:8 249:5	54:19,20 55:11 56:2	247:3	facts 16:7 56:14,15	237:19	177:8 178:13,15,22
examine 72:10 149:20	56:2 60:20 64:4	extensive 43:17	150:7	February 91:23 155:3	181:9 182:3,5
examined 245:1	68:3,4 72:22 73:9	extensively 37:2 116:5	factual 136:24 137:14	182:20 189:15	184:16,19,19,24,24
example 50:17 79:11	133:23 134:11	extent 15:9 66:3 71:24	141:15 160:7 197:3	feel 84:5 152:22	186:25 188:11
110:11 152:4	135:2,14,19 136:19	90:7 99:16 106:10	Factually 161:6	felt 92:25	197:19 209:1
166:11 183:9	143:9 150:25 151:6	107:11 127:24	failing 118:5	fertile 23:25 40:14	210:18 214:3 218:6
191:17	154:5,10 172:16,25	134:17 135:15	fails 34:19	181:15	237:6 238:14
examples 87:10	173:1 175:11	144:11 154:6	fair 54:9 72:9 113:21	few 5:5 7:6 19:6,6,8	firsthand 51:24 52:3
excellent 89:21	178:17 180:4 198:2	155:11 156:22	132:24 135:14	20:3 60:22 69:9	firstly 23:13
except 14:23 77:18	198:4 200:24 204:4	181:20 229:25	173:14 176:17	78:1 86:6 90:5	first-round 145:15
103:12 113:16	205:15,18 216:22	235:25	182:7,7 213:12	99:10,18,24 101:8	147:3 163:19
177:21 178:9	217:22 218:5,7	extract 185:7	245:10,10	102:21,21 103:15	fisheries 80:6
180:21 192:25	219:5,8,14,19,25	extraordinarily 88:18	fairly 3:25 25:13 32:3	103:16 104:5	fishing 61:21
excerpt 4:24	220:1,7,14,16 221:9	172:10 195:10	87:10 123:14 173:4	106:17,22 107:3	fit 119:22 128:4
excess 195:15 198:1,3	221:11 225:23	219:24 243:13	179:25	118:23 123:25	149:17 165:14
198:6,15,19,19	230:19 231:15	extraordinary 48:25	faith 177:14	127:3 183:16	fits 12:6 13:12
206:13 231:16	237:15,17,24 238:4	180:9 219:4 221:18	falcon 148:9	184:20 244:17	five 68:3 78:9 85:11
excessive 172:5	239:2 245:21	228:18	falconer 148:9	field 51:2 53:11 83:25	90:25
exchange 44:19	explain 6:15 9:22	extrapolate 116:12	fall 148:10	84:9 93:25 94:14	fix 131:14,20 229:15
exciting 37:5	44:13 140:22	extremely 82:14	falls 151:3 242:20	118:8	fixed 111:19
exclude 47:8	190:11 216:21	108:21 181:4 189:6		fields 10:2,7,11,14	flag 104:7 107:5
excluded 197:7	231:23	ez 20:20 35:13,16 39:9	false 15:25 familiar 61:24 77:14	25:17	flat 112:7
excludes 141:8	explained 40:17 43:1	39:15,18 40:4 43:21		fieldwork 181:2	flies 139:20,23 140:5
exclusive 176:1	49:23 64:21 138:4	53:1 117:13,19	familiarity 89:6	fifth 171:14	141:25
exclusively 80:20	157:7 200:8 232:13	124:1 125:9 139:3	families 179:17	fighting 103:11	Flipping 206:10
excuse 231:21	233:14 234:19	141:21 155:5 157:5	family 66:24 67:4	figure 94:4,8,11 153:3	flood 181:17
	200.11.201.17	1.1.21 155.5 157.5	famous 132:3		
	L				

flooded 86:23	found 4:7 6:8 7:14,17	103:16 105:1,2	136:20 143:24	115:19,20 124:10	230:15 236:3
flooding 8:9 40:15	13:24 16:5 22:11	106:20 107:16	157:6 162:22 164:5	124:18,24,25 126:6	239:12,14 243:23
140:4	102:13 109:11	109:3,3,4 110:10,17	169:1 174:11,24	127:10,12 128:6,20	244:25 245:1,2
floor 145:10 169:5	137:17 187:1	110:20,21 115:2,5	179:23 182:24	130:11,18 137:21	goes 3:19 7:5 17:16
flying 89:4	242:10 243:6	116:13 117:23	201:4	145:24 146:17	29:16 38:25 40:20
focus 30:6 38:21	foundation 79:12	125:10 126:14	furthermore 58:13	148:23 149:1,24	41:6 43:25 44:13
230:19	152:7 165:21 168:9	127:2 131:5,8,9	furthest 58:17,19	150:16 152:17	46:11 48:5 138:24
focused 19:8 87:23	188:19	133:3 136:2 137:14	97:18	153:18,22 154:1	139:2,5,15 140:10
105:9 153:14	four 37:15 79:20,25	138:8 141:12,16	Fut 184:6	155:16,18,25 163:8	182:24 184:10
208:14,21 218:15	80:19 82:23 83:3	142:3,5,24,25 143:4	future 121:10	163:15 164:5,23	198:1
focusing 35:4 152:12	85:18 91:24 159:21	145:24 146:3,24	fuzzy 134:7	165:12,13 166:6,13	Gohea 186:11
follow 132:19 166:3	159:22 165:5	148:21 149:10,23		167:12 168:6,18	going 1:8 3:15,17,18
followed 145:17	170:13 183:8 184:1	150:6,13,17 151:20	G	190:23 196:18	4:3,4 7:1 9:12 14:12
following 65:7 81:2	219:5 236:13	155:14 159:3,22	gain 92:13 93:1	204:13 220:20	15:15 17:12 19:8
109:23 124:3 167:5	fourth 83:8 114:5	162:25 163:2,7	gaining 92:15	224:16,22 225:17	21:7 22:5 25:4
185:7,20 244:5	121:25 167:19	164:2 165:15	gaps 151:24 160:16	226:16 227:19	26:16 27:24 28:7,10
248:6	171:7 184:18	166:17 174:13	garments 108:25	228:16 232:3 233:2	34:11 35:7 44:12
follows 32:15 131:22	fraction 106:18 211:3	175:6 180:22	Gary 2:5 81:6	233:4 234:24 235:4	50:23 51:17,19
136:8 166:14,16	fragmentary 6:14 8:1	182:17 184:9,22	gather 79:1	235:7 236:8	54:13 55:16,17
168:22 170:9 226:9	243:13	186:7,10 189:3,6	gathered 93:17 97:25	giraffe 37:9 39:25	62:18,25 63:15 66:7
fond 161:8	frame 81:13	190:12,13,18	192:8,9	40:1,7	75:4,5,6,10 76:24
food 45:7	framework 204:8	191:19 192:17	gathering 80:18 91:1	give 22:8 26:10 42:10	81:10 82:1,23 83:6
footing 79:5	franca 114:2	197:7,17 198:11	gave 15:12 108:12	49:14 60:19 68:15	84:16 88:10,22 91:5
footnote 219:17	frankly 2:18 14:2 15:9	201:1 203:15	144:7,23 145:4	68:22 90:19 129:25	95:25 98:12 119:17
force 6:20 242:5	19:17 22:1 30:19	204:13 206:19,19	168:12 194:11	136:22 169:5	120:20 121:3
forced 174:15,16	48:13 140:9 162:6	206:21 208:1 209:2	gazette 225:24 226:3	172:22 199:15	137:25 143:6,20
forces 100:21	192:8 228:19	210:19,24 211:6,8,9	226:12 233:19	244:1 245:16	165:14 200:25
forefathers 46:19	230:14 232:16	216:11,12,13,22	gazetted 161:7 242:24	given 16:3 25:19	205:11 210:15
foreign 104:25	free 73:18 202:17	218:23 219:13	gazettes 102:17	30:24 48:10 54:12	218:8 230:23 231:7
forensic 182:12	freely 203:1,18	223:22,22,23	general 21:22 23:14	73:21 89:18 107:18	234:16 240:18
foresaw 47:19	French 105:2 124:5	224:17,24 225:22	27:3 81:7 103:1	138:11 141:14	gone 13:9 87:18
Forest 78:6	190:22,23	226:8,9 228:21	164:9 169:12	159:7 161:6 170:3	131:24
forestry 79:17,19 80:6	frequency 177:25	229:4,11 231:19	181:13 183:15	179:1 189:7 190:6,8	good 1:5 7:23 23:1,17
forgive 188:9	friend 152:11	232:6 233:7,7 234:1	187:14 191:11	204:1 238:15	23:22 61:20,20
form 32:22 76:3 81:24	friendly 7:17 44:16	237:1,3 238:5	194:23 229:23	243:12	75:22 85:17 86:21
169:21 174:13	from 1:24 2:11,18	242:11,17 244:23	236:3	gives 67:2 140:8 141:3	87:4,13 88:5 90:18
191:8	3:21 4:4 5:5,15 6:10	246:19 247:2,18	generalised 69:3	giving 183:15 190:11	91:11 139:12 143:5
formalities 54:15	6:12 7:6 8:4,14,15	249:16,22	generally 39:8 119:13	201:24	143:5 148:2 151:20
formally 90:4	8:24 11:3,20,21	front 38:23 56:10	121:9 181:9,10	glad 78:15	152:10 157:15
formed 155:16 former 175:25	12:1,18 13:4 14:3	118:16 210:11	generate 171:11	Gleichen 23:9,25 24:4	187:13,23
formerly 146:16	14:10,10,11,11,12 15:16 16:21,25 17:5	212:6 221:3 240:12 241:6 243:25	generated 80:2 85:10	24:17,23 25:3 27:22 102:15 234:11	Gorkwei 189:18 222:22
152:16 155:15,25	17:11 18:14 19:10	frontier 20:17,24	generic 64:10	238:7 241:5	gotten 11:12,13
163:14 164:23	20:8,14 21:12 22:14	166:18	geographer 120:16,23	Gleichen's 4:18 22:15	government 1:2,16
167:11 168:18	26:6 27:24 29:12	fronts 145:4	121:8 132:3 173:7	22:19 24:4 26:2	2:4 3:7 6:6 7:3 10:3
228:15	30:11 32:7 37:21	Fula 183:20 184:6	geographers 173:8	236:4	10:17,21 13:17
formidable 6:20	38:9,25 39:3,7 40:1	fulfil 153:25	geographic 121:21	globalised 78:14	14:21 15:4,8 17:9
forming 170:14	40:10,15 41:2 42:23	full 4:15,17 17:10,14	122:7 170:14 175:3	glowing 118:7,11	17:14,17,20,22 18:1
forms 79:4	44:19 45:7 46:14,14	19:18 28:18 67:9	237:19 242:2	Gnok 210:25	18:15,20 19:10,16
formula 143:7 154:12	47:8,22 48:19 49:9	126:12 148:15	geographical 23:15,18 242:1	go 8:21 20:7 21:16	20:22 22:14 23:4,13
formulae 116:12	50:3,4,5,11,18,21	220:16 229:20	geographically 37:12	22:2,13 27:9 33:7	24:1,3,19,20,24
formulate 218:4 227:9	50:21,22,24 51:14	fully 13:18 71:25,25	193:11,17	34:1 44:22 46:5	25:24 28:17,23 29:3
formulated 221:4	52:13 53:18,23 55:1	77:15 101:9 166:1	geography 181:6	50:11,12,15 53:12	29:16,19 30:1,16,21
formulation 43:22	55:7,20 57:13 58:20	190:5 246:5	Geren 182:6 183:6	58:21 59:5,10,15	31:16 32:4 34:19
205:5 209:24 210:2	59:21,23 60:16 61:9	functional 120:20	184:2	60:14 62:24 68:12	36:22 40:6 41:24
212:9	62:1 63:1 64:20	fundamental 14:5	GERHARD 1:12	78:10,20 81:16	42:10 43:5 47:5,20
forth 66:7 76:15 78:9	65:18 66:23 67:4,11	19:13 193:10	Gerinti 191:19	82:23 84:2,6 95:25	48:11,23 49:3 59:19
85:15 89:4,19 91:10	70:11,14 71:4,14	fundamentally 47:11	gets 19:18	101:8 115:3 116:3	63:19 64:8 68:6
198:18	76:5,20 78:23 79:2	47:12 179:7 214:8	getting 78:16 82:1	116:10 118:22	69:16,17 70:1,9
forthrightly 198:10	79:2,12,24 80:17,20	229:22	90:20 91:9	119:1 121:17	72:4 73:18 74:10,16
forthwith 106:4	82:9,19 83:10 84:1	funds 102:21	Ghalla 37:25	122:12 126:24	76:25 77:6 78:24
160:19	84:16 85:7,11 87:1	further 11:10 17:17	Ghazal 1:20 20:18	127:3 134:2,24	79:16 89:24 90:5
fortunate 72:20	87:3 88:14 89:7,8	22:13 27:25 28:1	22:22,25 23:4 99:1	135:11 140:15,15	92:7 99:7,11 100:6
forward 15:10 36:21	89:24 91:19 92:13	44:5 46:24 53:12	99:13,18,22,22,25	188:18 191:23	100:10 101:17,24
85:19 135:12,13	92:22 93:1,16 94:13	57:16 62:9,25 63:3	100:16 101:21	202:20,21 208:5	101:25 102:17
171:25	95:6 96:7 100:17,18	64:25 65:17 66:24	102:7,25 103:17	210:16 219:11	103:6,10 105:20,25
fostered 181:14	101:1 102:10	98:6 117:22 133:11	110:23 114:23	220:15 221:8	108:2 114:8,20

governor-general 120:6 126:14
127:15 157:8,15,23
228:12 240:11
Governor-General's 105:17 146:15
goz 10:6.10 20:6 25:11
26:19 31:13 37:21 37:24 38:2,4,11,14
37:24 38:2,4,11,14
38:25 39:4,6 40:4 40:10,17 41:17
43:18,19,24 46:21
51:12,14,15 52:19
107:23 140:13,16
140:25 156:3 172:18 173:12,17
173:18 176:6 179:5
246:1
GPS 76:5,7,14 77:12
77:16 81:19 83:2,4 84:22 93:6
gradually 99:5 174:23
grain 44:19,20 46:19
191:24
grammar 170:18 202:3 208:8 231:1
grammarian 214:5
grammatical 200:9,16
206:20
grandfather 57:19
65:6,9,23,25 66:23 grandfathers 56:24
grandfather's 62:21
65:2,19
grandson 64:18 graphically 71:11
graphically 71:11 grass 140:18,24 142:1
grateful 136:22 169:3
grave 86:7 94:6,13,16
94:17,20,21,24 95:3
95:4 graze 4:11 59:10,11
64:22
grazed 43:14
grazing 12:21,22,23
12:25 23:1,17,23 28:1 4 37:18 42:17
28:1,4 37:18 42:17 46:1 47:8,18 48:3,8
65:2 70:17,18 71:9
71:15 74:7 139:13
139:13 140:17 156:3 179:21
194:16,22
great 46:15 89:11
102:21 135:7 136:9
167:24 greater 181:20
greater 181:20 greatest 55:13 68:11
205:19
Grinti 49:7,10
grips 233:16
grossly 171:12

ground 5:10 9:1 29:7

121:17 146:11

grounds 29:11 160:7

172:23 173:18

177:11

```
group 2:6 72:19 77:13
  84:13 180:15,15
   186.22
groups 80:15 104:15
   116:19 174:3
   179:24 215:20,24
grow 31:13 140:25
growing 9:16
grown 174:7
grows 51:8 140:24,25
guarantee 132:5
guess 217:10,18
  241.12
guide 7:18 15:23 16:3
  17:4
guided 15:24
guiding 227:11
Gulf 119:14
Gurf 32:20
Guyana 78:3
Gwitchen 75:19
         Н
ha 15:5 18:3
Hafner 1:12 246:17
  246:20 247:8
Hague 1:6 177:24
Hale 2:6
half 13:21,21 87:13
   173:17 175:15
  179:9
Hallam 29:6
Hallam's 28:16,18,22
hallmark 102:9
Hamadai 183:20
  184:6
Hamar 42:19
hand 67:18 112:8
   119:15 120:4
   134:16 243:12
handbook 52:10
   102:15 166:12
  236.4
Handed 116:23
handling 177:15
hands 224:4
happen 47:13,14
```

88.23

happened 71:7 85:21

88:23 89:2 145:21

174:8 213:24 222:3

150:23 171:5,12

224:7 235:9

happening 10:13

171:4 216:14

happy 96:25 136:16

hard 11:2,16,19,25

116:15 133:18

134:14 241:12

hardly 63:22 135:2

harsh 215:12 237:24

Harvard 50:24 51:16

53:2,14 69:6

221:21

harness 73:10

harvest 43:14

12:5,18 21:12 88:2

	_
harvested 10:1	
Hasoba 52:8 125:8,11	
240:6	
haste 60:23	
having 8:22 54:15	
73:16 81:15 84:2	
88:12 89:20 90:21 95:17 114:15	
headed 2:2 11:21 13:5	
186:8	
heading 130:22	
132:23 163:17	
186:15	
headings 130:16	
234:12	
headings/rubric	
159:23	
headquarters 37:22	
50:1	
health 103:7 119:19	
177:22	
hear 60:21 143:6	
148:9	1
heard 12:23 62:11	
65:11 76:5 103:10	1
123:25 126:11	
145:20 151:20	
152:2 192:13,14	
211:4,25 215:15	
218:8 223:22,23	
225:12 233:7 235:4 237:16 244:3,17,25	
237:16 244:3,17,25	
hearing 177:20 209:1	
248:6	
hearings 136:25	
247:25	
hears 66:22	
heart 14:4 116:8	
height 51:4	
held 47:14 120:5	
144:6 194:12	
help 80:12	
helpful 68:13 96:20	
139:7	
hence 155:22 224:22	
Henderson 53:16	
heralded 175:13	
Hercule 169:17	
herders 21:11 41:23	
51:7	
herding 59:7,14	
herds 2:10 6:23 12:24	
42:18 50:8 51:5,8	
42:18 30:8 31:3,8 hesitate 239:13	
hid 7:23	
hide 7:15	
hiding 8:15 189:5	
high 182:14	
highest 120:5	
highlighted 26:22	
125:21	
highly 105:21 169:24	1
highway 50:18	
high-resolution 82:16	
high-rise 142:15	
high-rises 19:24	
Hill 110:18,24 111:5,9	

```
him 14:23 15:8,24
   16:3,25 74:10 84:23
   92:22 108:12
   113:10 118:6,11
   132:8 141:22 145:4
   152:9 153:9 157:20
   157:22 177:10
   178:3 180:1 188:4
   192:15 200:13
   241:6 244:23
himself 127:15 138:7
   188:23 191:13
   238:8 240:14
hinder 16:6
hint 230:12,14
hippopotamus 58:1
historian 107:20.21
   117:5
historical 98:14 116:5
   118:8 144:11
   188:10 197:2,4,21
   205:18 239:12,15
historically 236:9
history 7:12 16:20
   67:10,25 188:22
   191:9,10 192:5
   199:13 205:24
   207:17,24 208:4,6
   208:12
hold 76:6 128:5
   148:10 151:3
   242:13
home 46:12,13 71:10
homelands 138:12
   197:4
homes 41:2 43:2 44:3
   46:17 48:15 61:10
homesteads 35:13
homogenise 144:8
Homr 3:20,24 24:10
   27:16 37:6 39:11
   41:9 43:11,13 44:4
   46:13 47:8 70:7,19
   113:10 157:6 174:4
   175:6,8,8,25 179:10
   179:15,19 183:16
   186:20 187:3
   188:17,24 211:1,18
   239:8,10 240:22
   247:16
Homr's 27:25
Honduras 164:12
honest 55:25 244:22
   245:2,3,4
honestly 244:24
honey 44:21
honour 2:7 74:25
   98:18 108:13,17,22
   118:19 161:7
Honourable 56:12
honoured 119:3
hope 108:7 195:21
hopeless 213:19
horseback 104:17
horses 6:19
host-guest 179:25
hours 85:11
```

```
houses 8:9,11,13
  44:21,21,25 45:6,7
  183:8,10 184:20
Howell 34:23
Howell's 52:20
Huber 160:14
huge 77:17 80:23
  103:24 181:11
  236:10
human 9:4 78:8 187:1
humid 81:22
humility 55:5,14
  67:21
hundred 88:15
hunted 189:3
Hunters 76:9
hunting 37:9 39:25
  40:8
Huntingdon 181:1,3
Huntley 15:12,23
Huntley-Walsh 15:16
  16:1
hurry 192:12
huts 32:22 184:2
  185:2
hvbrid 193:4,13
hydrology 114:7
  115:9 158:10
hypothesis 182:9
  193:19
hypothetical 131:24
  132:1 190:21
Ian 177:21
```

```
ICJ 119:6
idea 70:10 71:14
  85:17 99:15 104:1
   106:10 146:23
   148:2 157:12,15
   172:21 176:9,10
  211:23 222:13
   223:8.12 225:3
ideally 121:24 173:21
ideas 90:21
identical 137:15
identification 120:5
  121:22 122:8.20
identified 22:3 37:1
  63:13 73:3 158:16
   164:15 166:3,24
   187:19 234:8
  237:15,25 238:1
  239:1,5
identifies 18:20 30:25
  52:15
identify 26:8 34:20
  72:6 73:14 238:22
identifying 52:8
   126:15 134:13
   155:11
identity 107:2
IGAD 68:5
Ignatius 123:9
ignorance 145:22
ignored 156:13
ignoring 219:13
```

interesting 79:23

interests 79:5,6,18

interject 147:1

88:17,20 107:20

intermingling 138:20

intermittence 160:16

:Unatrate 00:10
illustrate 99:19
ill-defined 225:6
ill-founded 160:6
imagery 38:13 40:15
51:14 82:16
images 82:13,21
imaginable 247:2
0
imagine 94:21 120:8
190:20
immediate 51:3 55:12
immediately 122:1
181:25 189:8
:
immune 188:15,19
impact 188:11,17
189:6 242:5
impartial 68:3,7
impassable 101:6
imperialism 102:9
imperialism 102.9
implication 123:22
implications 143:21
143:24 144:21,25
implies 164:25 165:3
imply 106:20 161:3
importance 22:20.20
importance 22:20,20
38:3 54:5 151:1
193:10
important 10:22 11:4
16:5,15,24 17:8
24:4 25:14 30:15,25
22.4 12 25.7 26.10
32:4,12 35:7 36:19
36:23 40:8 106:2
107:9,20 124:8
141:15,15,18
142-22 143-17
142:22 143:17 149:13 151:21
149.13 131.21
161:5 174:1 176:20
176:21 178:20
199:4 200:9 201:23
201:25 202:4 226:5
importantly 23:14
24.2.71.6.202.0
24:3 71:6 202:9
impossible 25:19
134:23 229:7
imprecision 176:18
impress 93:4
impression 87:14
impressive 107:11
improbable 19:22
inaccessible 103:12
inaccurate 71:3 83:19
inasmuch 121:20
133:8
incidentally 105:25
177:8 187:4 190:17
include 36:7 41:22
99:7 195:4 201:12
201:13 203:7
401.13 403.7
included 20:9 25:3
69:2 98:1 175:15
201:8 203:2 222:22
235:7
including 30:21 68:6
99:2 110:22 150:18
174:14 190:3
222:15 245:13
222:15 245:13 248:1
222:15 245:13

182:3 inconsequential 160:5 inconsistent 28:6 incorporated 146:18 152:18 163:15 228:16 incorporation 228:23 incorrect 147:18 increased 116:20 increases 174:24 235:25 indeed 6:25 7:2 8:5 9:11 103:7 107:17 111:20 138:6 151:2 153:8 159:15 206:22 214:10 231:13 238:19 indefinite 122:22 123:7 124:21 127:20 independence 166:10 independent 93:24 94:2 130:11 indeterminate 120:3 122:22 123:7 124:21 127:20 201:13 225:6 235:20 241:21 index 18:16 249:1 **indicates** 8:6 13:23 70:12 83:22 indication 33:20 126:20 184:22 indications 12:11 36:15 indicator 87:22 indigenous 54:6 75:22 75:24 77:3 79:17 100:6 indirect 4:21 5:25 indistinguishable 190.18 individual 92:24 125:22 130:19 133:9 179:17 individuals 213:18 214:5.11.12 inescapable 206:24 inescapably 214:2 inevitably 228:1 inexistent 160:20 inextricably 159:16 Infantry 4:15 6:17,25 7:12 16:20 infer 184:9 inference 18:12 32:7 169:15 182:9,11,14 186:21 inferences 136:24 137:14 141:16 inferential 5:25 25:21 inferring 177:14 **inflated** 173:16 influence 174:3 informally 90:3 informants 80:21

information 67:5

70:11 79:1 80:20 82:1,3,12 89:4 97:25 105:18 113:22 191:3 192:8 194:22 informative 150:22 informed 47:7 info@TMGreportin... 2:13 **inhabitants** 6:4 107:3 inhabited 8:20 107:13 175:17 223:9,13 **inheres** 136:23 initial 5:16 207:20 initiated 65:25 innocence 148:13 innumerable 32:22 insert 125:16 insinuate 55:24 insinuations 16:10 insofar 61:10 169:11 insomuch 78:5 inspect 88:1 inspecting 93:6 instance 28:16 instances 121:16 instead 13:20 32:5 39:22 54:18 68:18 102:8 138:3 143:9 165:19 191:6 199:9 201:10 208:18 231:12 232:17 instruct 92:1 instructions 154:22 instructive 225:11 instruments 73:6 intelligence 1:12 2:3 20:11 32:9 33:10 102:14 150:14 152:5 155:3 156:18 157:2 158:20 167:21 189:12,17 208:22,23 209:11 209:14,22 210:5,10 213:20 216:7,17 217:11.19 219:15 219:20 220:17.24 221:7 227:7 228:9 230:9 231:14 234:13 intend 58:22 154:9 intended 53:24 149:23 167:4 168:23 intensity 148:15 intensive 144:18 intention 131:14 132:11 148:20 150:8 167:16 interaction 48:1

interest 80:3 85:13

115:11 154:24

158:13 190:14

interested 97:8 104:9

152:25 153:3 158:5

194:19,23

244:12

93:6 103:4.13.18

internal 102:23 120:15 international 2:6 81:10 82:20 119:12 120:15,22,24 164:8 164:11 interpolate 185:10 interpret 230:23 232:17 interpretation 55:10 143:8 169:12 188:7 193:23 196:11 197:16 198:6,14 199:2,16 200:6 206:4,9 207:22 208:9 216:13.16 223:10.14 interpretations 206:15 interpreted 56:7 160:19 204:3 interpreters 54:24 112:25 interpreting 199:4 231:6 interrupt 96:11 130:22 interrupted 27:4,8 interruption 34:2 intersect 126:9 interspersed 174:22 Inter-American 67:12 73:2 78:8 inter-provincial 129:1 intimated 158:3 intricate 126:9 introduce 90:3 118:6 118:11 128:14 introduced 118:11 Inuit 75:18 invented 76:4 invention 215:14 investigate 154:20 189:13,20 investigations 216:2 invite 74:20 invited 76:20 85:2 151:23 involve 70:8 105:14 116:16 149:11 170:23 172:4 involved 78:2 92:9 97:15 144:14 149:9 190:3 200:17 involvement 85:2 100:10 involves 8:25 involving 79:13 irony 53:24 irrelevant 146:6 159:14 162:20

197:6 232:14 irrespective 197:2 Island 76:9 160:9 isolated 101:4 237:6,8 isolation 200:18 issue 107:13 120:1 133:21 145:8 154:5 155:13 159:10,12 178:18 182:2 193:9 193:13 198:24 199:7 200:13 203:22 207:5 221:14 232:23 234:19 247:24 issues 75:20 79:10 97:7 98:14 105:9 149:5 193:7 218:15 244:11 item 75:7,13 items 82:23 itinerary 117:6,12,16 117:20 ivory 189:2 Jaart 182:5 183:5 184:2 James 2:2 90:4 108:5 125:4 Jange 24:7,10,13,15 25:6 26:23 27:1 28:2 34:1 52:13 January 126:2,21 127:16 182:20

211:9 Jebel 110:14 114:23 iebels 6:5 jigsaw 149:18 JIMÉNEZ 2:6 job 204:11 Jones 121:8 132:3 journey 5:5 107:7 185:6 187:3 joy 190:24 Juba 114:1 judge 1:11,12 16:13 135:25 136:3 137:6 143.14 judgment 68:10 78:12 177:25 judgments 55:13 73:3 judiciously 118:9 133.19 JUDITH 2:8 July 36:9,10,10 junction 13:6 Jur 115:19 jurisdiction 121:2 247:3,4 jurisdictional 198:19 just 3:4 10:24 12:17 17:4,9,9 18:12,13 18:21,22 20:1,3,12 23:11 34:9 39:20 45:12 49:10 50:19 51:13 53:5,7 55:19

57:15 58:4,14,17

61:1,11,13 62:17 63:16 66:8 72:14 75:25 76:5 79:20 81:1,7 82:4 83:9 89:7 94:5,8 95:14 96:11 97:17 99:4,19 104:17,25 110:14 129:25 131:20,22 134:3 135:11 137:6 138:6,24 143:25 144:2 156:24 157:19 162:22 164:4 181:11 196:25 197:11 201:1,22,25 202:7 206:4,18 209:21 211:8,14 213:14,17 213:21 214:5,9,11 215:7,15,25 216:6,8 217:20,20,21,22 219:3 220:2 221:14 225:19.25 227:12 227:25 229:20 233:14,15 238:1 239:16,17 240:3 243:7,8 244:2,17 245:7 246:4

K Kareit 186:20,25 187:5,20 keep 68:16 198:23 234:18 keeps 185:23 Keilak 5:5 17:11,19 38:9 kept 158:17,21 key 84:11 165:5 keys 84:22 **Khartoum** 99:5,10,14 100:14 102:5 107:6 157:23 khor 176:21 Kiir 2:17,25 3:1 4:5 4:21 5:9,24 6:12 13:1,2,5,15 14:15 15:15 17:19 18:2.3 18:5,6,24 19:7,8,12 19:15,17,17,19,24 19:25 20:3,4,5 21:10 24:21,22 25:8 25:21 26:13 27:17 27:20.21 29:4 32:21 33:11,13,15 34:4 35:5,6 36:1,3 38:16 39:1,8,23 40:11 43:25 45:2 49:8 52:4,9,13,16,19 65:11 69:10 115:4 125:2,23 127:1,1 136:7 137:24 141:13 142:11.17 157:3,4,6 167:22,23 168:1 201:10 212:16 217:1 222:12 227:2 229:18 237:22

, -
239:6,22 241:2,2
Kiir/Bahr 1:15 5:11
20:25 21:25 26:4,6
34:8,25 39:10,21
137:22 138:5,13
141:20 197:6 232:4
kilometres 83:10,20 86:25 95:12,12,23
95:24,24 96:2 101:1
172:17 176:25
180:5,23 224:17
kind 81:14,23 87:12
98:25 99:12 101:13
101:16 103:2
211:11 kindly 178:6
kinds 89:1 153:6,11
156:6 236:2
kingdom 243:12
Kipling 53:24,25
Kipling's 54:7,9
Kitchener 114:22
knew 7:15 15:21 104:8 113:19
146:13 158:24,24 163:22 181:22
205:12 208:16
237:11,12
know 2:1 14:24 15:21
15:24 16:13 21:16
26:3 30:11 31:7 50:14,20 51:10 57:2
59:2,3 60:16,25
65:8 66:17 69:24
70:17 71:4,8 84:5
90:18 92:14,14,16
93:3 94:13 95:8
103:14 106:11,14
108:16,17,18 109:1 111:11 112:2,15,18
113:18 115:2
121:14 124:5 125:4
127:23 128:13,13
133:8,9 140:21
142:1 150:23
152:23,25 154:22 158:22 159:2 161:6
161:9,10,11 190:25
211:15 224:9 225:7
229:6,9 230:4
238:17,18 246:25
knowing 90:10
knowledge 32:13
73:11 89:6 119:14 147:6,9,15,22 148:5
223:18
known 39:13 40:2
104:19 126:25
136:13 171:2
187:15 241:1
knows 37:11 67:4
181:5 Kook 20:24 30:20
Koak 29:24 30:20 31:3
Kol 57:20,21,23,24
58:4,6,11,12,20
62:7

Kol-Lang 63:2
Kordofan 1:9,10 23:6
24:7,8,11 32:10,10
32:14 33:23 52:10
52:15 99:1,12
100:13,16,25 101:4
101:14,20 102:6,25
106:5 108:12,16
109:4,18 110:11,12
110:14,16,22
111:19,22,24
112:11 116:19 124:10,18 125:7
127:10,11 128:21
130:17 136:14
141:9,11 144:15
145:17,24 146:19
148:22 149:2,4,24
150:16 151:11 152:18 153:18,22
152:18 153:18,22
154:2,3,15 155:20
155:21 156:1 163:8
163:16 166:18
167:13,15,17 168:7
175:10,15 180:5
189:20 190:23
199:23 200:3
204:13,24 207:2
212:17,21 213:10
213:10 214:24
215:21 216:4,24
217:1,3,8,18,24
220:5 222:22 224:5
224:15 225:5,25
226:8 228:17,24
232:3,12 234:23
235:7,22 239:9
240:5,6,10
Kordofan's 114:7
223:2
Kordofan/Bahr 128:6
137:21 165:12
166:6 196:18
224:22 233:2
Kuol 28:25 61:5 64:19
Kwol 85:5 92:19

L
labelled 239:7
labels 241:9
lack 102:20 148:5,14
lacking 64:9
Lake 5:5 17:11 33:14
166:19,21
lakes 38:8
land 33:23 37:7 39:12
42:2,6,16,22 43:3,4
43:4,5,6 51:8 57:23
60:25 67:22,23
78:25 79:8 80:5
105:11 106:25
107:22 136:12
173:10 181:11,17
205:23 218:17
lands 31:10,10 42:8
49:14,16 61:6 65:15

246:1

Lau 186:16

laws 79:16

lawyers 120:17

latter 16:2 27:17

170:2 215:19

law 2:6 77:2 99:23

156:5 164:9 198:6

lay 137:19 146:14,17

158:6 162:21

Kwot 65:22

JDAN / THE SUDA
106:10 143:4
144:11 181:16,16 landscape 89:7
Lang 62:7 language 42:2 57:25
104:8 112:18
176:18 197:19,24 199:5 12 17 20 25
201:1,5 202:10
199:5,12,17,20,25 201:1,5 202:10 203:16,17,24 204:25 205:13
206:5.19.20 208:7
210:11 213:5 214:4 214:7 215:1 216:10 216:11,12 217:11
216:11,12 217:11 227:12 228:2
230:24,25 238:20
242:19 languages 89:13
Lapradelle 121:7
lapsing 228:1 large 2:9 12:24 14:18
20:14 21:23 79:13
86:8,9 90:20 107:14 156:24 163:20
169:23 176:5 178:25 184:11
186:18 221:23
largely 100:1,23 largest 35:3 52:23
large-scale 149:11
last 75:13 78:4 79:11 90:15 104:14
115:13,13,23 119:4
123:25 125:19 126:6 142:2 146:25
188:13 195:11,24
197:21 245:7 247:24
lasted 85:10 239:3
lastly 157:23 late 54:7,9 111:20
125:2 127:15
136:10 213:22 later 76:19 87:25
111:3 127:3,16 164:16 175:13
180:12 184:25
latitude 34:5 52:14 70:25 77:20,21
83:16 84:17 97:5,9
97:22 131:15,19,21 131:23 132:4,13,16
132:20 135:8 149:25 150:1
165:11 174:25
192:21 244:9,14

LE 2:9	
lead 17:4 22:9 61:1	
85:6 173:10 leading 6:16 72:21	
120:23 127:22	
211:25 218:11	١,
leap 190:24 learn 173:8	l l
learned 8:10 37:6 67:4	Ι
learning 104:10 least 2:17 91:15 99:23	li I
109:2 110:12 148:7	li
156:19 176:22	li
181:19 213:15 221:22 222:1 239:4	li I
245:17	
leave 2:16 45:6 111:16 128:8 187:6	li
leaves 185:6	li
leaving 24:9 44:22	li
185:21 led 81:13 86:24	li
209:23 210:2 212:9	
Lee 105:25	li
left 31:1 77:22 95:9 103:8,19 117:2	
185:22,22,24	
195:22 241:21	
248:2 leg 187:2	
legacy 123:8	
legal 2:8,9,9 48:10,11	
78:23 93:10 137:16 137:17,18 138:11	
141:4 143:2,7 160:7	
160:8 177:13	
178:18 247:1 legend 82:6 83:12,13	
84:18	
legislative 233:18 leisure 119:9	
length 64:5 69:13	
138:4 170:6 196:16	
199:24 lengthy 15:12 144:18	
234:16	
less 11:8 12:14 51:22	li
60:23 76:20 80:20 127:17 181:25	li li
195:5 199:9 211:21	
213:12 235:5 236:18 237:7	li
lesser 181:20	1
let 26:7 97:17 110:5,6	li
129:13 132:8 156:12 157:19	li
160:7 193:14	li
209:13 216:22	
219:18 letter 29:17 105:16,21	
106:3,6,15 161:18	li
161:19,19 162:15	_
177:17 let's 15:7,10 20:7	Ι
26:20 45:15 49:22	li
77:10 115:24	
121:17 122:12,13	

Wednes	
180:9,19 199:15 201:1 204:2,19	
210:16,17 212:3	
215:14 217:5,14 218:10 219:13	
227:18 245:5,6 level 120:22 182:14	
levels 120:6 121:20	
LEVINE 2:8 liar 16:4	
LIBERATION 1:2,18	
liberty 96:12 lied 192:1	
lies 38:9 187:8,20 Lieutenant 115:3	
126:24 163:23	
life 46:7,9,9 61:20 136:18 170:8	
lifeless 9:23	
lifestyles 12:17 176:12 light 12:15 40:6	
153:19 162:17 167:3 181:3 185:12	
like 4:13 17:4 18:19	
22:13 28:14 31:11 32:8 34:13,23 36:8	
36:18 46:17 48:23	
51:19 53:16 56:3 60:14,21 61:4,13	
62:1 64:6 69:11,15 71:20 72:11 74:20	
79:11 81:22 87:9	
88:13,24 89:1 90:17 94:3,17 105:1	
115:22 116:13,18 117:14 120:16	
125:7 134:3 135:20	
138:15,24 139:24 141:2 142:3 149:18	
166:3,7 187:16	
189:25 196:10,25 197:15,16,22,23	
211:8 219:9,10 221:24 231:19	
241:25 243:1 246:4	
246:25 liked 28:15 71:25	
likelihood 17:6	
likely 19:3 104:11 105:4,24 113:24	
211:21 likewise 106:21	
224:13	
limit 22:25 23:16 123:6 129:1 224:11	
limitations 151:19 limited 25:13 26:24	
30:17 36:6 86:25	
100:24 149:12 150:4 153:14	
limits 159:15 166:4,23 166:24 224:21	
LINDSAY 56:8 59:16	
249:5 line 81:2 83:20 95:19	ĺ
95:22 121:1,10,14 121:14,17,21,22,22	
	L

```
121:24 122:2,7,8,9
  122:10 131:15,21
  132:13 135:12,14
  142:3,4 160:6
  166:15 179:13
  224:15
lines 83:17 102:22
  131:18 132:4,16,20
  134:15 172:13
lingua 114:2
link 245:15,18
linked 159:16,17
lisaig 140:19,23,24
  142:1
list 62:18 78:19 79:20
  85:6,7 87:2 94:24
listed 18:16
listened 88:19 129:24
litany 148:5
literally 99:11 107:5
  214:10 215:6 224:1
litigation 63:21,23
  67:18 72:10 92:6,10
  115:16 149:8
Litigations 63:24
little 9:20 14:8 18:25
  21:22 24:22 36:8
  60:15,23 62:1 75:6
  80:16 96:13 98:11
  99:14 103:14 114:7
  140:8 146:22
  158:11 180:12
  183:20 201:3
  217:14 241:16
  245:3
little-known 115:4
live 19:12,14,15,16,16
  19:23 35:14 45:8
  48:21,22 67:22 72:7
  73:7,15 142:18
  174:3 175:21 176:9
  193:19 226:24
  227:1,2
lived 1:15 20:2 24:21
  24:22 33:16 34:24
  36:20 42:25 43:11
  50:22 53:15,19,20
  59:1 65:17,24 71:19
  73:7,16 138:18
  173:22 188:25
  238:25
livelihood 173:11
  174:13
lively 88:18,19
lives 55:22 89:8,8
  100:10
living 13:11 15:6 23:5
  24:15 32:16 33:1,12
  33:21 35:5,18 47:9
  52:1,21,25 53:3,8
  113:6 148:22,22
  154:2 167:10
  170:11 175:25
  179:9 183:16
LLAMZON 2:9
Lloyd 26:20 27:15,24
```

28:9 124:6 166:7

174:21 175:6,7,13	191:16 193:1	MacMichael 175:24	Malwal 70:7	98:4 173:2 192:6,7	205:6 209:6 236:23
176:2 237:4,9 238:7	197:22 199:5 201:2	made 3:9 11:4,5 16:11	man 15:23,23 37:6	192:11,19,25 244:6	242:9 247:5
LLP 2:3,6	201:25 202:4 204:2	30:3 55:24 56:10	65:24	244:20 245:24	meaningful 62:17
local 6:24 85:3 100:10	204:19 206:7 208:5	61:17 69:16,23	manage 118:9 133:18	maps 17:8 18:15,17	meaningless 163:5
102:10 104:5	208:11,22 209:17	77:17 78:11,11	177:24	20:3 28:17 72:25	167:18
106:13 107:3	210:15,16,16,17,20	79:20 82:19 84:21	manageable 135:3	78:11 79:3 81:11,11	meanings 237:2,3
112:17 239:9	212:3,7,14,14	85:14,22 88:13	managed 76:6	81:12 86:14 89:19	means 11:21,22 16:16
localise 81:19,20	213:24,25 214:1	97:13,14 104:14	management 80:7	102:22 150:18	21:14 26:23 27:2
localised 80:22	215:14,17 217:5,14	105:13 106:16	mandate 154:15	166:7,8 168:20	30:14 54:19 72:5
locally 126:25 241:1	218:10 219:11,13	112:11 120:12	171:23 195:8,15	march 15:12 20:8	96:1 113:23 138:2
locals 183:24	220:1,15 221:8	124:3 126:22 132:3	198:1,3,7,15,19	69:23 125:2 152:5	172:5,8 195:3
locate 14:4 154:5	222:19 224:7 226:5	140:9 164:13	204:21 206:9,13	156:18 157:2	200:18,21 207:22
located 2:14 14:8 17:7	226:5,11,17 227:16	171:21 173:23	209:24 212:10	158:16 164:16	208:9,10 230:25
41:15 52:16 97:4,21	227:18 230:16	177:25 178:3,8	231:16	167:20 177:18	231:1 248:1
117:3 125:8 146:23	231:2,5 232:16,16	180:8 188:2 193:5	manner 72:6 156:4	209:11,15	meant 3:11 8:3 14:25
148:3 153:17	232:18,20 233:6	206:12 209:10,14	192:10	Mareng 64:23 65:13	16:18 17:6 27:19
192:20 196:17	234:5 241:4,8	211:12 212:21	many 7:22 13:9 58:2	65:15,18	106:14 113:12
197:4 232:3 240:6	244:18 246:11,12	216:3,18,19 218:19	62:3 81:24 90:21	margins 128:1 131:12	184:19 202:5
244:7 245:25	247:9,14	223:15 229:18	95:6 105:18 107:11	131:13	205:13 215:3
location 52:18 106:12	looked 25:5 28:11	230:10,18 236:2	111:12 120:17	mark 30:6	229:17 233:5
107:2 121:23 122:9	35:21 47:15 68:8	239:17 240:4 243:3	121:16 123:8,8,12	marked 31:2	236:25 240:9
124:19 127:13	69:14 88:2 116:5	Mading 65:9	139:1 150:6 201:10	market 179:20	241:23 242:1,3
133:2 146:5 150:21	123:17 132:21	Mahdi 188:11,17,25	236:14	marks 121:17	measures 93:1
153:18 154:8,20	140:3 151:18 167:2	189:6	Manyuar 64:24 65:22	marshal 99:23	medium-scale 82:18
159:13 167:5 168:3	188:22 220:2	Mahdiyya 62:22	man's 77:5,9	Martin 98:17 127:6	medium-sized 83:1
168:16 229:24	231:16	100:21 104:22	map 2:15 13:25 17:10	249:9	meet 65:3
locations 30:7 34:15	looking 49:4 51:11	111:21 174:15	17:15,18,23,25 18:2	mastery 118:8	meeting 22:18 69:20
57:16 63:10,13	54:1 95:18 119:17	Mahon 1:9,24 2:11	18:4,19,22 19:7,7	material 74:15 93:16	69:25 74:8 85:16,18
68:23 74:8 92:2	187:17,23 199:21	3:8 4:1 6:10 12:24	25:3,6,9 26:20	93:17 105:17	94:22,23 194:12,20
147:7,10,16,22	200:15,18 201:4	13:13 22:7 29:1	28:22 29:17,21 30:1	188:16	204:19,25
223:19	211:21	237:8 238:6	30:10,12,19,25 31:8	materials 29:18 69:2	meetings 54:23 84:25
logbook 84:10,11,15	looks 242:15	Mahon's 2:22 3:13,19	31:17,17,19 33:23	162:18 179:1	85:5 86:9 88:18
logbooks 82:2 84:10	loop 3:9	main 35:2 39:18 52:22	33:24 34:14,19 42:9	mathematical 116:12	95:1 204:6 206:8
86:4 87:23 88:3	loosed 148:11,12	79:20 101:1 174:12	52:6,8,13,15,17	Mathiang 2:17,25	218:7
logical 224:6	loosely 100:2	174:12 202:19	62:19 63:9,15,16	Matrix 2:2	meets 182:22
Logically 127:19	LORETTA 2:3	maintained 162:18	66:8,11,12 68:21,23	matter 1:1 14:2 90:5	Meiram 65:1
Lol 1:21 20:5,17 115:5	lost 13:8 22:20	major 6:21,22 20:4	68:25 69:12,25 70:3	90:16 102:24 103:5	Mellum 29:24 30:20
125:24 127:1	lot 9:19 20:9 54:6 55:8	80:19 182:19	70:14,23 71:6,13,16	134:9 143:17	57:22 58:8 187:9
167:23 170:11	55:16 75:8 78:15	majority 104:3 172:16	71:20 72:3,23 77:5	149:14 169:23	member 142:23
239:22 241:2	79:7 80:2,7,25	191:2	77:6,10,17,21,23	175:2 193:23	144:10
London 79:12 106:1	87:15 88:13 89:4	make 10:18 40:6	80:8,9,18 81:3 82:4	198:22 223:22	members 25:12 44:15 56:19 57:4,7 73:12
long 17:11 56:13	113:19 115:1 120:8	41:20 44:16 77:5,6	82:9,10,18,21 83:16	236:9 244:21	1 20:19 27:47 / 13:17
79.21 94.6 95.12		77.0 90.0 01.6	02.10 24 04.7 05.25	mottomed 122.5	
78:21 84:6 85:12	231:20 237:16	77:9 80:9 91:6	83:19,24 84:7 85:25	mattered 133:5	92:12,25 145:13
90:15,17 101:12	231:20 237:16 246:20	118:23 126:17	86:1 87:17 91:5	157:24,25 158:4	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 M M 1:12	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 M M 1:12 MA 119:6	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 M M 1:12 MA 119:6 Maalia 24:9 58:15	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14 67:16 68:21 70:18	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 MA 119:6 Malia 24:9 58:15 Mabek 62:13	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1 making 4:3 30:14	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5 72:19,22 73:12,13	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12 meagre 107:19	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2 209:17,19 210:1,7
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14 67:16 68:21 70:18 72:15 77:9 80:4	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 M M 1:12 MA 119:6 Maalia 24:9 58:15 Mabek 62:13 MacDonald 5:14	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1 making 4:3 30:14 170:25 193:11,12	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5 72:19,22 73:12,13 73:14 74:17 75:7	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12 meagre 107:19 mean 11:22 21:13	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2 209:17,19 210:1,7 215:14 216:12,20
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14 67:16 68:21 70:18 72:15 77:9 80:4 82:9 94:3,17 111:7	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 M M 1:12 MA 119:6 Maalia 24:9 58:15 Mabek 62:13 MacDonald 5:14 13:25 19:2 25:5	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1 making 4:3 30:14 170:25 193:11,12 193:13	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5 72:19,22 73:12,13 73:14 74:17 75:7 78:14 79:8,14 80:17	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12 meagre 107:19 mean 11:22 21:13 27:1 30:13 101:7	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2 209:17,19 210:1,7 215:14 216:12,20 217:21 218:2
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14 67:16 68:21 70:18 72:15 77:9 80:4 82:9 94:3,17 111:7 116:10 121:4	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 M M 1:12 MA 119:6 Maalia 24:9 58:15 Mabek 62:13 MacDonald 5:14 13:25 19:2 25:5 119:21 225:8 234:3	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1 making 4:3 30:14 170:25 193:11,12 193:13 Makuac 61:5	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5 72:19,22 73:12,13 73:14 74:17 75:7 78:14 79:8,14 80:17 81:6,10,13,23 82:20	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12 meagre 107:19 mean 11:22 21:13 27:1 30:13 101:7 174:5 181:9 197:2	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2 209:17,19 210:1,7 215:14 216:12,20 217:21 218:2 220:13 221:12
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14 67:16 68:21 70:18 72:15 77:9 80:4 82:9 94:3,17 111:7 116:10 121:4 125:15 126:5,19	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1 making 4:3 30:14 170:25 193:11,12 193:13 Makuac 61:5 Malaysia 160:12	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5 72:19,22 73:12,13 73:14 74:17 75:7 78:14 79:8,14 80:17 81:6,10,13,23 82:20 84:20,23 87:3,9	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12 meagre 107:19 mean 11:22 21:13 27:1 30:13 101:7 174:5 181:9 197:2 202:3,6 208:8	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2 209:17,19 210:1,7 215:14 216:12,20 217:21 218:2 220:13 221:12 227:18,21 230:15
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14 67:16 68:21 70:18 72:15 77:9 80:4 82:9 94:3,17 111:7 116:10 121:4 125:15 126:5,19 138:17 139:7 141:3	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 M M 1:12 MA 119:6 Maalia 24:9 58:15 Mabek 62:13 MacDonald 5:14 13:25 19:2 25:5 119:21 225:8 234:3 234:6 238:19 241:7 MacDonald's 128:2	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1 making 4:3 30:14 170:25 193:11,12 193:13 Makuac 61:5 Malaysia 160:12 males 6:22	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5 72:19,22 73:12,13 73:14 74:17 75:7 78:14 79:8,14 80:17 81:6,10,13,23 82:20 84:20,23 87:3,9 90:13,15 92:19 93:25 94:14,19 95:8 95:19 96:9,16 97:3	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12 meagre 107:19 mean 11:22 21:13 27:1 30:13 101:7 174:5 181:9 197:2 202:3,6 208:8 242:25	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2 209:17,19 210:1,7 215:14 216:12,20 217:21 218:2 220:13 221:12 227:18,21 230:15 230:16 238:5
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14 67:16 68:21 70:18 72:15 77:9 80:4 82:9 94:3,17 111:7 116:10 121:4 125:15 126:5,19 138:17 139:7 141:3 151:10,21 170:5	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1 making 4:3 30:14 170:25 193:11,12 193:13 Makuac 61:5 Malaysia 160:12 males 6:22 MALINTOPPI 2:3	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5 72:19,22 73:12,13 73:14 74:17 75:7 78:14 79:8,14 80:17 81:6,10,13,23 82:20 84:20,23 87:3,9 90:13,15 92:19 93:25 94:14,19 95:8	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12 meagre 107:19 mean 11:22 21:13 27:1 30:13 101:7 174:5 181:9 197:2 202:3,6 208:8 242:25 meaning 57:24 117:20	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2 209:17,19 210:1,7 215:14 216:12,20 217:21 218:2 220:13 221:12 227:18,21 230:15 230:16 238:5 memorials 235:11
90:15,17 101:12 103:10 165:1 longer 98:12 164:18 longitude 77:20,21 83:17 84:17 131:19 132:5 look 3:3,13 4:14 5:4 8:18 10:15,23 13:22 15:5,7,10 17:8 18:1 23:8 30:9 31:1 34:12 35:24 38:22 38:23 39:11 42:21 45:15,16,23 53:6,23 60:14 61:4,13 64:6 64:11,16 66:14 67:16 68:21 70:18 72:15 77:9 80:4 82:9 94:3,17 111:7 116:10 121:4 125:15 126:5,19 138:17 139:7 141:3 151:10,21 170:5 177:4 182:16	231:20 237:16 246:20 lots 21:9 54:24 61:20 low 82:14 88:8 lowlands 22:24 luaks 34:18 49:12 50:7 139:22 140:5 141:24 Lual 61:18 66:21 lunch 136:5 lying 150:4 167:25 191:14 192:2 M M 1:12 MA 119:6 Maalia 24:9 58:15 Mabek 62:13 MacDonald 5:14 13:25 19:2 25:5 119:21 225:8 234:3 234:6 238:19 241:7 MacDonald's 128:2 MACHAR 2:5	118:23 126:17 144:1 153:6 177:7 177:19 187:4 188:10 189:10 194:8 203:6 209:16 214:3 215:25 216:8 231:24 237:19 243:12 247:9 makes 3:12,25 4:11 10:8 13:17 26:4,13 29:16 40:12 81:4 113:6 140:19 162:12 178:15 189:13 200:10 212:10 225:1 making 4:3 30:14 170:25 193:11,12 193:13 Makuac 61:5 Malaysia 160:12 males 6:22 MALINTOPPI 2:3 Malith 58:14	86:1 87:17 91:5 95:19 96:10,13 100:13 102:14 110:20 125:13,16 166:7 171:16 180:18 186:5 187:6 187:23 194:20 234:8,11 235:8 241:4,5,6,7,8,14,19 243:4,6,20,22 mapped 77:11 86:10 121:25 122:10 mappers 82:25 85:20 85:21 87:22 94:17 mapping 63:16 72:5 72:19,22 73:12,13 73:14 74:17 75:7 78:14 79:8,14 80:17 81:6,10,13,23 82:20 84:20,23 87:3,9 90:13,15 92:19 93:25 94:14,19 95:8 95:19 96:9,16 97:3	157:24,25 158:4 159:6 168:14 Max 160:14 may 59:17 70:3 92:25 97:25 120:16,21 123:19 125:1 136:5 151:1,3 154:10 169:16 174:8,10 175:2 176:8 189:24 192:1,8 201:10 208:8 236:6 239:20 239:23 maybe 10:3 11:6 83:11 84:4 220:8,8 McGowan 2:12 meagre 107:19 mean 11:22 21:13 27:1 30:13 101:7 174:5 181:9 197:2 202:3,6 208:8 242:25 meaning 57:24 117:20 125:8 198:20	92:12,25 145:13 162:6 166:25 169:2 169:9 195:25 memorandum 152:12 155:23 158:6 159:3 161:18 162:15 163:13 164:17 165:23 168:13,14 199:10 208:14 228:12 229:20 230:6,12,15 231:11 240:12,13,14 memorial 22:21 36:23 133:24 146:20 151:12 198:13 207:23 208:1 209:2 209:17,19 210:1,7 215:14 216:12,20 217:21 218:2 220:13 221:12 227:18,21 230:15 230:16 238:5 memorials 235:11 men 6:18 15:20 61:2

MENAS 3:22 5:13	13:4,21,25 14:3,5	monopoly 183:10	moved 14:5,15 25:25	225:19	next 2:5 10:24 19:9
20:21 146:4,21	19:2 52:4 74:6	month 189:15	26:1 43:13,17 54:8	names 32:2 37:5 57:15	20:7 33:4 34:11,13
158:14 238:12	95:21,24 96:1,4,6	monthly 150:14	61:15 194:3	62:16,18 77:18,24	44:13 45:6 46:11
245:13	125:3 142:16 155:6	months 75:17 91:3,8	movement 59:7 174:3	84:12 106:12 110:9	49:4 66:19 69:11
MENAS's 161:14	180:14,22 185:23	91:11,12,24 158:18	movements 62:23	110:10 126:9	75:5 78:1 85:21
mention 7:22 106:23	military 100:8 105:23	158:21 239:20	MOVEMENT/AR	national 75:16	86:12 113:19
152:4,5 153:6	109:23 157:22	more 2:23 11:1 12:5	1:2,18	nationalist 104:22	122:11 125:18,25
175:20 235:14	milk 44:19 174:13	21:22 23:14 24:3,4	moves 33:15	Nations 82:19	126:11 139:10
mentioned 23:5 81:7,7	millet 31:12 43:14	26:16 28:15 29:20	moving 33:2 56:14	natives 113:20	168:2 186:15 217:5
118:6 186:16	mind 79:21 98:23	39:5 46:25 53:10,11	148:16 237:14	naturally 103:19	217:14 223:1 224:7
188:14 194:14	107:1 127:21 130:2	54:7 55:8 60:15	240:25	197:23	236:3 237:14
mentions 183:14	130:5 148:7 184:13	63:5 68:12 71:21	Mual 65:22	nature 25:19 26:9	NGO 78:6 82:3
mere 148:11 177:1	206:1	74:12 75:6 79:9,13	much 2:23 11:8,10	41:4 60:19 99:16	Ngok 1:18 4:20,22
184:1	mindful 71:21	80:3,20 81:17 82:15	12:13 13:23 22:16	160:25 238:16	5:24 6:1 7:5,8,14,22
merely 106:3 158:2	minds 145:22 156:7	87:15 88:10 96:14	27:10 28:10 29:10	243:13	7:23 8:6,20 9:15,25
229:23	minimal 122:24	100:15 101:6 102:5	29:16 30:18,22 31:5	near 44:15 52:19	10:13,22 11:5 12:13
Messiriya 4:10 10:4,6	Ministry 181:14	107:4 119:12 120:8	41:8,16 42:16,21	62:13 185:13	12:17,21 13:3,9
10:9,22 11:7,8,8,10	minutes 54:21 60:1,2	123:15 135:18	51:11,22 53:16	nearly 46:22	15:2,10 16:17 17:2
25:10 27:24 28:4,5	60:6 69:20 75:6	150:4,6 151:21	55:17 59:17 69:16	necessarily 36:7 53:25	17:5,6,21 18:3,6,10
29:11 31:10,11,12	118:22 145:9 248:2	153:14 174:18	74:15 80:22 88:24	81:20 160:12,16	18:13,14,18 19:4,6
31:23 34:9 35:10,11	248:3	180:12 181:23,25	90:21 98:8 106:15	164:24 166:3	19:8,11,14,19,23
35:11,15 36:21	mishmash 135:17	192:9 193:14 195:5	106:16 108:1	167:10 173:22	20:2,5 21:6,10,11
37:10,18,23 41:11	misinformed 47:20	199:9 202:9 214:8	114:12 117:24	necessary 9:22 119:1	21:14 24:5,15,21
41:20,21 42:6 43:15	misinterpretation	216:5 224:16	124:23 126:7 127:7	153:25 208:2	25:16,23 26:8,8,12
44:14 45:5,25 46:12	198:4,17	228:19 229:22	128:9 129:9 132:21	need 3:5,6 5:20 82:10	26:17,23 27:2,12,14
46:23 47:16 48:1,20	misinterpreted 198:2	233:11,11	133:10,13 135:21	101:21 102:11	28:2,6,8,12,20,24
49:25 50:1 52:2,25	misinterpreting 198:9	Moreover 106:11	135:23 136:25	124:22 131:5	31:9,15,18,22,24
70:21,25 71:2	206:12	158:5 174:18	143:12 145:6 150:4	132:16,17 134:18	32:2 33:1,5,10,12
139:16,19 140:12	mislead 16:6	morning 1:5 58:22	150:25 153:14	134:19,20 140:14	33:17,21 34:3,12,15
140:19 150:13	misleading 23:8	107:11 136:7 146:3	169:2,15 171:9	140:15 142:15,17	34:17,20,24,25 35:5
174:16 176:10	misquote 108:7	146:12 147:3 152:9	174:18 180:6 182:1	146:25 149:16	35:10,12,18 36:1,4
Messiriya's 46:7	misreference 1:17	158:8,12,15 161:17	182:15 185:24	152:25 154:2	36:7,11,16 38:3
met 54:22,23 90:3	misrepresentation 192:24	162:11 173:2 188:2	190:24 192:3 196:1 214:3 216:5 225:12	155:21 162:25	39:1,22 40:21 41:5
112:23,24 113:5 method 77:25 90:10	miss 171:18 209:13	195:24 212:2 229:16,19 231:21	233:10,11 236:17	163:2 167:16 170:5 188:18 196:13	41:15 42:6,8 43:2,4 44:8,17,21,25 45:1
93:16	215:25 216:9	234:20 243:3 244:4	239:14 240:22	198:23 206:15	45:4,6,8,12 48:1,15
methodologies 79:9	missed 86:8	morning's 197:12	246:15 247:7,8,22	207:21 232:16	48:21,22 49:5,9,10
methodology 72:8,24	missing 151:24	Morrison 170:7	248:3	234:25 242:16	49:24 50:1,5,6,7,9
75:11 76:16 81:18	misstating 207:12	mosquitoes 32:19	much-vexed 240:21	needed 85:17 124:17	50:13,23 51:3,5,15
82:24 88:6 190:8	mistake 25:9 125:5	most 30:15 36:19 38:3	mudiria 123:19 236:5	152:22 163:10	51:18,22,25 52:4,8
methods 140:20	187:11,16 238:25	41:9 44:4,10 53:13	Muglad 1:24 29:12	168:6	52:12,16,17,21,25
metropolitan 100:14	239:17 240:4	53:19,21 58:19	37:20,25 38:2,9	needs 121:15 188:13	53:3,8,12,13,21
Michael 1:13 49:2	mistaken 179:7	71:19 86:3 89:12	40:5 43:13 44:20	negative 18:11	54:12 55:21 56:19
Middle 119:13	mistakes 231:24	98:22 100:3,5	46:13,21,23 50:1,5	negotiate 77:1	58:10 59:1 60:17
mid-air 45:18	mistook 237:20	102:11 103:25	53:18 61:10 179:17	negotiated 207:11	61:2,10,12 63:4,20
mid-1800s 66:22	mixed 174:23	143:16 151:9	mules 6:19	212:6 221:1 222:6	64:20,23 65:3 69:24
mid-1930s 65:5	Miyen 62:14	154:13 157:18	multiple 227:21	negotiating 207:17	70:4,8,12,23 71:2
Mienway 58:14	Mm-hm 92:11 94:12	186:4 195:17	235:18	negotiations 144:19	71:16,18 72:1,18
might 9:20 14:15 42:1	96:8 111:25 115:7	motivated 155:10	museum 119:6	230:7,8	74:2 92:2,9,12 97:4
42:19 44:16 67:9	mobilising 79:1	motivation 109:7,8,10	must 9:24 16:2 49:20	negotiators 207:14,18	97:11,21 99:3,15
73:23,23 82:22	mobility 87:15	109:15	67:20,23 68:19	208:13	103:3,8,22 104:8,11
100:14 111:18	mode 182:13 183:7	motives 16:14	106:20,24 113:23	neighbours 99:17	105:4 106:3,20,23
119:18 129:1	model 228:4	mountains 98:23	120:1 122:21	neither 14:16	107:8,12,19,22
137:14 144:21	modem 81:2	175:17,18 205:19	123:16 126:1	never 13:18 21:5 27:4	108:9 109:3 115:24
171:8 177:2 179:19	modern 68:22 73:10	205:20	127:20 153:19	36:14 87:7 92:14	116:1,18 117:4,7,13
205:15 216:20	73:13 100:14,15	Mounted 4:14 6:17,25	160:20 173:22	104:2,2 111:19	117:18 134:13
219:3 222:13 224:1	181:1	7:11 16:20	myself 49:13 75:11	117:14 127:21	135:7,10,15 136:11
224:2,10 236:11	modest 161:2	move 18:19 28:14 32:8	77:25 78:10 90:4	131:25 157:4	136:13,15,21 138:2
mighty 19:18	modification 190:10	32:19 34:13,23	128:14 231:25	187:11 210:24	138:18 139:22
migrate 44:9,10	MOHAMED 2:2	36:18 39:3 40:1	myth 181:13,18	219:25 224:16	140:2,11,21 141:8
139:16	moment 96:12 160:13	41:3 46:10 51:8		new 2:19 3:18 8:10	141:19 142:17
migrated 25:23 migration 11:13	206:18 218:9 moments 244:17	54:13 56:3,13 59:4 61:13,17 64:6 66:19	N	76:3 77:8 104:23	143:4 144:10,11,20 144:23 145:16
116:17		77:2 83:7 98:12	name 57:24 58:8 90:4	107:6 165:25 166:5 166:5 168:25	146:23 148:3,25
migrations 12:2	Monday 157:9 196:13 196:14 213:12		96:18,19 108:5	169:21 191:21	· ·
mile 14:3,5,15	219:1 224:19	118:10 176:7,8 211:8 231:19	110:12 111:6	192:5 224:22	150:12 152:23 154:7,12,21 155:12
miles 2:5 6:3 7:6 13:1	money 80:25	241:25	named 184:6,12	news 143:5,5	155:18 169:19,20
2.0 0.0 7.0 10.1		211.23	namely 1:14 2:24	110110 1 10.0,0	155.10 107.17,20
	ı				

		Г	Г	Τ	
170:7 171:13 172:9	61:25 85:1 116:6	101:2 105:2 107:22	number 12:11 13:9	octogenarians 177:23	61:11,11,22 62:1
172:12,22 173:18	117:4 119:5 138:20	113:13 135:8,11,11	18:21 25:14 34:12	odd 180:21	63:1 66:6,6 67:6,16
173:20 174:5,6,10	145:16 154:6,12	136:12 138:5,12,19	34:14,15 36:4 55:20	off 10:1 29:24 77:18	67:16,18 72:1,8,8
175:3,20,20,22	196:22 199:22	139:12 140:17	58:1 62:18 64:12	83:2 211:1 214:15	72:10,14,15,21 73:8
176:1,4,6,8 177:3,5	200:1,4,22 201:8,11	141:1,10,13,20	69:4 74:2 84:12,17	214:16	73:17,23 75:5,5
180:11,13,15,18,22	201:11,18 202:24	142:25 149:25,25	84:18 111:11 160:6	offered 178:4	76:5,6 77:8 83:8,20
181:22 182:5 183:4	203:5 204:12,22	157:6 172:15	170:10 183:12	Office 33:24 102:14	85:1,22 87:5,5,17
183:6 184:4,8 185:4	205:3,6 206:25	174:22 176:5,25	190:11 201:13	125:16 234:14	87:18 88:6,14,17,21
185:8,11 186:1,12	219:22 220:4	177:2 179:18,20	numbers 4:20 68:1	officer 29:17	88:24,25 92:24 95:1
186:19 188:5,15,19	232:18 235:8	181:17 183:17	194:13	officers 100:3 101:8	95:25 97:7 102:6
191:15,19,20 192:3	242:15	185:3,8,11 186:9,14	numerous 30:10 38:6	102:4,21 103:15	105:13 109:3,3,11
192:20 193:8,22,24	noble 16:22	186:15 187:1	40:21 73:9 123:24	104:12,15 105:6,23	115:1,13,22 118:23
194:1,6,19 196:22	nobody 40:18 45:19	188:25 189:14	150:14 175:19	106:17 154:19	120:22 125:5,18,25
199:22 200:1,4,23	56:13 230:4 233:16	192:4,21,21 193:3	237:1	official 102:16 132:14	129:6 131:3,6,8,9
201:9,12,15,17,17	237:11,12	197:5 202:21 203:3	Nyama 31:3 61:16	132:18 133:5	132:21 133:21
201:18,22 202:23	nomad 42:18	227:1 232:6,11	62:7,14 64:22 65:16	151:13 157:19,24	137:16 146:13
203:4,5,8 204:12,23	nomadic 29:11 46:6	243:18 244:8,9,13	65:17,18,20	157:24 158:3,4	147:17,19 149:8,10
205:3,7 206:25	nomadism 37:8 41:1	244:16 246:1,2	Nyamora 13:6 35:4	159:5 168:14	155:2,4,5,9,14
208:25 210:25	46:8	northeast 3:15 33:14		219:21 239:10	161:11 163:1,3,18
211:18 213:3	nomads 42:13 45:25	186:15	0	241:19	170:5,6 172:24
214:16,20,21,25	nomenclature 39:18	northern 4:5 51:9	OBE 200:7	officials 16:16,19 17:5	178:9 179:18 182:7
215:9,20 216:3,15	162:17	52:11 99:1,13	Obeid 100:19,24	21:4 99:14 103:20	183:10,18 184:9
216:23 217:3,7,9,17	nominal 99:7	101:20 104:16,19	101:9 102:5 103:16	104:7 114:3 123:24	185:15 186:22
217:23 219:22	nomination 132:4	117:3 130:17	110:15,17	124:3 128:22	189:21,25 191:17
220:5,19 221:24	nominations 132:5	159:15 166:4,12,24	object 153:20 155:22	129:17 132:25	192:6 194:10,13
222:9,16,21 223:5,8	none 7:22 15:20	170:15 181:14	205:9 206:2 212:25	145:23 146:22	205:14 208:10,18
223:12,25 224:1,3,4	100:11 208:15	211:22 229:15	213:1	147:6,9,15,22 148:2	209:11 214:15
225:3,7,13 227:1	219:5	234:24	objection 147:11	148:17,19 149:6,23	218:19 220:19
228:5,23 229:1,9,24	nonetheless 5:25	northernmost 96:9,16	204:18	150:3,9,17 151:22	236:19 243:11,11
232:18 239:21	25:14 73:25 125:6	northwards 35:2	obliged 84:3	152:1 153:6,10,14	244:11 246:16
242:15 243:5,8,17	127:18 149:13	52:22 95:13,22	obscured 217:15	154:17,24 155:12	247:18,18
243:18 244:7,15	163:25 242:20	northwest 13:5 37:17	observation 21:3,4	157:11 158:12	ones 53:19 81:25
245:19,25 247:17	non-appearance	61:7 62:25 64:25	52:20 84:17,20	159:9,19 161:25	124:10 162:10
247:17,21 N=-14-40:14.16.107:2	177:9	183:1 185:22 186:9	observations 34:21	162:4 163:10,22,25	one's 44:20
Ngok's 49:14,16 197:3 197:7	non-humped 140:6 non-involvement	north/south 77:14 notably 17:24	35:25 36:6,16 87:7	167:3 168:24 181:15 185:2 214:9	only 1:5 4:2,3 5:7 7:6 15:5 17:1,14 19:14
Ngol 2:1 3:25 4:1,6,11	192:3	note 18:21,25 19:5	87:9	214:19 222:10,25	28:17 29:20 30:1
4:23 5:8,12 6:1,2,8	Noong 62:25 63:1	21:1,21 22:5 32:4	observe 179:8,12	223:7,11,18 229:9	36:22 46:8,16 48:9
6:12,12 8:19,25	65:11	49:7 54:14 121:11	observed 34:25	229:11 236:24	71:23 74:14 86:6
10:20 11:3 12:3,4	normal 59:9 140:17	158:19 203:11	obstacle 90:12	237:20 238:17	89:14 99:5,20,24
12:13,14,17,18	177:13 182:12	210:6 219:3 226:1	obstacles 89:18 obtained 7:17 30:18	off-hand 112:15	100:1,19,21 103:20
14:25 15:6 18:13,14	north 1:21,25 2:1,25	226:13	obvious 11:12 70:14	often 104:7,16 121:25	103:23 106:18
20:24 21:7,10,12,15	3:21 4:3,4,21,22 5:5	noted 2:8 6:2 30:9	81:19 144:3 176:19	132:2	107:12 110:13
25:8,10,20,22 27:19	5:24 6:1 10:6 11:10	106:3 125:19 130:3	190:13 194:19	Oh 30:8 86:7 112:2	113:9 116:4,10
28:3,4,6 31:4,20	11:22,23 12:14 13:1	159:20 163:19	221:22	okay 94:10 95:16,18	124:21 126:17
33:13 34:4 35:16,19	13:2,15 14:18 17:18	notes 4:25 5:4 7:2 8:17	obviously 69:24 111:1	96:2,5,24	133:5,8,21 137:23
36:2,4,5 39:9,23	17:19 18:24 19:19	38:11 106:23 175:6	119:14 130:10	Okwai 228:14	147:23 150:11
50:4,14 51:22,23	19:24 20:2,17 21:15	nothing 30:4 70:3	133:3 155:6 159:11	old 2:16 57:2,3	153:21,24 155:4,17
52:5,7 63:4,11,17	22:24 23:6 24:16	71:16 102:19 104:8	168:2 188:22	older 83:2	155:19 157:24,24
65:21 69:9,9 125:8	25:11,22 26:5 27:13	106:3,6 107:4	192:23 194:14	omission 159:4	158:4 159:5 161:14
125:17 138:6 139:3	28:25 29:4,23 31:3	108:23 151:3	243:11	omits 17:18 30:10	165:14 168:13
194:16 229:18	31:4,9,13,18 33:10	152:12 161:21	occasion 27:6 44:22	omitted 22:14 175:5	170:5 171:20
238:9 239:19 240:2	33:13 34:9,24 35:5	192:25 242:23	46:15 118:5 177:12	omodiyas 179:19	176:11 183:7
240:7,9 241:9,10,13	35:19 36:1,2,5	notice 225:24 226:12	192:2	once 27:4 29:19 46:25	186:10 191:22
241:18 243:7,10,18	37:17,21,25 38:11	noticed 226:2,3	occasional 14:24	125:11 159:7	192:9 196:16
243:18,19	40:3,17 42:19 43:12	notifying 100:6	113:16	203:11	202:16 211:3
Ngol/Ragaba 20:20	46:21,24 49:8,12,25	notion 48:5,6 66:12	occasions 192:1	one 1:5 1:7,13 3:3,4,5	221:12 222:7 223:4
124:1 141:21	50:4,14,15 51:23	242:11	212:20 213:6	4:2,3,3,4,6 6:13,15	224:13 232:10
Niat 186:17	52:4,5,7,9,16,18	notwithstanding	occupied 20:4 27:17	6:16 7:20 9:6,7,11	234:3 235:4,11
nicely 13:25 139:8	53:12 58:10,12,17	17:23,24 Navambar 01:22	100:21 101:9	9:12,13,18,20 10:18	241:19 242:24
Nile 20:8 32:11 40:1		November 91:22	152:24 154:21	10:25 12:7 14:3 17:10 21:2 22:13	246:23 onus 185:16
00.10.100.17	58:19 59:10 61:16	100.12			LOGUE IXXIIA
99:10 100:17	61:17 62:14,25 63:5	189:12	155:11		
114:11,18 115:17	61:17 62:14,25 63:5 65:10,11,16,20 67:1	no-name 77:21	occupy 20:5 22:24	24:23 29:9 31:15,25	open 32:16 54:23 58:6
114:11,18 115:17 115:18 225:25	61:17 62:14,25 63:5 65:10,11,16,20 67:1 69:8 71:11 95:10,15	no-name 77:21 Nuba 32:16 175:16,17	occupy 20:5 22:24 35:1 41:9 180:22	24:23 29:9 31:15,25 32:7 34:21 35:24	open 32:16 54:23 58:6 93:5 119:7 181:15
114:11,18 115:17 115:18 225:25 226:8	61:17 62:14,25 63:5 65:10,11,16,20 67:1 69:8 71:11 95:10,15 95:21,22 96:23 97:5	no-name 77:21 Nuba 32:16 175:16,17 175:19	occupy 20:5 22:24 35:1 41:9 180:22 occurred 7:1 190:16	24:23 29:9 31:15,25 32:7 34:21 35:24 36:19,25 37:9 43:22	open 32:16 54:23 58:6 93:5 119:7 181:15 185:24
114:11,18 115:17 115:18 225:25 226:8 Nile/Congo 166:17	61:17 62:14,25 63:5 65:10,11,16,20 67:1 69:8 71:11 95:10,15 95:21,22 96:23 97:5 97:5,9,10,12,16,18	no-name 77:21 Nuba 32:16 175:16,17 175:19 nucleus 100:24	occupy 20:5 22:24 35:1 41:9 180:22 occurred 7:1 190:16 241:20	24:23 29:9 31:15,25 32:7 34:21 35:24 36:19,25 37:9 43:22 44:16,19 47:3 48:18	<pre>open 32:16 54:23 58:6 93:5 119:7 181:15 185:24 opened 115:14,17,18</pre>
114:11,18 115:17 115:18 225:25 226:8	61:17 62:14,25 63:5 65:10,11,16,20 67:1 69:8 71:11 95:10,15 95:21,22 96:23 97:5	no-name 77:21 Nuba 32:16 175:16,17 175:19	occupy 20:5 22:24 35:1 41:9 180:22 occurred 7:1 190:16	24:23 29:9 31:15,25 32:7 34:21 35:24 36:19,25 37:9 43:22	open 32:16 54:23 58:6 93:5 119:7 181:15 185:24

					7
223:15	235:14,19 237:19	packages 91:9	55:22 64:13,15,15	233:16	14:11,21 15:2 17:9
openly 3:3 173:4	243:12,21 247:22	page 84:15 91:13 94:5	70:24 74:18 101:4	peace 1:6 206:23	17:10,16,25 18:12
operations 165:3	others 60:18 123:16	94:9,11 111:1,2,11	101:10 103:2 111:1	233:16	20:7,19,23 21:21
opinion 117:5 123:5,6	237:4,9	114:5,13,15,18	115:16 120:2	Peake 114:22 165:16	22:7 27:22 29:1
128:22 129:16	otherwise 9:22 34:7	116:25 126:5,11,11	160:21 173:10,10	peculiar 70:1 206:4	62:12 67:9 124:4
132:15	46:24 50:8 103:23	126:19 142:3,3	174:8 184:23	Pellet 2:3 198:10	154:19 167:23,25
opponents 146:1	Ottoman 123:10,12	147:3,17 157:10	186:22 187:4	206:10	237:4,8 238:6
148:6 154:25	123:13,15	158:1 165:1 181:7	191:17 192:14	pen 216:19	239:17,19,25 240:4
156:14	Ouest 2:3	182:19 226:13	193:16 198:12	pencil 81:2	Percival's 4:25 5:20
opportunity 60:20	ought 53:23 121:4	234:6 249:2	200:21 204:3	penetrate 40:3 126:24	7:2 8:17 11:9 17:10
opposing 147:12	ourselves 210:20	pages 126:4	211:22 222:17	peninsula 119:14	18:22 113:1 125:1
opposite 16:18 86:18	out 7:4 10:10 14:9,18	paid 219:25 231:9,10	223:3 228:13 229:2	people 8:10,15 14:6,9	188:3,4
151:17 162:5	25:25 26:1 28:22	231:14	233:22 238:22	14:18 16:13,21,22	perfect 4:11 16:11
208:12	33:8 34:16 36:8	paint 170:13	240:18 246:22	22:7 42:19 45:1,18	26:4 40:12 225:1
optimistic 89:20	50:10,22 51:1 53:7	painted 145:21	particularly 107:20	45:19 46:16,19	perfectly 81:19 152:19
option 82:18	53:11 62:16 66:4	Palace 1:6	119:13 122:4	50:15,23 51:1 53:10	171:21 173:14
OPTIONAL 1:4	67:2 80:12 81:9,18	Pallme 123:9	125:22 134:23	53:15,16,18,20 54:2	187:13 205:12
oral 54:1,16,17 67:14	82:1 83:8 85:23	Palmas 160:10	167:25	54:2,6,22,23 55:3	212:25
67:14 68:18 152:20	87:2,23 88:3 90:19	Pangnirtung 76:8	parties 1:4 10:25	56:17 60:12,15,21	perhaps 30:15 60:11
191:9,10 192:5 224:19	115:4,12 121:17 130:24 134:24	paper 42:12 paragraph 97:2,19	14:24 17:1 45:22 47:19 54:18 68:5,6	60:25,25 61:3 62:1	67:7 90:18 96:13 98:22 111:16
order 9:22 17:24	130:24 134:24 137:12 151:25	116:25 125:23	113:17 149:21	66:16,16,23 67:20 67:23 68:16 72:7	127:16,17 128:5
30:22 79:17 119:18	156:8 159:1 160:9	126:19 128:18	159:12 197:9	73:4,15 74:2 75:9	151:3 214:4 216:6
155:21 163:9 185:7	163:5 165:2 168:14	136:8 137:11,13	199:17 201:14,20	76:21 78:15 84:12	perimeter 51:9
209:6	168:24 176:2	138:8,16 139:5,11	202:5 203:14 204:6	84:13 87:6,8 88:3	period 13:16 73:23
ordered 30:4	178:24 188:13	139:15 140:10	208:21 210:10	88:19,25 89:5	74:1 77:15 91:11,19
orderly 93:16	195:22 204:8 205:2	141:2 145:2 146:24	212:4,5 220:25	100:14 104:5	100:4 107:21,23
orders 16:3 207:9	210:24 211:13	151:12 165:1	222:6 225:18	105:11,12 106:4,5	108:9 110:18
ordinarily 73:23,24	216:2,22 244:23	176:14 178:22	230:12	111:12 112:18	111:21 123:12
91:14	246:7	179:4 180:6 192:17	partly 86:13	118:25 131:7,9	139:17 162:3
organisation 59:25	outcome 92:13 193:2	208:1 245:5	parts 17:22,24 32:6,14	138:13 140:20	176:23 188:17,21
81:24	outer 172:12	paragraphs 139:6	107:14 243:21	144:7 145:25 154:1	188:25 189:9
organised 100:7	outrageous 27:7	parallel 165:10 228:8	party 159:8 185:15	155:20 156:23,24	195:19
orientation 77:15	outset 119:9	paramount 1:19 14:7	passable 86:23	157:1,1 167:10	permanent 1:4 2:10
original 100:25 228:4	outside 79:5 80:9 98:2	14:13,17 28:24	passage 22:22,23	187:16 190:2	8:7 12:1 25:16 38:8
228:5	outsiders 101:6,7	56:17 60:17 61:18	23:13 24:17 113:18	201:17 202:23	40:21 41:2,4,8,14
originally 79:7 110:13	over 20:14 40:2,3 75:5	61:19 64:20 67:25	152:14 160:10	203:8 204:2 205:15	43:2 44:3 45:6
origins 9:4 119:11	78:1 80:15 87:18	103:22 201:19	185:20 209:20,21	205:24,25 208:24	46:17 48:15 50:7
165:15	102:9 111:14	parenthetically 34:1	209:21,23 210:2,3	208:25 212:13,18	51:25 52:4 62:15
Orleans 8:11	115:16 123:11,25	226:1	212:8,9 218:3	212:20 213:3,6,9,13	64:23 65:7,9 71:10
other 1:22 2:9 8:11,21	125:19 129:5 149:5	Paris 2:3 14:4	220:25 221:3,4,4	213:16,24 214:6,6	74:3,6 97:3,20
14:12 15:20 30:11	170:3 202:25	parks 75:16 parlance 5:11	222:5 227:8 230:11	214:15,17,21,25	117:7,13,18 156:3
30:14 32:3,6 35:13 39:4 45:21 48:13	238:25 overlapped 71:5	part 1:22 6:21,22	231:13 passed 103:21 106:19	215:1,8,9,10,10 216:15 217:4,13	176:5 192:19 244:7 245:24
50:11,20 51:21 62:7	overlapped 71.5 overlaps 179:5	10:10 12:22,24 16:7	112:17 184:2	218:8,17,18,24	permanently 176:9
62:9,9,15 63:3	oversee 247:16	17:10,14,15,16,19	passing 12:21 80:1	220:19 221:22,24	permanently 176:9 permeates 146:14
66:25 67:18 70:6	oversight 247:20	18:2,4,8,21,22,23	103:16 152:11	221:25 222:9,16,16	permit 202:23
72:11 73:9 74:3	overthrown 104:21	30:19 32:5 39:5,7	219:3	222:21 223:5	permitted 151:4
75:19 78:15,22 79:2	own 18:16 38:24 42:5	41:3 44:2 45:9	passionate 148:15	225:16,20 226:9,10	perpetrators 211:18
79:10 81:12,20	43:7 44:20 45:13	49:16 57:15 89:24	past 67:21 73:7	226:18,20,21,23	person 74:19 221:13
82:18,23 87:20	62:4,4 76:10 77:9	100:1 103:23 108:2	104:17 202:25	227:2,3,7,11,15	personal 64:14 89:7
88:20,21 92:2 103:3	79:19 80:16 81:3	113:13 117:24	241:14	228:3,22 229:1	247:3
107:14 115:20	103:9 144:13	126:10 129:10	pastureland 23:1,17	230:21 239:21	personally 214:13
116:17,19 121:4	185:16 190:7 195:3	135:24 136:15	23:23	247:4,13,16	personnel 127:23
124:23 125:5 128:5	205:20	146:16 151:20	patent 175:22	peoples 71:4 75:19,22	persons 170:11 247:3
128:13 130:3	owned 80:8	155:16 164:23	path 185:23	75:24 77:3 78:6	perspective 53:23
132:14 133:9	owners 142:13,20	173:7 176:5 181:13	pattern 13:14 59:14	99:2 100:6,10	141:12 242:17
134:16,21 139:8	ownership 81:3 177:3	196:2 209:8 219:23	patterns 48:3 174:3	102:10 190:3	persuade 79:15
144:5 147:23 153:2	Oxford 111:10	220:20 227:24	176:22 181:3	211:21,22 246:23	pertaining 129:5
158:4 159:4 168:10	o'clock 137:1 196:3	234:1 242:3 246:16	PAUL 2:6	people's 1:18 12:16	Peter 72:21 74:22
177:7 178:25	247:25 248:1	partial 18:19 28:17	PAUL-JEAN 2:9	77:19	249:6
182:11 183:12	O'Connell 124:6	30:1	pause 138:24 188:8	PEOPLE'S 1:2	Petterson 204:10,20
184:13 188:10	125:4 237:9 238:7	participate 202:14,17	pay 49:1 77:6 101:10	Percival 4:14 5:8,18	206:2,8
191:12,16,18,18	240:5 241:24	particular 7:23 8:20	165:21 207:21	6:2,8,16 7:5 8:2,15	phase 156:21 185:5,15
192:3 194:25	P	11:14 16:17 22:23 29:13 30:13 36:11	230:25 231:8 242:18	8:24 9:13,14,24	195:20 247:23 PhD 75:14 106:1
200:11 204:2 211:23 221:3,3		37:10 43:22 54:15	paying 54:5 76:25	10:19,20,23 11:15 12:3,19 13:12,24	photograph 84:18
211.23 221.3,3	pacification 100:2	31.10 73.22 34.13	paying 37.3 10.23	12.3,17 13.12,24	photograph 04.10
			L		L

Day 5					sday, 22nd April 200
95:5	pluck 7:3 246:6	posed 159:14	26:13	13:13 30:8 85:2	produce 81:11 92:5
photographs 84:19	pm 108:3 118:3,14	posited 148:6	predominates 175:1	90:7 110:10 126:22	172:18 243:21,22
88:10,12,14	128:11 133:14	position 110:25	prefer 147:13 162:15	217:21 222:24	produced 2:12 17:9
phrase 27:1,3 117:14	136:1 137:3,4,5	129:19 172:11	preferable 42:20	230:19 235:16	23:10 30:5 82:20
126:22 201:8	145:11 169:7 196:4	178:12 190:10	prefers 7:3,3	previously 4:9 8:8	98:24 192:11
227:20	196:6 246:18 248:5	191:11 200:24,24	Preliminarily 197:25	29:2 33:8 35:21	243:21
physical 121:17	poem 54:7 148:8	207:20 218:2,23	207:16 233:12	38:5 50:17 63:8	production 30:4
Pibor 115:19	point 3:16 13:2 14:6,7	positions 149:7,21	237:14	65:12 152:3 153:17	professional 173:7
pick 193:20 205:15	27:11,13 28:22,24	194:7	premise 238:9	153:22 154:1 158:9	professionals 177:13
picked 68:4 205:14,17 Pickering 2:6	30:15 47:3 48:10,10	positive 6:14 possibilities 79:18	prepared 26:20 67:17 71:23 72:23 93:9	166:20 217:12 228:20	Professor 1:11,12,13 2:2,3 3:23 6:6 12:12
picture 72:18 74:12	60:3 66:4 81:9,17 83:11 84:1,2,23	247:1	150:14 190:7	pre-Mahdiyya 110:10	22:18 25:1,1 26:25
94:4 120:8 145:21	87:20 96:9,16 98:22	possibility 137:7	preparing 72:24	pre-modern 73:11	27:6 32:1 33:18,21
174:19 189:21	101:6 102:2 106:2	possible 42:1 73:15	prerogative 144:12	pre-transfer 128:3	34:2,10 35:8,17
piece 90:17 243:14,15	114:5 117:11,16	80:22 86:15 113:24	Prescott 120:24	146:5 162:7 164:19	36:20,20,25 37:14
243:22,23	120:12 121:23	126:25 154:10	prescribes 122:16	165:4	38:12,17,18,21
pieces 35:25 149:17	125:12 126:17	187:15	presence 81:15,16	pre-1905 1:8 4:13	40:16,24 42:23,25
197:22 228:6	132:4 134:5 144:1	possibly 184:18	101:13,15 103:7	22:6,16 24:24 25:13	45:10,23 47:19 48:9
PIERRE-MARIE	146:9,11,25 147:25	post 102:10 103:6	105:5 117:7,13,18	26:3,7 33:9 245:11	51:13,20,24 53:5,14
1:11	160:13 162:22	posted 99:24	187:1	price 76:19	53:17,22 55:23
place 3:21 11:2 13:19	170:2,24 171:18	posts 100:8 101:16	present 13:11 42:14 56:4 67:22 74:13	prima 169:21 primarily 190:3	69:13 70:15 89:25
15:2 46:16 57:9,10 57:13,20,22 62:8	172:7,20 174:1 178:8,9,13 180:8,13	posturing 149:8 post-Condominium	106:23 113:6 117:6	primarily 190:3 primary 128:17,19	90:2 96:11,15 98:13 98:15,17,21 108:1,5
65:16 82:11 83:15	185:19 186:24	189:8	169:16 171:2	154:24 161:14	111:5,11,13 114:18
86:20,21 88:25	187:4 189:8,10	post-transfer 146:6	presentation 1:3	191:6 208:10	117:21,21,25 118:2
90:11 101:24	191:17 193:4,11,12	224:22	22:21 49:21 75:3	principal 146:3	118:6 120:11
105:12 142:7	193:13,18 194:24	post-1905 26:15,17	98:21 118:21	163:18 192:5	128:17 133:4,13,22
162:25 163:9 174:6	211:14 215:25	152:21 168:19	135:21 140:10	219:21 220:4	139:9 143:15,16
182:3 199:23	216:9 221:25	245:11	147:3 156:14 158:3	principle 164:9	145:18 146:10,11
211:24 212:22	224:18 227:11	potential 85:8	159:21 163:19	189:25	148:1 152:7 153:8
218:18 247:18	228:7 233:11	potentially 222:1	169:10 188:9 193:8	principles 156:5	154:10 157:20,25
placed 153:23 211:19 214:24	246:23 pointed 87:2 160:9	power 157:20 powerful 4:22 5:23,25	207:7 220:14 225:23 249:7,10,13	printer 81:21 printing 80:18 91:7	158:7,9 161:17 162:1,10 169:4,6,9
places 8:11 13:20,24	162:3	7:20 8:19 18:11	presentations 27:5	prior 71:1 109:2	173:3 176:13
16:18 18:18 25:16	pointing 115:12	26:10 32:7 33:19	197:19,20 216:18	112:11 163:20	177:16 178:10,11
30:10 33:10,25 34:3	points 3:16 15:19	36:15 48:25 50:13	221:11 230:19	165:7	178:13 179:2 188:2
35:13 56:16 58:17	30:25 74:11 81:17	55:2 72:17 201:23	presented 2:7 174:19	priority 175:21	188:6,21 189:11,21
58:18,21,25 59:3,6	83:14,15 85:14	powerfully 23:11	189:21	private 105:24	190:5 196:1,15
59:8 62:20 63:3	86:15 99:18 118:23	202:6 208:7	presenting 119:3	probably 16:18	197:5 198:10,12
64:13,15 66:7,9,12	148:5 172:19	practical 48:2 102:8	presents 186:4	124:17 128:16	200:7,8 201:6 202:8
75:10 81:21,24	173:20 176:2 177:7	102:22 105:9	present-day 14:3	181:20 198:8	203:21 204:15
90:13,14 91:9 183:17	182:4 200:19 233:6 243:1	134:17 135:3 218:15 224:6	preserves 48:7 president 1:5 60:11	226:16 234:17 probative 32:3	206:10,11 208:20 209:3,16 210:8,19
placing 213:7	police 100:8 101:17	practically 57:14	98:11 132:9 133:11	problem 19:13 73:1,3	211:25 218:10,21
plain 199:25 206:16	policies 79:16	practice 9:18 10:1	133:16 135:20	95:17 180:9	219:9,10 221:9
213:5 221:14 228:1	Policy 2:6	practices 28:13	136:3 145:13	problems 86:19,22	223:23 224:2
238:13	political 78:22 121:1	preceding 23:10 27:23	146:25 162:6	87:14 91:8 141:13	227:23 231:1 233:7
plainest 216:10	134:17 136:18	75:15 235:21	166:25 169:2,9,17	procedural 22:17	233:14 234:21
plainly 240:9	138:9 141:12	precise 134:8,13,14	178:4 195:19 196:9	204:8	237:1 238:13
plains 32:17 33:2,13	174:14 236:12	135:9 210:3	248:4	procedure 54:19	243:16 244:4,18,19
175:17 181:18	Pongo 170:11	precisely 11:14 12:7	pressure 192:23	procedures 76:13	244:23 245:6,14,22
plan 76:23 83:25 plane 91:18	Poole 72:21,21 73:9	13:12 14:19 21:8,18 21:19 22:10 23:19	pressures 71:24 presumably 210:25	93:24 proceeded 13:4,7,10	246:8,17,20 247:8 249:8,9,10,18
plane 91:18 planning 75:16	73:18,21 74:18,19 74:22,23 75:3 90:3	24:13,25 28:8 29:14	presumably 210:25 presumed 169:22	125:11 238:9	249:8,9,10,18 programme 78:7
Plans 42:14	98:8 192:15 244:3,4	34:6 42:9 47:16	185:3	proceeding 43:6 54:15	213:23
play 151:23 230:8,9	244:19,21 245:23	48:16 73:14 146:19	presumption 171:11	proceedings 56:1,11	programmes 190:17
played 230:6	246:8,9 249:6,7	151:14 163:12	presumptive 169:22	60:19 64:2 68:7,8	progress 189:16
plays 232:21	pools 32:20	166:2,23 173:15	pretend 3:4 135:9	70:5 135:13 156:21	progressed 110:15
pleading 145:15	poor 30:23 177:22	190:16 198:12	238:24	238:14	prohibited 140:12
pleadings 146:15	population 6:21,22	204:15,16,17,25	pretended 15:24	process 73:22 79:23	project 50:25,25
188:12	32:18 33:12,15	209:20,23 210:2	pretty 22:16 30:18	79:24,25 80:17	51:16 73:14 78:4
please 27:9 56:9,18,22	99:16 115:24,25	212:8 218:3 220:25	75:17 85:17 86:9	81:13,23 84:24 93:1	79:13,15 81:6,8,12
56:25 57:7,12,17 58:16,18 74:23	116:3,10,18,19 190:6	221:4 224:23,25 227:8 228:8 230:11	87:4 90:12 prevent 15:15,16	101:13 126:18 195:11 234:14	82:8 91:14 97:3,15 97:18,20,23 98:3,4
118:13,17 125:25	portion 152:17 160:18	231:13 239:16	164:1	236:16,17	192:12,19,25 244:6
129:13 145:10	228:15	precision 26:9	previews 64:14	proclaimed 99:5	245:24
plotted 83:21 96:10	portions 29:20 163:20	predominantly 20:2	previous 1:17 5:20	proclamation 146:9	projected 166:7

projects 75:24 78:3,19 87:4,210:13.25 10613 167:12.35 10613 16		I		I		
promised 33 196-23	projects 75:24 78:3,19	156:1 161:3 162:9	107:3 128:4 153:20	240:21 243:10	raids 148:21 189:17	162:23 213:14
promised 33 196-23	87:4.21 90:13.25	163:1.3.3.14 164:23	153:21.25 155:22	244:3.5.6.22 245:3	211:15 212:21	220:22 225:8 227:1
			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
2442 20414 2200-20 2058 22616 19 2255 21817 2255 22617 2255	-					
Promoted 21023 Proposition 22058 2283-16.19 Proposition 22058 Proposition	_					
propose 1711 18	1					
provinced 171:18 provinces 10:57 19:2.22 149:9 59:0.02.122 89:24 73:0.123 73:0.143 73:0.123	promoted 210:23		215:2 218:17	questionnaires 93:9		48:24 64:2 66:2
	promptly 216:3	235:5	purposes 30:14 81:7	questions 54:25 56:16	Rainforest 79:12	70:17 101:8,10
	pronounced 171:18	provinces 110:5.7	119.2.22.149.9	59:20.21.22.89:24	rains 8:12 37:19 40:2	102:4 104:4 105:6
233.19 128.21 129.3 202.11 1203.13 141.16 117.22.23 rainy 59.12 101.5 159.15 161.15 161.16 161.16 162.21 150.15 161.16 161.16 162.21 150.15 161.16 161.16 162.21 150.15 161.16 161.16 162.21 150.15 161.16 161.16 161.21 150.15 161.16 161.16 161.21 150.15 161.16 161.16 161.21 150.15 161.16 161.	-	_				
properly 32.24 131:11,13 146/2 2002.1 2088 19:12 123:10 19:13:12 136:24 164.4 145:163:22 19:10 10:28,24 164.4 231:5 247:14 10:29 10:20 162.4 145:163:22 136:21 163:14 12:21 136:13 10:20 162.4 12:21 136:13 10:20 162.4 10						
247:10						
247-10 162:8,24 164:4 231:5 247:14 136:2 142:5 152-9 roposed 42:6 proposed 42:6						
propriofine 869 projection 133:1 projection 136:2 projection 133:1 projection 136:2 projection 133:1 projection 136:2 projection 133:1 projection 136:2 project						
Proposition 135:1 149:22 150:2 150:12 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2 150:12 120:16:2	247:10	162:8,24 164:4	231:5 247:14	136:2 142:5 152:9	raised 136:20 143:14	176:18 184:20
province 19-921 150:2 19-92 150:2 19-92 150:2 19-92 150:2 19-92 150:2 19-92	proportion 86:9	165:8 225:25	pursuant 146:8	172:3 173:4 189:11	146:9,11	187:14 194:11
provisition 133:1 province's 1019-11	proposal 42:6	235:15	207:25	193:14 196:2	raison 156:10	195:14 202:22
149-122 150-22 150-123 150-1						
164:14 187:10 101:22 102:16.24 37:3 42:6 68:1 248:2 249:16.22 105:19 106:7.8 74:18 42:8 48:5.5 106:21 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:21 102:19 107:105:1 106:18 106:1	• •	_			0	T
19512 22015 105:19 1067.8 74:14 82:44 88:25 106:02 1104:7 1105 105:19 167.8 186:4 106:13 186:4 17:10 180:15 186:13 186:4 187:10 180:15		_	-			
prosperitions 19-22 prosperous 25:17 10-4.21.2 112:12 12 10-22 10-25.4 12-25 10-22 10-25 10-22 10-25 1						
102.21 102.21 102.21 102.21 104.71 10.5 102.21 104.71 10.5 102.21 104.71 10.5 102.21 104.71 10.5 102.21 104.71 10.5 102.21 10		•		_		
1864 123.515 124:12, 15 133:25 133:12 133:25 133:12 133:25 133:12 133:25 133:12 133:25 133:12 133:25 133:12 133:25 133:12 133:25 133:12 133:25 133:2		110:4,21,22 112:12	88:3 94:5 96:22	quickly 28:14 46:6	171:10 180:15	reasoning 180:3
1864 123.515 124:12,15 133:25 133:15 133:25	prosperous 25:17	120:22 122:5,14,25	102:2 104:7 110:5	54:13 55:19 125:6	183:8 188:22 191:4	reasons 7:24 9:8,18,21
protect 161.21 protecting 217:13 protecting 217:						
protecting 217:13 protection 213:23 protection 213:23 protection 213:23 protect 313:24,111 protection 213:23 protect 205:10 protecting 217:13 protecting 217:13 protection 213:23 protect 205:10 protecting 217:13 pr						
protecting 217:13 protecting 217:13 protection 213:23 protest 205:10 Protocot 45:15,16.22 protest 205:10 protest 205:						
protection 213:23 protest 205:10 proved 15:21 lide4 provesion 201:2 provisions 45:21 proved 205:21 forest 18:29 provision 325:1 133:12 0.23 202:15 206:3 provided 28:17 25:55 46:15 50:13 73:19 155:14 103:31 20:23 202:15 206:3 provided 28:17 53:54 proper 205:22 provising 205:22 pr	-					
Protoce 205:10 131:15 132:12.12 203:24 205:19.21 203:24 205:19.21 203:34 205:19.21 203:34 205:19.21 203:34 205:19.21 203:34 205:19.21 203:34 205:19.21 203:34 205:19.21 203:34 205:19.21 203:34 205:34.11,17 164:3 207:21.11,14.17,18 1662.41,61.9.23 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 208:4.14 2095.9 210:12 221:1 222:6 227:13 230:7.24 231:6 232:15 227:13 230:7.24 231:6 232:15 223:15 224:14 229:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.12 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.14 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.14 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.14 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.14 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.14 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.14 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.14 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.15 235:5 233:1 24 224:4.14 235:5 233:1 24 234:5 235:1 24 235:5 235:1 24 235:5 235:1 24 235:5 235:1 24 235:5 235:1 24 235:5 235:1 24 235:5 235:	•					
Protocol 45:15, 16, 22						
464.47.17.48.77 149:12 154.84 240:11 242:12 158:10 161:25 176:18 158:10 161:25 17			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
1438.23 196:20 159:11.13.17,24.25 240:11.24:12 241:11 197:10 199:6,12,14 160:4 161:4,16,21 162:4,16,19,23 162:4,11,17 164:3 162:4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 164:4,21 165:6,8,18 165:20,24,25 166:6 165:20,24,25 166:6 168:64:3 69:13 215:6 232:5 reaching 184:10 238:4 reading 238:4 reading 238:13 24:1 reading 238:13	Protocol 45:15,16,22	134:21 146:1,4	207:23 210:17	118:23 133:22	13:5 50:6 68:9	rebuttal 196:10
1438.23 196:20 159:11.13.17.24.25 240:11.24:12 243:4.25 244:4 162:4.16.19.23 162:4.16.19.23 162:4.16.19.23 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 245:5.15 246:6.7.8 246:10.20 246:10	46:4 47:17 48:7	149:12 154:8	216:5 218:4 224:4	135:11 138:14	96:17 144:18.22	recall 1:6 22:17 35:7
197:10 199-6,12_14 1603-4 1614,16,21 202:10,113,16 162-4 16,19,23 263:13 204:3 203:13 204:3 203:13 204:3 163:2,4,11,17 164:3 246:10,20 246:10,20 221:14 222:6 216:22.26 221:12 222:6 227:13 230:7,24 223:16 63:2,4,17 164:3 224:12 22:16 23:25 246:20 224:12 22:6 227:13 230:7,24 231:6 232:15 221:16 22:26 223:15,2 23:15 224:14 229:5 232:2 223:16 233:15 224:14 229:5 232:2 223:16 233:15 224:14 229:5 232:2 223:16 233:13,24 234:16 239:14 234:25 235:12 224:14 229:5 232:2 237:10 234:25 235:12 234:14 229:5 232:2 237:10 234:25 235:12 242:4.6 238:14 238:4 162:5 176:18 178:15 210:24 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14 178:14 178:15 210:23 178:14						
202:10,11,13,16 203:13 204:3 207:11,14,17,18 2084,14 2095,9 210:12 221:16 223:15 210:12 221:12 222:6 227:13 230:7,24 231:6 232:15 210:12 221:16 223:15 227:13 230:7,24 231:6 232:15 231:6 232:15 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 231:15 231:31 185:16,19 200:12 242:4,6 200:12 21:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 231:16 232:15 231:12 232:15 234:28 66:8,11 73:12 237:10 234:28 66:8,11 73:12 237:10 234:18 18:51 200:18 18:9 200:12 24:4,6 227:13 230:7,24 234:5, 15, 246:6,7,8 246:20 240:10,20 240:10,20 243:16 239:4 246:20 240:10,20 243:16 239:4 246:20 240:10,20 233:8 21:1 246:20 240:10,20 233:8 21:1 246:20 240:10,20 233:8 21:1 246:20 240:10,20 233:8 21:1 246:20 240:10,20 233:8 37:5 47:22 237:10 234:16 239:4 246:10,20 20 243:16 239:4 246:20 246:10,20 240:10,20 233:8 21:1 246:20 246:10,20 240:10,20 233:16 233:2 4:1 246:20 246:20 246:10,20 247:12 23:1 237:10 234:16 239:4 246:20 246:20 246:10,20 247:12 23:1 237:10 234:16 239:4 246:20 246:20 246:10,20 247:10,21 22:15 247:20 247:10,21 22:15 248:10 25:23 147:2,13 246:20 246:20 246:20 246:10,20 247:20 247:10 22:1 237:10 234:16 239:4 246:20 246:20 246:10,20 247:10 22:23 247:10 22:23 247:10 22:23 247:10 22:23 247:10 22:23 247:10 24:23 247:10 23:24 246:20 246:10,20 247:10 22:23 247:10 22:23 247:10 23:3 17:24 246:20 246:10,20 247:10 22:23 247:10 22:24 237:10 234:16 239:4 246:10,20 247:10 23:3 47:2,13 238:18 47:2,21 237:10 234:16 239:4 244:10 238:4 246:10,20 247:10 23:3 247:10 23:4 246:10,20 247:10 23:3 247:10 23:4 247:10 23:4 247:10 23:4 247:10 24:2 2						
203:13 204:3			-			
207:11,14,17,18 164:4,21 165:6,8,18 208:4,14 209:5,9 165:20,24,25 166:6 167:14 168:3,11,19 128:25 154:8 165:9 227:13 230:7,24 238:23 195:17,18 168:25 195:17,18 196:18 203:16,22 221:16,17,19 223:1 223:1 223:15 223:15 221:16,17,19 223:1 233:23:15 221:16,17,19 223:1 233:23:15 223:15,24 233:23:15 233:23						
2084.4 4 2095.59 165:20.24_25 166:6 124:20 127:19 128:25 154:8 165:9 128:25 154:8 165:9 128:25 154:2 165:2 165			T			
221:1222:6	207:11,14,17,18	164:4,21 165:6,8,18	putative 122:14	246:20	reaching 184:10 238:4	145:8 146:3 152:14
231:6 232:15 196:18 205:16,22 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 223:29,25 233:13,24 223:29,25 233:13,24 223:29,25 233:13,24 224:46 234:25 8,10,12,15,19 234:28,810,12,15,19 234:18 244:29,5 233:12 244:4 244:38 244:4 244:	208:4,14 209:5,9	165:20,24,25 166:6	124:20 127:19	quotation 23:3 24:1	read 5:20,22,23 7:2	157:19 162:10
231:6 232:15 196:18 205:16,22 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 221:16,17,19 223:1 223:29,25 233:13,24 223:29,25 233:13,24 223:29,25 233:13,24 224:46 234:25 8,10,12,15,19 234:28,810,12,15,19 234:18 244:29,5 233:12 244:4 244:38 244:4 244:	210:12 221:1 222:6	167:14 168:3,11,19	128:25 154:8 165:9	quote 33:8 42:14	8:21 12:15 29:5	197:18 207:7,23
Protocol's 197:19				_		
Protocol's 197:19 proved 41:21,23 46:9 proved 22:116,17,19 223:1 232:19,25 233:13,24 232:10 proved 22:22 160:18 232:9,25 233:13,24 234:5,8,10,12,15,19 proved 15:21 16:4 90:12 242:4,6 provisions 45:21 provided 28:18 18:9 provisions 45:21 provided 28:17 35:11 198:1 240:19 provided 28:17 35:11 103:3 120:23 provided 28:17 35:11 provided 28:17 35:11 provided 28:17 35:11 provided 28:17 35:11 103:3 120:23 provided 28:17 35:14 18:11 25:24 provided 44:7 102:18 18:11 25:24 publication 32:8 11:14 11:0 225:24 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 providing 64:1 107:21 127:2 providing 95:6 123:4 providing 95:6 123:4 providing 95:6 123:4 providing 64:1 107:21 127:5 providing 95:6 123:4 providing 95:6 123:4 providing 95:6 123:4 providing 95:6 123:4 providing 64:1 107:21 127:5 providing 95:6 123:4 providing 95:6	•					
proud 41:21,23 46:9 224:14 229:5 232:2 237:10 234:16 239:4 96:13,21 97:17 recent 160:11 recent 160:11 recont 160:11 reco						
Prove 82:22 160:18 323:9,25 233:13,24 234:5,8 1,0 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,2 1,2 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,2 1,2						
185:16,19	-				•	
Provided 15:21 16:4 234:25 235:12 242:4.6 provisions 201:2 provisions 201:2 provisions 45:21 198:1 240:19 provided 28:17 35:11 198:1 240:19 provided 28:17 35:11 198:1 240:19 provided 28:17 35:11 103:3 120:23 provides 419 5:23 provides 419 5:23 provides 419 5:23 provides 419 5:23 18:11 25:21 29:20 111:4 114:14 115:24 116:15 219:20 243:14 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 providing 64:1 107:21 217:4 provide 23:5 40:1 provide 23:5 40:1 provide 23:29 provide 147:2 111:22 130:13 111:22 130:13 111:22 130:13 111:22 130:13 111:22 130:13 111:22 130:13 111:22 130:13 111:22 130:13 113:6.8,9 132:23 purporting 95:6 123:4 113:21:27 purpose 63:2,122 purpose 63:2,122 purpose 63:2,122 purpose 63:1,22 purpose 63:1,22 purpose 63:2,122 purpose 63:1,22 purpose 63:2,122	prove 82:22 160:18		putting 15:9 78:17	quoted 181:1 185:6,20	118:16 119:8	recently 52:6 215:15
Provide Prov	185:16,19	234:5,8,10,12,15,19	96:12 135:12	quotes 39:12 209:22	129:24 137:12	recited 22:21
Proviemance 69:25 T:13,18 Provisiona 201:2 Provisiona 91:5	proved 15:21 16:4	234:25 235:12	puzzle 149:18 243:14		142:3 144:4 178:18	recites 62:8
Proviemance 69:25 T:13,18 Provisiona 201:2 Provisiona 91:5			[-	R		
71:13,18 provide 8:18 18:9 67:8 129:23 provided 28:17 35:11 103:3 120:23 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 5:21 103:3 120:23 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 5:20 31:17 35:25 36:15 111:4 118:11 25:21 29:20 31:17 35:25 36:15 111:4 118:11 25:21 29:20 31:17 35:25 36:15 111:4 118:11 25:21 111:0 225:24 publisation 32:8 111:4 118:11 25:21 118:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 119:4 118:11 25:21 111:4 118:11 25:21 118:13 115:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 115:4 118:11 18:11 2:2 118:13 115:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 115:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 118:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 118:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 118:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 118:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 118:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 118:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 118:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:13 118:4 118:11 18:11 12:2 118:6 19:12 19:3 188:6 19:12 19:3 188:10 188:10 188:10 188:10 188:10						
provide 8:18 18:9 67:8 129:23 provided 28:17 35:11 103:3 120:23 provided 28:17 35:11 103:3 120:23 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 5:23 18:11 25:21 29:20 31:17 35:25 36:15 50:13 73:19 135:14 168:15 219:20 243:14 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 provide 23:5 40:1 provide 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 provide 4:10:215 111:10 225:24 provide 64:1 107:21 127:4 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 provide 23:5 40:1 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 provided 28:17 36:18 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 7:29 93:13 provides 4:19 7:2	-	_				
198:1 240:19 provided 28:17 35:11 103:3 120:23 202:15 206:3 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 5:23 provides 4:19 5:23 18:11 25:21 29:20 31:17 35:25 36:15 50:13 73:19 135:14 168:15 219:20 243:14 published 44:7 102:18 111:10 225:24 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 provided 147:2 136:4 137:6.13	1	_				,
provided 28:17 35:11		_				
103:3 120:23			quality 55:9 63:12	radius 74:5 87:1	· ·	
103:3 120:23 202:15 206:3 provides 4:19 5:23 18:11 25:21 29:20 31:17 35:25 36:15 50:13 73:19 135:14 168:15 219:20 243:14 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 province 23:5 40:1 99:21 100:7,19,23 province 23:5 40:1 99:21 100:7,19,23 102:6 109:19,21,24 11:22 130:13 11:22 130:13 13:16,8,9 132:23 13:1 146:17 149:1 11:20 25:25 purpose 63:21,22 provides 4:19 5:23 provimity 200:9,13 préparatoires 143:23 préparatoires 143:23 préparatoires 143:23 public 2:6 public 2:6 publication 32:8 111:4 41:19 72:9 93:13 109:14 111:8 112:2 112:3,4,7,10 114:12 112:3,4,7,10 114:12 115:24 116:15 129:16,20 116:16,19 177:1,2 126:15 129:16,20 127:4 126:15 129:16,20 127:4 128:18 185:1 purpose 63:21,22 providing 64:1 107:21 128:18 185:1 purpose 63:21,22 providing 64:1 107:21 129:21 131:25 purpose 63:21,22 providing 64:1 107:21 120:21 20:20 120:15 20:20 120:15 20:3:13 120:21 20:20 120:15 20:3:13 120:21 20:20 120:15 20:3:13 120:21 20:20 120:15 20:3:13 120:21 20:20 120:15 20:3:13 120:15 20:3	-	_	87:18 243:25	ragaba 35:3,13,16		0 0
202:15 206:3 provides 4:19 5:23 Public 2:6 publication 32:8 11:14 published 44:7 102:18 168:15 219:20 243:14 providing 64:1 107:21 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 public 2:6 provides 23:5 40:1 psychologic 23:5 40:1 psychologic 23:5 40:1 psychologic 100:7,19,23 102:6 109:19,21,24 11:19 229:15 11:22 130:13 11:22 130:13 13:1 46:17 149:1 13:16,8,9 132:23 133:1 146:17 149:1 149:10 155:17 purpose 63:21,22 provides 4:10 7:20 purpose 63:21,22 provides 4:10 7:29 93:13 109:14 111:8 112:2 1109:14 111:8 112:2 112:3,4,7,10 114:12 114:14 115:24 115:5 13:9:16,20 116:15 129:16,20 116:15 129:16,20 1176:16,19 177:1,2 183:5 185:14 187:7 170:11 179:23 187:2 188:6 191:22 193:3 187:7 233:5,24 189:10 136:4 137:6,13 189:10 14:14 189:10 15:18 189:10 14:14 189:10 15:18 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:11 179:11 189:12 179:11 189:12 179:11 189:12 179:11 189:13 189:19 189:13 189:19 189:13 189:19 189:13 189:19 189:12 14:11,7,12 189:12 14:11,7,12 189:12 14:11,7,12 189:13 148:19 189:14 149:14 189:14 149:14 189:14 149:15 189:14 149:14 189:14 149:14 189	103:3 120:23	proximity 200:9,13			241:12 244:23	recognition 41:4
provides 4:19 5:23 Public 2:6 publication 32:8 109:14 111:8 112:2 12:2 133:13 53:1 17:8,13,19 125:15 readiness 78:24 reading 15:18 245:10 245:10,22 reads 170:8 227:13 recommended 119:7 realis 15:14 set 15:14 set 15:14 set 15:15 set 15:15 set 14:15 set 15:15 set 15	202:15 206:3	préparatoires 143:23			245:7,7 246:3,4	recollection 66:6
18:11 25:21 29:20 31:17 35:25 36:15 111:4 123:4,71,10 114:12 125:9 139:3 155:5 125:10,22 126:15 129:16,20 126:15 129:16,20 129:21 131:25 132:7,8,10 134:3,4 132:7,11,2,0,2,1 138:6 191:2 193:3 138:7 233:5,24 12:15 223:5 138:6 191:2 193:3 138:6 191:2 193:3 138:10				T		
31:17 35:25 36:15 50:13 73:19 135:14 168:15 219:20 243:14 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 province 23:5 40:1 99:21 100:7,19,23 102:6 109:19,21,24 111:22 130:13 13:1 46:17 149:1 13:16,8,9 132:23 133:1 146:17 149:1 149:10 152:17 111:4 111:4 114:14 115:24 114:14 115:24 116:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 1126:15 129:16,20 129:21 131:25 132:7,8,10 134:3,4 132:7,9,10,10,20,21 188:6 191:22 193:3 188:6 191:22 193:3 188:6 191:22 193:3 188:6 191:22 193:3 188:6 191:22 193:3 188:6 191:22 193:3 188:6 191:22 193:3 188:6 191:22 193:3 188:7 233:5,24 12:15 123:6:26 5:13,19 12:15 12:15 12:15 12:15 12:15 12:15 12:15 12:15	•					
50:13 73:19 135:14 168:15 219:20 243:14 providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 purple 180:17 purple 180:17 purple 180:17 purple 190:17 purple 190:19 purple 190:17 purple 190:17 purple 190:19 purp		_			S	
168:15 219:20 243:14 111:10 225:24 pull 53:7 129:21 131:25 132:7,8,10 134:3,4 pull 53:7 183:5 185:14 187:7 170:1 179:23 187:2 170:1 179:23 187:2 188:6 19:12 18.2 187:2 188:6 19:12 187:2 188:6 19:12 188:1 18:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10 187:2 188:10					· ·	
243:14 pull 53:7 132:7,8,10 134:3,4 187:9,12,14,20,21 170:1 179:23 187:2 record 1:9,11 9:23 providing 64:1 107:21 pure 158:18 185:1 jurple 180:17 132:7,8,10 134:3,4 187:9,12,14,20,21 170:1 179:23 187:2 record 1:9,11 9:23 province 23:5 40:1 purple 180:17 jurple 180:17 purple 136:4 137:6,13 237:21 239:6,10 realise 66:3 26:3,10 35:9,23 102:6 109:19,21,24 121:19 229:15 purported 147:2 145:15 153:9 154:9 raided 105:13 218:19 realised 136:10 36:19 48:18,19 11:22 130:13 170:21 232:9 159:14,17 160:3 raided 105:13 218:19 reality 124:8 127:5 67:8,021,21 70:11 133:1 146:17 149:1 229:25 purporting 95:6 123:4 197:11 20:2:20 218:18 19:14 70:16 82:5 107:8,19 111:7 149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 206:11 21:11 raiding 7:10,12,13 88:2,6,17 115:21 127:5 128:14 149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 221:15 227:5 16:20 109:4 155:4 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21		•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 pure 158:18 185:1 purple 180:17 132:15 135:24 136:4 137:6,13 136:10 136:4 136:10			129:21 131:25	183:5 185:14 187:7		
providing 64:1 107:21 127:4 pure 158:18 185:1 purple 180:17 134:12 135:24 purple 180:17 188:6 191:22 193:3 237:21 239:6,10 pralise 66:3 purple 180:17 12:15 22:6 25:13,19 purple 180:17 purple 180:17 povince 23:5 40:1 99:21 100:7,19,23 102:6 109:19,21,24 11:22 130:13 13:6,8,9 132:23 133:1 146:17 149:1 149:10 152:17 121:19 229:15 purported 147:2 159:14,17 160:3 purporting 95:6 123:4 170:22 29:25 purporting 95:6 123:4 149:10 152:17 134:12 135:24 136:4 137:6,13 237:21 239:6,10 purport 119:10 241:11,13 realise 66:3 realise 136:10 241:11,7,12 realise 136:10 138:10 realise 136:10 138:10 realise 105:13 218:19 realise 136:10 36:19 48:18,19 36:19 48		_	132:7,8,10 134:3,4	187:9,12,14,20,21		· ·
127:4 purple 180:17 136:4 137:6,13 237:21 239:6,10 realise 66:3 26:3,10 35:9,23 province 23:5 40:1 99:21 100:7,19,23 121:19 229:15 143:13,17,21 241:11,13 realise 66:3 26:3,10 35:9,23 102:6 109:19,21,24 purported 147:2 159:14,17 160:3 raid 211:1,7,12 raided 105:13 218:19 reality 124:8 127:5 67:8,10,21,21 70:11 111:22 130:13 purporting 95:6 123:4 197:11 202:20 218:18 raiding 7:10,12,13 19:14 70:16 82:5 107:8,19 111:7 133:1 146:17 149:1 purpose 63:21,22 purpose 63:21,22 206:11 212:11 raiding 7:10,12,13 88:2,6,17 115:21 127:5 128:14 149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 purpose 63:21,22 221:15 227:5 16:20 109:4 155:4 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21		_			187:7 233:5,24	-
province 23:5 40:1 purport 119:10 143:13,17,21 241:11,13 realised 136:10 36:19 48:18,19 99:21 100:7,19,23 102:6 109:19,21,24 purported 147:2 145:15 153:9 154:9 raid 211:17,12 138:10 51:21 53:6,8 60:18 111:22 130:13 170:21 232:9 170:21 232:9 171:20,23,24 188:3 raiders 104:17 105:12 reality 124:8 127:5 67:8,10,21,21 70:11 133:1 146:17 149:1 229:25 206:11 212:11 218:18 19:14 70:16 82:5 107:8,19 111:7 149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 206:11 212:11 221:15 227:5 16:20 109:4 155:4 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21	127:4	purple 180:17			realise 66:3	26:3,10 35:9,23
99:21 100:7,19,23 102:6 109:19,21,24 111:22 130:13 131:6,8,9 132:23 133:1 146:17 149:1 149:10 152:17 170:20 20:20 145:15 153:9 154:9 159:14,17 160:3 171:20,23,24 188:3 197:11 202:20 206:11 212:11 149:10 152:17 149:10 152:17 149:10 152:17 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 149:10 15:13 218:19 170:21 232:9 171:20,23,24 188:3 197:11 202:20 206:11 212:11 206:11 212:11 218:18 107:10,23,24 188:3 197:11 202:20 206:11 212:11 218:18 107:10,12,13 108:10 15:14; 12:15 146:25 107:8,10,21,21 70:11 121:19 229:15 121:19 229:15 121:19 229:15 121:19 229:15 121:19 229:15 121:13 23:6,8 60:18 121:11,7,12 138:10 121:11 23:13,12 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 138:10 13	province 23:5 40:1	purport 119:10			realised 136:10	36:19 48:18,19
102:6 109:19,21,24 purported 147:2 159:14,17 160:3 raided 105:13 218:19 raiders 104:17 105:12 170:21 232:9 purporting 95:6 123:4 197:11 202:20 218:18 raiding 7:10,12,13 149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 21:15 227:5 221:15 227:5 167:8,10,21,21 70:11 raided 105:13 218:19 raiders 104:17 105:12 raiding 7:10,12,13 16:20 109:4 155:4 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21 142:15 146:23 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21 142:15 146:23 14	*					
111:22 130:13	1 T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T					,
131:6,8,9 132:23 purporting 95:6 123:4 197:11 202:20 218:18 19:14 70:16 82:5 107:8,19 111:7 133:1 146:17 149:1 229:25 206:11 212:11 raiding 7:10,12,13 88:2,6,17 115:21 127:5 128:14 149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 221:15 227:5 16:20 109:4 155:4 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21						
133:1 146:17 149:1 229:25 206:11 212:11 raiding 7:10,12,13 88:2,6,17 115:21 127:5 128:14 149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 21:15 227:5 16:20 109:4 155:4 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21			, , ,			
149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 221:15 227:5 16:20 109:4 155:4 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21						· ·
149:10 152:17 purpose 63:21,22 221:15 227:5 16:20 109:4 155:4 142:15 146:23 130:15 139:21			206:11 212:11	raiding 7:10,12,13		
			221:15 227:5			
	153:22 155:14,16	79:15 105:11 107:2			149:22 150:1	149:17,20 150:1,2
			, -, -	1		

					<u> </u>
150:24,25 155:9	27:18 34:1 38:5	139:25 140:3	nomoniza 112.6 199.10	reported 2:24 10:19	resulted 211:16
			remarks 113:6 188:10	_	
156:5 165:20 166:8	49:3 50:8 54:4 58:1	158:11 173:12,12	195:23	10:23 17:25 18:12	results 89:16,17,20
179:1 200:14	58:18 66:10,11	173:21,22 174:2	remember 19:11 25:5	20:10 29:2 155:3	93:5,7
208:19 210:9,20	67:12 68:24 69:1,5	179:10 181:3,4,21	38:19 49:11,12	156:9 158:20 161:7	retain 47:17
211:4 225:22 234:4	69:12 95:10 110:13	192:21 202:13	111:2 122:16 152:8	210:21 211:6	retransfer 225:18
235:10,14 239:2,12	122:23 124:1	244:8,12 246:1	188:4 196:12,14	214:16	227:17,19,25 228:3
239:15 243:14	129:10 133:22,23	regions 53:3 99:2	remembering 104:4	reporting 21:8 66:22	retransferred 225:16
246:4,11,12	139:21 150:20	100:18 102:23	remind 172:16 176:24	156:18	retreated 123:11
recorded 83:13 87:16	156:20,22,25 159:2	236:8	243:20	reports 2:11 6:10,14	return 3:20 35:12
108:20 123:12	164:16 165:1	region's 173:24	reminded 119:20	7:21 8:21,24 28:19	42:3 46:20 49:22
150:20 165:7	186:18 201:11	register 84:11	remit 81:9,12,16	33:9 68:17 103:10	58:23 59:18 60:13
202:11 220:24		registered 86:4	remote 91:9 101:5,11	105:19 111:23	139:18 154:9 187:2
	203:4,5,12 204:9	S			
recording 74:3 82:1	205:6 206:25	Registrar 2:8,9	103:12 161:2	112:11,14 122:25	returned 226:15
107:2	208:17 209:6	REGISTRY 2:8	rendering 123:6	124:11 130:8,8,12	returning 3:21
records 26:7 30:18	211:16 214:14	regular 179:21	repeat 100:11 209:13	130:13,19 132:14	revelation 221:18
67:6 68:17 73:5	216:7 217:12 219:5	regularise 82:5	239:14	132:22 150:14,15	226:21 228:18
103:19 151:13	235:10,11,19,21	regularly 44:15	repeated 26:25 31:24	152:6,9 162:7 165:8	revenues 101:25
210:21 245:11	238:10,13 239:19	123:11	32:1 146:7 158:15	165:17 189:17	revert 193:6
record-keeping 73:6	240:1 241:10,18,22	rein 123:23	160:1 243:16	191:3 221:17	review 62:19 91:6
recounting 125:1	247:20	reinforcing 120:13	repeatedly 40:20	222:17,18 233:21	revisited 199:7
recounts 14:21 65:14	referring 3:24 4:4	Reisman 1:13 198:12	41:16 199:20	236:14 237:19	revolution 104:22
recourse 231:7	9:25 20:24 35:15	Reisman's 206:11	208:20 231:12	238:8 239:11 240:1	rewrite 151:8 159:8
rectified 237:10	104:20 111:4 129:8	rejoicing 46:15	repeating 101:15	represent 95:15 123:5	Rgaba 138:22
red 63:9 174:24	130:8,10 141:10	rejoinder 97:2,19	repeats 39:24 126:21	164:7	rich 38:15 150:22
reddish 174:22	150:12 156:24	146:24 188:20	rephrase 110:6	representation 135:15	Richard 111:9 118:15
redo 231:15,17	159:23 165:19	192:18 244:24	replaced 241:14	192:16	249:12
refer 21:23 24:3 37:3	188:24 196:25	245:5	replies 145:7	representations	ride 61:1
57:22 102:5 104:13	214:9 229:22 230:1	Rek 59:15	reply 137:9 143:15	125:19	RIEK 2:5
114:22 125:21	refers 3:14 21:22,25	related 81:12 159:10	145:14 177:8 238:5	representative 101:17	Riet 63:2
126:4 132:23 145:3	22:22 24:2,18 37:24	168:2 171:20 189:9	247:23 249:17,18	represented 180:18	rifles 6:19
150:25 168:10	49:4 86:12 98:4	relates 97:17 177:9	report 1:12,13 2:4	represents 180:14	right 8:7 28:5 55:10
184:20 187:25	175:25 179:9	178:8 182:5	3:13,19,22 4:13,16	reproduced 189:16	68:8 91:19 109:22
188:1 191:2 200:3				_	
	183:16 184:5	relating 150:7 165:5	4:19 5:13,21 8:1	Republic 79:12	109:25 112:19
214:5 220:9 222:20	189:17 196:20	195:16	10:15 20:11,22	requests 17:23 30:3	129:6 143:10,21
reference 3:23 4:2 7:1	200:1 210:13 213:5	relation 153:7 188:3	27:15 28:9,16 29:5	require 22:8 91:15	171:22 175:11,22
11:8 12:23 20:20	213:6 219:14 226:6	193:2,12,13	32:5 47:23 51:1	242:14	195:5 198:22 215:8
21:17 23:14,15,16	227:6 232:15	relations 99:17	53:2,14 69:6 91:13	requires 80:24 121:19	238:4,15 246:9,10
23:16,18 33:4,6	refined 121:7	relationship 180:1,3	91:20,21,23 92:5,13	164:10	rightfully 41:24
49:18,18,20 57:8	reflected 240:16	relationships 75:21	94:4,6,9 97:14	rescue 76:13,13,17,18	rights 46:1 47:18 48:8
58:4 62:11 63:1	Reflecting 124:22	relatively 22:10 54:13	105:17 113:1 114:5	research 76:5 237:25	78:8,25 136:12
65:12 102:7 142:5	reflection 71:17 79:25	131:21 134:5	115:2,5 116:22,25	reserve 143:21	156:4 175:22
142:10 147:18	reflects 17:2	149:12 161:2 242:2	117:6,9,12 125:10	resident 61:14	178:14,21 179:5,13
152:11 162:12	Regabet 186:16	relevance 159:11	125:21 126:1,4,5,20	residents 202:14,16	179:21,22 180:2
164:13 188:5,7				210:22	194:16,22
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	regard 175:13	relevant 32:14 94:22	126:23 128:18		*
199:9,10,11 207:8	regarded 46:13 96:22	137:11 150:15,24	129:24 130:4 133:4	resolution 88:9,11	rigidly 170:18
209:10 213:13,14	179:14 220:20	153:11 154:23	135:19 146:21,21	resource 79:4	Rihan 148:21 155:2
221:19 229:14,17	regarding 79:17 170:7	155:1 158:5 162:3	151:6 152:5,7 155:3	resources 77:24 79:14	156:25 161:9
230:10 233:4	regards 160:18	216:16 232:23	156:18 157:2,25	respect 54:6 55:4,14	211:12 212:17,19
236:22 239:25	regime 102:18,20	reliable 86:14 151:9	158:6,14,16,21	67:20 68:11 88:4	213:9,14,18,21
240:8,9 243:3,7	104:18,21,23 107:6	reliance 207:16	167:21 171:17	167:4 173:23 174:4	214:10,23 215:7,16
referenced 162:3	110:17	relied 22:23 135:6	179:6 182:4,18,20	205:19 223:10,14	215:23 222:22
references 26:22,24	Reginald 105:22	222:17 230:11	184:9 188:3,4	respected 144:9	Rihan's 156:23 167:22
36:4 63:3,6,17	region 14:19 16:21	233:25	189:12,16 191:18	respectfully 149:19	rise 144:23 168:12
102:16 122:19	19:4,12 22:22 23:4	relies 24:2 28:23 53:17	192:6 200:7,12,15	159:7 160:5	175:17 189:7
123:1 124:9 132:22	23:24 24:16 25:18	rely 9:12 16:25 80:9	208:22,24 209:11	respective 247:16	river 1:20,21 4:3,5 5:8
193:16 221:16		•		_	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	31:3,20 32:11 33:1	80:11 172:25	209:15,22 210:5,10	respond 73:19 136:5	6:3 8:2,3,4,7,10,14
222:18 228:20	33:7,22 34:16 37:10	206:16	211:9 213:20 215:2	responded 161:11	10:20 11:3 15:21
230:17 233:21	37:12,14 38:17,24	relying 152:20	216:7,17 217:11,19	193:6	20:17 27:17,21
235:18 236:2,14,19	40:9,9,10,12,22	remain 159:12	218:5,9 219:7,11,14	response 42:5 85:13	28:25 32:21 38:1
237:1 240:20 242:4	44:9 48:16,21 50:25	remained 67:1 99:22	219:15,20,23 220:7	142:4 153:8 188:2	39:13,18 49:9 57:11
242:7,24	53:9 60:13,15 62:2	103:25 163:21	220:16,17,24 221:7	responses 161:12	57:23 63:4 65:11
referendum 134:18	74:1 97:5,8 99:11	164:1 224:11 225:6	221:8 226:5 227:8	responsibility 93:15	86:17 107:22
202:15,18,19,23	100:17 101:2,14	remaining 106:21	228:9 230:9 231:14	rest 67:2 75:23 181:20	113:12,13 114:21
203:7,10,12,19,24	103:12,14,18,25	remains 43:14 117:5	236:3 237:23	235:2	115:13,23 120:3
231:6	104:13 106:18	remark 27:7 177:12	238:12 240:6	resting 94:18	128:3 130:4 132:25
referred 3:3 5:9 12:24	107:13,21 110:11	remarkable 170:17	244:20,25 245:13	result 172:18 197:8	133:2 146:13
	107.13,41 110.11	i ciliai nabit 1/0.1/			
	113.7 120.2 124.25	173.3	246.0	226.10.10	158-17 162-22
14:25 19:1 20:19	113:7 120:2 124:25	173:3	246:9	226:10,19	158:17 163:23
	113:7 120:2 124:25	173:3	246:9	226:10,19	158:17 163:23

	I	Γ			Τ
164:18 165:14	156:14 159:20	satellite 38:13 40:15	Sciplini 159:1 165:2	113:9 162:6,17	198:23 200:10
166:3 176:21	route 29:5 65:2 101:2	51:14 76:13 82:13	scoff 31:25	174:17 177:21	203:6 214:3 215:11
182:23 183:2	106:19 113:1	82:21	scoffed 30:7 72:4	182:24 199:13,19	225:1 238:14
185:22 186:10,10	116:22 117:11	satisfied 89:17 195:12	screen 1:13 2:4 37:6	200:25 206:19,19	sensitive 139:19
187:17,19,20	171:17 182:18,20	Saturday 231:13	94:5 199:19 209:4	206:21 207:11,13	sensitivity 12:15
189:10 190:15	182:21 183:2 191:2	Saunders 165:16	209:18 210:1	208:11,18,23 209:3	sent 15:23 16:7 154:22
194:5 212:16	191:18	saw 8:8 9:13,14 12:3	211:13 212:7	210:1 211:12 212:7	163:23
237:22 238:18,23	routes 182:17	15:2,3 31:11 41:22	219:16 230:17	214:1 217:10,10,18	sentence 1:22 97:17
243:11	routh 58:2	42:22 50:10 51:14	search 76:16,18 156:5	217:19 219:16	98:4 126:6 139:10
riverbank 186:12	Ruba 62:7	55:9,10 103:23	searching 243:4	220:10 222:18	141:5 170:8,23
riverbank 100:12	rudimentary 105:9	106:18 141:22	search-and-rescue	224:20 225:8,21	200:17 246:4
riverbeds 39:17	218:15	173:1 197:11 200:6	76:3.10	226:6 227:21	separate 61:25 62:4,4
188:25	Rudyard 53:24,25	201:25 223:22	season 1:10,20 4:8,10	230:16 232:22	124:10 125:24
riverine 176:15 181:6	54:7,9	228:9 242:25	4:16 6:9 9:16 21:5	234:10,16 235:2,16	183:8 239:24 241:3
189:1	rule 200:9,10,13	saying 15:2 21:6 23:12	21:13,14,15 28:3	238:20 239:15,19	separating 121:1
rivers 33:2 34:24	ruled 113:20	30:8 36:8 80:4	29:7,7 33:3,16 36:8	240:20 241:5,9,17	129:2
39:19 77:19,19,20	rules 1:4 170:18 202:2	90:17 126:23	36:12,15,17 43:11	241:17 243:6,8	September 210:22
77:22 86:22 106:13	206:20 208:8	131:20 132:11	43:12 44:5,10 50:12	246:6 247:14	211:6
	Rumthil 61:8				sequence 226:17
115:4,10 125:24		135:10 144:24	51:2,4 59:12,12	seeing 8:24 11:15	
126:7,16 132:5	run 172:6	145:2 166:21	70:22 71:7 101:5	50:18	series 75:24 76:1
146:14 154:23	runners 211:5 214:20	193:21 195:5	103:13 106:24,25	seek 16:25 200:12	166:8 183:14
158:5 164:7,10	214:20	204:16	120:7,9 129:11	seem 120:16 170:2	serious 136:20 206:12
170:13 238:17	running 125:17 130:4	says 2:4 7:7 10:21	139:22 179:25	192:2 193:21	seriously 147:25
239:24 240:23	runs 185:21 187:8	13:19 15:5 17:20	180:11 181:23	seemed 9:20 22:20	180:14
241:3,9	rural 6:20 14:6	24:6 27:15 39:19,25	seasonal 8:9,12 11:13	seems 124:2 134:6	servants 100:4
riveting 37:4	Russian-American	40:9 41:7 43:10	12:2 29:11 40:14	170:3 179:7 191:5	services 101:25 102:1
Rizeigat 24:10 58:15	76:13	46:4,12 47:6 61:5	140:4	196:13 226:25	session 197:12
70:7 166:16	Ruweng 184:13,14	61:14 62:25 65:6	seat 14:13,17 59:18	seen 1:21 2:9 6:17	set 8:3,13 35:25 36:6
road 50:4,6,11,19 61:9	226:7,7,7,18	70:10 97:9 110:24	second 7:25 37:20	8:16 14:10 15:1	76:10 88:8,11 93:7
83:10,18,21 86:2,2		111:2,13 113:5,7,17	70:14 87:5,18	17:11 27:20 29:1	198:18 199:15
95:2 184:12 185:21	S	117:17 120:24	104:19,23 114:5	31:21 32:24 33:8	204:8 234:11
roads 84:7 86:22	sacred 74:8	126:6 127:6 139:10	121:13 126:19	43:23 54:14,22 61:9	sets 130:24
Rob 1:14,18 2:13,23	safeguard 93:2	140:13 141:5	133:4 145:7 148:8	64:13 65:20 66:16	setting 205:2
13:11,15,24 14:22	safety 105:5	144:16 175:7 179:4	151:5 157:25 167:9	67:11 69:7 87:10	settle 149:6
15:1,7,13,14 16:2,4	Sahara 100:18	183:19,25 184:15	169:24 178:8 180:7	89:20 99:9 103:16	settled 41:25 42:16,21
16:12 17:12 20:13	sake 180:9,17	186:23 189:18	182:2 185:5 189:8	105:1 107:10	43:3,11 66:24
24:7 25:9 26:5	salient 98:22	191:22 194:9	211:8 243:8	139:21 143:6	settlement 42:13
27:18 33:5 103:23	salnameh 123:13	204:17 206:5 211:4	secondary 156:3	147:19 196:19	44:15 64:23 185:8
108:9 113:5,6,9,25	Salvador 164:13	212:14 215:2	208:9	197:25 201:16	185:11,21 186:20
148:21 156:22,25	same 10:14,14 13:16	217:19 224:13	Secondly 165:17	217:20 218:6 223:7	186:23 187:3
157:3 161:6 182:24	13:18,19 27:21 28:9	244:13 246:13	seconds 60:12	223:11 224:16	191:15,20,20
185:6 191:13 192:1	42:12 43:9 45:16,21	SC 2:2	second-class 2:7	230:8,25 232:5,8	settlements 4:20 8:7
195:4 210:23,24	57:15 58:6 62:21	scale 82:14	108:13,17,22	237:1 238:5 241:23	29:4,6 32:22 40:21
211:10 212:15,19	65:3 68:9 70:24	scanty 107:8	second-guess 151:8,25	sees 184:24	41:5,8 58:10 62:13
213:8,14,18,21	73:22 78:16,17	scattered 25:17 26:18	159:8	segregates 71:4	62:15 63:5 65:3,8
214:9,15,18,23	88:19 95:17 126:22	71:11 72:18 195:22	second-to-last 141:5	seized 6:7	65:10 66:25,25 69:4
215:7,15,22 222:21	149:3 153:23	scepticism 151:19	secret 158:17,21	seizes 15:4 236:20	71:10 74:6 87:3
228:14	158:20 159:1	Schofield 118:10,13	secretary 105:24	selected 9:8 85:19	138:22 141:8
robe 2:7 108:13,17,22	160:23 163:9	118:15,21 128:13	section 30:2 130:13	selection 66:9	183:14,15 184:11
161:6	167:14 173:23	131:5 133:10,13,17	162:9,14 164:20	selective 29:20 169:24	186:22 188:5
robust 119:24	180:6 204:25 205:6	152:10 172:1	sections 44:4 125:21	191:4	seven 23:10 75:15
Rob's 2:2,5,12,12,16	211:20 212:23	218:22 221:10	226:8	self-evident 147:5,14	85:11 168:13 201:9
2:19,22 3:17,21	213:7 216:16 218:2	229:16 233:8	secure 114:21	147:21 223:17	224:14
15:16 20:23 21:22	218:22 220:11,11	234:19 235:19	see 1:12,16,23 2:15	self-published 49:19	several 29:22 88:15
64:18 106:10 157:1	220:12,13 227:23	237:2 239:13,14	4:24 5:2,4 7:1 13:24	Semima 2:12,16,21	shambles 133:24
167:21,24 185:21	230:18 231:18	240:12,17,20	14:12 18:16 19:1	3:10	135:19 219:10
186:8	234:21 236:2,25	249:12,13	23:7 25:4,6 26:15	send 80:14	220:8
rode 53:17	238:19 239:25	scholar 175:24	28:7 31:1,8 32:15	sending 44:20	shaped 221:5
Rodman 2:3 128:14	238:19 239:23	school 103:6	33:25 34:16 35:1	senior 157:19	share 162:1
role 37:7 41:18 100:1	240:4 sanctioning 132:17	Schwebel 1:12 135:25	36:9,9,11 38:22	seniormost 150:19	shared 44:2 178:14,21
230:6,8,9 232:22	O	136:3 137:6 143:14	39:3 40:15 42:15	sense 3:12 4:11 10:8	179:5,12,22 180:2
Rome 14:4	sand 174:22,23,24	scientific 9:8 72:6	44:12 45:24 46:7	10:19 16:12 26:5,14	238:6
room 142:18	sandier 51:9 181:16	133:24 135:19	49:10 50:6,23 51:17	40:12 41:20 62:17	shares 161:15
rou 58:3	sandy 37:17,21 43:18	187:22 219:10	54:11 60:21 61:5	67:7 84:23 86:10	sharing 179:23
rough 170:13	51:10,10 53:3	220:8	62:10 63:11 68:25	88:2 90:20 99:8	sharing 179.23 shed 167:3 181:3
roughly 95:12	140:24 176:6	scientist 141:22	75:4 78:15 96:2	100:9 131:19 151:5	sheet 166:8
round 50:7 145:7	Saramaka 78:11	scientists 76:6 170:6	102:15 103:22	156:24 194:8	sheets 80:24
154114 55.7 175.7	sat 203:16 205:9	55161161565 70.0 170.0	102.13 103.22	150.21174.0	SILVERS COLET

Sheihk 155:2 161:9	224:5 228:7	skip 34:11	54:14 56:16 61:24	119:16 135:17	59:15
167:22 211:12	simplistic 174:19	slabs 178:25	62:16 64:5,6,14	175:23 199:1 201:3	southwest 2:20,20
212:17,19 213:9,14	simply 35:19 50:15	slang 104:23	65:7 66:3 69:13	205:16 213:21	3:15 12:19 175:9
213:18,21 214:10	66:13 67:19 78:20	slave 7:12 16:20	71:23 74:6 80:11	221:18 222:13	southwestern 99:1
214:23 215:7,16,23	81:14 83:13 85:9	104:17 105:12	83:1,1,3 84:19	230:18 232:24	101:14
sheikh 3:20 4:1,7,8	91:8 94:19 101:21	211:1,7 218:18	86:20 87:8 89:11	233:24 245:8	sovereign 99:3
148:21 210:23	102:2,8,24 103:13	sleep 37:4	95:9 98:13 104:13	sorts 73:5 174:10	sovereignty 160:15,18
Sheikhs 222:21	104:5 107:18 120:4	slide 1:16 4:24 15:18	107:11 108:6 110:9	sought 179:16 201:20	160:20,24
Sherlock 169:16	121:16 129:4 130:1	19:10,10 23:7 26:21	113:6,23 114:2	217:25	so-called 69:12 151:19
shift 209:2	132:13 154:12,16	32:15 33:4,25 34:11	115:8 119:1,3,5,8	soundbites 7:4 53:7	168:8 169:11
shifted 59:14	155:13 172:11	34:13 35:1 38:23	119:15,17 123:15	246:7	171:12 179:5,22
Shilluk's 20:15	180:10 188:7	42:15 44:13 46:11	124:16 125:21,25	source 53:25 82:9,10	207:22
short 5:2 13:16 60:8	189:10 192:10	49:4 54:11 61:6	127:17 134:17	110:18	space 160:17
79:20 91:2 151:25	230:1 232:25	62:10 63:8,11 64:16	135:4,5,17 138:1,4	sources 22:8 28:11	spaghetti 225:9
165:5 179:25	234:25 236:15	66:19 67:2 75:4	138:19,19 158:2	30:11 85:7 116:5	sparse 35:24 243:13
182:24 196:5	242:13,22	82:24 86:12 95:25	170:10,23 171:15	169:25 181:17	speak 68:16 89:11
238:25	simultaneously	212:14 214:19	175:6 176:23 177:1	south 1:15,19,21 2:17	112:21,22 160:3
shortly 44:4	202:18	216:22 217:5,14	177:23,25 179:16	2:17,25 4:10 6:11	179:18 247:9
shortness 179:1	since 23:10 54:9 87:7	224:20 227:22	183:11,15 192:23	6:23 10:9 11:2,16	speaking 161:19
short-legged 140:5	101:23 104:24	235:3,17 236:3	193:7 194:4 196:12	11:19,21,25 12:4,18	specialty 37:10
show 17:25 30:12 55:5	109:24 114:14	237:14 238:21	196:16,24 198:25	13:4 15:3 17:17	specific 55:20 57:8
55:19 62:18,20 66:8	115:1 155:19 174:8	243:6	199:24 200:4	18:13 19:7,8,12,14	64:7,9,12 66:5 69:4
66:11 67:20 70:23	179:2 185:15 237:7	slides 18:25 46:7	201:13,13,22 203:7	19:17,17,24 20:4,18	129:15,15 162:8
71:6 104:5,6 165:18	sincere 75:2 98:20	55:18 118:23 119:1	203:8 204:2 205:7	21:12 24:22,22	205:8 223:3 232:5
167:24	118:20	120:9 217:22	211:2 213:21	26:13 27:25 28:1,1	specifically 24:5,18
showed 18:18 20:3	Singapore 160:11	slight 176:17 177:1	216:19 221:17,25	29:12,23 31:20 32:6	33:5 35:16 39:5
38:13 42:10 45:17	single 66:12 84:20	190:10	222:12 228:18	32:16,19 33:2,11,15	41:19 82:8 150:21
66:9 97:11 194:4	155:8 201:19 205:5	slightest 49:4 54:17	229:25 230:21	35:5 38:1,4 40:10	154:23 159:22
197:3 214:19	206:23 211:19,24	70:8,12 72:14	232:24 233:4 237:3	40:18 41:12,17	177:16 201:14,20
244:15	235:13 238:1	219:12	238:14	43:17,24 44:5,9,10	209:10,14 219:15
showing 28:18 51:22	sir 26:25 89:25 105:22	slightly 8:4 38:9 188:8	somebody 49:3 80:9	45:1,5 48:20 50:3	219:19 230:10
52:7,17 107:4 119:5	143:16 145:5	slip 216:19	87:25	50:18 65:17 66:24	233:8
160:19	195:25	slowly 32:19	somehow 129:2	69:9 70:19,24 71:9	specification 125:22
shown 29:4 63:11 84:7 148:1 163:13 166:7	sit 16:13 176:3 198:16 site 94:16,17,20,21	small 6:20 19:1 32:22 57:16 66:9 95:16	164:18 180:16 185:3	71:15 75:25 101:11 105:3 110:14	specified 121:15 specify 202:13
180:18	95:4,4	142:8,12 180:15	someone 86:6 113:21	114:20 125:3	speculate 151:24
shows 12:16 18:23	sites 74:3,7,7,7,9 85:8	183:4,11 184:1	116:15 169:23	137:20,23 139:16	speculation 9:6 11:6
19:10 22:12 25:9,10	85:17,24 86:4,5	211:3 242:2	170:17 191:19	142:24,25 146:17	66:14 87:16 158:18
25:25 26:17,21	87:15 92:1 94:3,24	smaller 13:23 84:4	207:12	150:5 152:16	speech 143:20 144:19
31:19,19 33:1 34:11	95:6	smart 55:3 77:2	someone's 169:21	155:24 157:17	spend 28:10 29:13
34:14 38:14 52:12	sits 134:20 170:16	smoke 169:18 180:21	something 11:17	164:22 168:1,17,20	36:18 55:6,16 58:22
53:8 63:9 68:23	situated 148:25	snippets 7:4 55:8	16:10 31:1,19 69:14	169:1 174:11,15,16	73:22,24 74:1 75:6
70:3,16,17 72:16,17	155:18 163:14	246:7	80:14 83:23 85:4	174:24,25 179:16	89:3 124:22 197:20
97:3,20,24 110:21	167:12 168:17,20	snotty 191:4	87:25 93:1 113:25	179:23 180:2 182:1	spent 9:19,21 22:5,18
150:1 158:7 192:19	175:9,11	snow 36:9,10,10	142:1 147:2 151:2	182:22,24 186:8	29:9 31:5 41:11
195:1 208:19	situates 167:21	Sobat 115:19	178:16 182:11,13	189:5 191:23 194:3	51:1,11 53:11 54:20
243:17 244:7	situation 78:23 136:20	social 37:7,8 40:25	190:18 199:6	194:4,17,17 196:17	54:21 75:15,17,23
245:24	148:17,23 154:18	41:18 102:1	221:13 237:24	202:20,25 203:2	76:8 77:12
shrubbery 134:25	159:19 161:24	society 99:17	242:11	227:2 228:14 232:6	split 89:13
sick 140:19	163:4 190:15	soil 23:25 38:16 39:1	sometimes 36:2 80:23	232:11 235:24	SPLM 136:16,17
side 4:5 50:19,20	237:12	43:25 153:2 174:22	somewhat 6:14 8:14	243:7	138:9 159:13
80:12 118:25 145:8	six 29:13 54:20,21,21	174:25 175:1,13,16	69:17 70:1 143:20	southeast 2:18 3:15	165:22
159:4 168:10	55:6 75:15,17 85:11	175:21,23 176:1,19	176:11 183:1 237:7	38:9,10 51:5 65:10	SPLM/A 2:7 47:2,4
170:15 182:11	91:11,12 169:12	176:20,22 177:3	somewhere 17:1	southern 17:16 18:22	69:24 92:6 97:2,14
203:16 248:1	183:11	soils 40:14	222:12 226:24	21:24 22:25 23:16	134:16 135:1
sides 9:2 98:24 114:17 sign 186:25	sixth 168:8 171:17 size 50:16 73:25 90:23	soldiers 100:4 101:16 104:16	227:3 soon 50:6 51:6 199:13	24:8,12,17 26:3 27:15 38:14 39:21	136:10 138:6 143:25 144:3,22
significance 111:18	170:16	sole 163:6	sophisticated 72:5	52:11 99:12,25	145:21 151:7,12,16
242:21	sizeable 104:15	solely 155:13	sorry 1:16 25:8 26:25	100:3 101:4,19	152:3 154:4 157:9
significant 36:4 68:1	sketch 17:10,15,18,23	solemnly 74:25 98:18	94:8 95:23,24 96:22	109:4 114:7 115:14	161:8,15 172:25
74:1,2 90:10 127:22	17:25 18:2,4,15,17	118:18	97:13 110:24 112:1	123:21 126:16	173:15 174:20
150:16 190:14	18:19,22 29:16 30:1	solid 87:6	112:2,6 130:21	130:16 166:1,5,23	178:2,9,18 179:3
similar 71:2 179:21	30:19,25 34:19	some 5:21 6:3,9 7:7	132:9 188:1	175:15 181:18	182:8,10 185:16
211:9,11 236:4	52:17 69:14 150:18	12:15 14:22 15:14	sort 9:17 67:8,14	202:19 212:21	190:6 191:6 193:5
Similarly 46:22	168:1 243:4	15:19 20:10 22:18	69:14 71:3,17 73:10	224:11,21 225:5	193:18 199:18
simple 81:19 129:20	sketches 167:24	30:25 36:18 37:8	78:16,16,17 83:4,5	236:7	203:15 204:7
132:10 134:5 200:8	skimpy 87:11	40:25 44:11 49:20	85:6,7,10,23 114:1	southwards 24:9	207:10 212:5

220-11-221-5	144.47.150.0	5.16.54.5.122.15		100-24	
220:11 231:5	144:4,7 158:9	5:16 54:5 133:15	sudd 115:22 126:13	199:24 Sunset 49:7,18	symbol 83:12 84:18
SPLM/A's 26:11 40:23 145:15,18	178:19,25 241:24 245:16,20,20	145:12 154:25	sufficient 124:12 183:20		symptoms 140:21 system 38:1 39:13
,	states 62:3 97:2 136:8	159:4 169:8 196:8 196:10 198:9	suggest 3:11,16 4:22	supervise 247:16 supervision 93:24	76:11 189:10
146:14,20 158:3 160:1 173:19	157:2 166:13	215:17 224:19	7:20 8:17 10:8	supervisor 94:2	systematic 192:9
192:16 200:23	station 58:7	227:24 244:17	12:10 16:9 18:7,10	supplement 189:11	systems 107:23 115:13
spoke 58:17 89:12,14	station 30.7	249:3,15,19,20,21	19:9,21 22:9 23:7	supplementary	115:23
113:25	statistics 116:11	submit 137:15 138:14	28:19 31:16 32:2,6	207:22	113.23
spoken 114:3	stay 44:11 139:17	149:15,20 160:23	40:24 48:25 50:12	support 25:24 26:11	T
spots 30:7	stayed 44:12 103:11	203:20	53:20 54:3,16,17,25	29:18 82:3 149:22	tab 113:4
spread 14:9,18	staying 59:6	submits 167:1	68:10 71:12 72:17	150:2	table 80:25 203:15
spring 79:21	step 82:8,25 201:1	submitted 69:18,18,21	124:9 160:5 164:12	supported 49:2	tableland 23:1
square 172:17 176:25	Stephen 1:12 121:8	70:2 72:2 219:8	182:13 185:1	supports 23:11 40:22	Taj 94:7,10
180:4,14,22,23	132:3	subscribe 133:7,7	191:16 198:8	164:14 179:2	take 3:2 5:6 43:6
squarely 34:3 40:22	steps 201:4 224:8	subsections 61:11	201:23 202:4	208:10	49:15 59:8 60:3
40:23	stick 223:10,14	subsequent 108:18	205:11 213:15	suppose 61:25 120:17	66:3,4 75:10 78:20
squeezed 21:24	still 26:2 80:12 81:1	227:10	214:10 233:10,23	supposed 181:17	79:24 82:3 83:11,24
Stack 105:25	100:6 106:8,12,13	subsequently 108:15	242:3 246:3,12	195:20 207:16 230:21	84:23 86:1 88:10
staff 105:23 106:9 stage 38:2 121:9,13,25	110:20 114:9 125:25 126:7,8,20	159:1 222:7,9 226:22	suggested 158:14 170:15 177:10	supposedly 141:14	90:22 93:2,15 94:3
122:13 182:22,25	127:8,17,17 164:2	substance 135:18	180:14,20 237:5	219:23 229:4	95:21 110:9,25
184:21 225:7	171:24 208:9	172:20 199:3	suggesting 155:9	supposition 185:1	113:1 120:1,20 137:25 138:15
stages 121:5,9 182:21	239:23 240:23,23	223:21	173:11	suppressed 154:16	139:24 140:11
stake 149:13	stocks 189:2	substantial 4:20 6:18	suggestion 26:12	suppression 178:7	141:2 151:15 178:6
stand 92:12	stood 154:7,13	34:14 74:11 138:25	41:24 135:16	supreme 54:4,8 67:11	179:20 182:12
standard 123:14	stop 23:23 53:4 83:11	207:23	164:17 178:6,8	73:2 157:21	191:17 201:1
standards 208:21	176:19 195:20	substantially 70:19	180:24 188:15,18	sure 35:22 49:8 53:24	219:18 235:22
start 26:20 76:25 80:5	206:18 224:2	138:4	210:6,7,8 213:17	76:22 84:1 85:25	240:18
80:6 88:25 160:7	246:14	substantive 198:7,14	236:12	91:6 92:17 114:25	taken 18:17 48:12
187:24 196:25	stops 38:25 43:19	199:16	suggests 3:8 10:3 17:3	124:15 129:8 132:5	63:21,22 68:19,19
199:15,23 224:2	45:18	sub-part 200:4	20:2 29:3	133:19 146:13	84:19 86:20,21
230:24 247:25	store 46:18	sub-section 139:14	suit 53:7 144:3	215:25 216:8	96:12 116:8 121:25
started 17:13 79:10,25	straight 244:22	sub-tribe 56:21	suited 14:19 173:21	231:24 247:10 surply 124:20	126:2 178:24
83:2 91:21 230:23 245:22	straightening 172:13 straightforward	succeeded 133:19 successful 78:5,12	Sultan 1:14,18 2:2,5 2:12,12,13,16,19,22	surely 124:20 Surinam 78:3,4	182:17 195:18
starting 38:14 166:6	66:16 131:16 134:5	successfully 78:7	2:12,12,13,16,19,22	surmise 137:16	200:18 229:20
247:2	134:10,11 149:9	successive 201:4	13:15,24 14:22 15:1	surmised 20:23	242:11
starts 38:25 40:17,18	straight-line 135:4	Sudan 1:2,2,16,18 2:4	15:7,13,14,16 16:2	surplus 179:20	takes 3:14 84:22 137:20 142:14
43:19,24	stream 134:25 187:8	1:11 2:3 20:10 32:9	16:4,12 17:12 20:13	surprise 101:18 135:3	143:3 144:10,12
state 1:5 119:9 120:12	stress 47:24 170:13	33:9 42:13 49:7,18	20:23 21:22 24:7	234:22	230:22
120:12,14 128:18	stressed 170:6	90:8,9,20 99:25	25:9 26:5 27:18	surprised 7:9 89:17	taking 67:24 96:6
160:12,17 162:11	stretch 169:17	100:3,5 102:14,17	33:5 64:18 103:23	140:23	97:15 194:7 201:3
164:21	stretches 37:20	104:6,19 105:18,19	106:10 108:9 113:5	surprising 5:18 6:24	talk 24:25 45:3 120:16
stated 105:11 110:19	string 90:17	105:24 110:19	113:6,9,25 148:21	7:11,13,14 53:10	121:3 131:18 178:2
119:21 130:18,21	strip 21:24 37:22 39:9	111:10 114:8 115:5	156:22,23,25,25	63:22 70:25 74:13	205:21,23,24,24,25
132:14 160:14	stripped 77:18	115:14 116:6 122:6	157:1,3 161:6	102:19 107:18	227:18,20
188:20 218:17	strong 22:10 25:21	125:13 126:10,16	167:21,24 182:24	144:15 181:7	talked 24:20 63:18
statement 1:18 16:22 17:5 35:17 43:9	87:13,21 stronger 72:12	128:15 132:19	185:6,21 186:8	221:21,21 238:11	71:8 86:5,15 227:24
48:13 51:20 56:10	stronger 72:12 struck 5:6,8 185:23	134:21 152:5 156:18 157:2,19,22	189:18 191:13 192:1 195:4 210:24	surprisingly 141:4 156:17 218:5	240:21,25
63:16 75:1 97:9,11	Stubbs 170:7	166:12 167:1	211:10 212:15,19	236:10	talking 22:18 75:20,20
97:13 98:19 109:18	students 119:6	175:24 177:19	213:8,14,18,21	surrounding 118:25	89:1 96:3 113:4
111:23 112:11	studied 50:25	181:18 182:18	214:9,15,18,23	122:1	165:23 176:24 186:21 198:23
118:19 127:4 134:1	study 32:10 72:19	189:12,17 190:2	215:7,15,22 222:21	survey 30:17,24 33:24	210:4
136:6,23 137:12,18	73:24 74:5,18 95:10	208:22,23 209:10	222:22 228:14	121:25 243:23	talks 27:25 29:6
138:1,15,16 141:18	95:11 96:17 98:1,2	209:14,22 210:5,9	sultans 152:16 155:24	surveyed 164:10	183:13 208:24
142:2 143:3 144:2	181:8,10 245:1	211:17 213:20	163:7,13 164:22	165:16	targets 214:13
173:14 176:14	stumbled 38:19	216:7,17 217:10,19	167:10 168:17	surveys 239:5	task 114:20 146:6
178:16,23 180:7	style 215:5	218:11 219:15,19	sum 51:19 230:22	survive 139:23 140:2	149:16,19 155:17
190:9 197:14	subdivide 39:14	220:17,24 221:7	245:10	140:6 174:7	tasks 67:25
201:19 223:15	subject 40:14 94:21	226:2 227:7 228:9	summarise 233:9	suspect 68:13	Taufikia 20:8
228:13 244:13,15	106:1 202:7 213:2	230:9 231:14	summarised 32:12	sustained 174:14	teach 77:9
statements 16:25 35:8 48:13 60:16 63:14	subject-matter 212:1 submission 18:8 67:13	233:13,15 234:4,8 234:13,15 237:19	summarising 117:19 summary 105:18	swamp 186:18 swampland 142:16	team 84:15 89:10 92:1
66:2,10,18 67:17	111:17 193:15	Sudanese 104:16,24	summary 105:18 summer 47:8 139:17	swampiand 142:16 swathe 167:25	92:19,25 94:14,19
68:2,12,15,23,25	197:8	119:10	sums 26:2 245:8	swathes 172:14	96:9,16
69:2 74:14 107:12	submissions 1:4 5:16	Sudan's 149:12	Sunday 146:7 154:4	Swiss 82:19	teams 81:25 84:13,20 89:13 92:12 93:25
					07.13 74:14 75:45

	I				
technical 131:19	136:13 138:3 154:6	69:18 73:3,16 75:18	55:9,12,23 56:3	throughout 14:9,19	149:18 181:24
technique 72:24,25	154:12 155:11	75:20 76:10 77:17	60:1,13 66:13,14	25:17 26:18 33:1,12	197:22,23 203:24
techniques 73:13	160:14,19 161:1,1	77:19,24,24 78:12	78:4,21 82:15 84:4	33:21 34:15 40:22	211:19,24 246:6,7
technological 73:6	167:24 196:17,21	79:4,14,18 80:16	86:12 88:16 89:16	41:15 42:16,21 43:3	Toj 189:18 212:17
technologies 181:19	197:7 199:21	82:11 87:23 88:3	89:21 91:11 92:17	44:9 48:15 49:15	told 12:12 14:22 15:20
technology 73:11	201:21 205:8	89:2,7,7,8,8,9 93:4	92:22 96:3 100:14	51:25 52:18,21 53:9	16:15 17:4 25:1
78:17 80:22 181:12	212:11 213:16	93:5 94:1 97:19	106:22 107:10	69:8 71:12 72:18	28:15 45:23 47:20
Tel 2:13 telescope 115:15	218:1,20 223:6,8,12 223:24 224:1,9,9	99:15,16,17,17 100:1 102:7 103:9	109:9,15 110:8 111:10 113:12,25	75:25 97:4 104:19 140:3 173:22	51:12,13,16,17 55:25 56:1 59:5
tell 11:24,25 25:18,20	225:3 227:15,20	103:19 105:5,5	114:15 115:11,15	192:20 244:8	65:8,25 67:3 72:22
50:21,24 51:18	228:6 229:25	124:11 131:23	118:7 120:1 122:3	245:25	74:5 83:23 89:9
53:16,19,22 55:7	232:10,18 246:23	136:11,17 138:11	122:13 126:15	thrown 136:19	94:20 113:9,10,16
56:18,22,23,25 57:4	territory's 127:25	143:4 146:24	129:3,19,21,23,23	Thuba 65:24 66:1,25	115:3 141:23,24,24
57:6,7,17,19 66:17	terse 5:2 8:1	150:18 153:4,4,12	129:25 132:2	thunderstorms 9:3	141:25,25 142:14
85:12 112:9 140:23	testified 65:22 66:5	156:14 160:2	134:10 135:7 138:1	Thursday 247:24	142:19 151:7
141:22 156:15	136:7	164:10 165:3	139:7 142:23 193:2	Thuur 61:15	178:14,16 182:23
183:18 234:1	testimony 44:17 54:6	172:11,25 173:1	195:11,19 198:9,10	Tibbs 49:2,4,19,22	208:12 209:3 229:8
telling 36:24	54:12,16,17 55:1,8	174:7,12,12 177:14	203:23 208:1,2,13	53:15 61:9 245:19	231:1,9,11
tells 11:17 19:16 40:8	55:18 60:24 63:20	178:11 181:7,10	208:18 220:22	Tibbs's 52:3	tomorrow 143:22
42:4 45:13,15 48:23 53:13 70:20,21	63:25 64:4,8,8,11 64:17 67:15 69:3	189:2,20 193:15 194:2 195:2 204:5	222:14 226:25 231:8 238:11	tide 148:12 tidying 115:21	154:11 193:9 195:24 247:24
143:1	73:20 74:12 107:9	205:20 208:1 211:2	245:17 247:11	time 9:2,19,21 10:10	tone 112:5,6
ten 78:2 118:22	107:10,16,19 142:4	213:9 214:14	third 4:13 37:24 46:5	10:12 11:13 13:16	tone-deafness 170:19
tend 82:14 115:15	144:2 145:3 158:15	215:14,17 219:6	83:8 87:5 116:25	14:17 22:5,18 28:10	Tony 120:9
tendency 171:18	210:19 233:7,10	220:21,21 221:5,5	167:16 170:17	28:10,15 29:10 31:5	top 95:19 125:7
tends 119:15	243:2 245:14,20	225:19 227:18,21	184:18	32:13 36:18 41:9,11	170:16
tension 6:9	text 184:9 209:7 210:3	233:10,22 237:16	thorough 85:12	51:1,11 53:10 55:16	topic 38:20
tenure 79:8	212:4 219:17 241:5	237:25 239:10	though 10:22 11:17	55:17 56:17 58:9	topics 75:4
TENY 2:5	texts 152:8 165:21	theme 78:25 146:14	16:24 19:7 28:12,22	59:1,16 60:1,12	topographic 82:20
ten-minute 143:20	168:9	themselves 35:11 40:2	48:25 49:8 68:14,21	61:17,24 62:22,22	83:16
term 20:20 39:24 110:16 129:2 247:6	textual 200:18 thank 1:5 27:10 58:24	50:23 53:21 68:3 71:19 79:3 98:25	71:14,20 72:14 78:21 81:18 129:12	65:19 71:24 72:2 73:22 74:1 75:7,17	toponymy 31:25 total 91:19
247:6	59:16,17,19,22,23	103:3 120:7 128:7	140:23 149:13	76:18 77:3 80:13	total 91:19 toured 1:9 29:18
termed 152:7	60:5,11 74:20 89:22	150:4 214:24	184:14 197:3,25	88:19 90:24 91:1,4	towards 2:2 27:11,14
terminate 23:2,17	89:23,25 91:25	237:25	210:17 214:8	91:19 103:24	33:14 51:7 55:5
terminology 27:21	96:15 98:6,7,7,11	theory 142:15 143:2	229:22 247:11	106:11 118:9 119:4	65:17 67:21 76:1
31:25 119:18	98:14,15 107:25	195:3	thought 7:9 88:5,9	119:21 124:20,23	81:13,15 174:15,16
terms 59:25 61:25	108:1 112:16	thesis 75:21 106:1	89:10 92:14 138:7	124:24 127:13	235:24
62:2 64:10 86:18	114:14 116:22,24	136:23 137:13,15	145:4 148:23	128:5,23 129:17	Town 14:3 49:10
89:19 90:10 95:13	117:21,23,24 118:1	137:25 138:15,17	164:18 210:11	133:18 138:1 145:7	57:13 64:19 65:10
102:7 118:7,11 122:24 135:12	118:2 128:8,9 130:20 133:10,12	141:5 197:13 they'd 25:25 104:25	237:21 239:23 three 13:15,20,21 22:7	145:21 146:2 148:17 149:1	65:11,17 95:7,8 96:7
140:2 153:16	133:13,16,16	112:23 131:24	32:22 49:11 68:3,4	150:13,23 151:9	towns 68:24 69:1
237:24 247:1	135:20,22,23 136:3	Thibek 136:6	77:12 79:25 83:3	159:19 160:16	99:10
terrain 173:25	136:24,25 137:2,10	thick 239:21	84:13 85:18 90:25	176:23 179:1	trace 6:4 156:6 180:20
terribly 133:19	143:11,12 145:5,6	Thigai 138:22	91:3 95:2 103:20,21	181:24 184:8	traceable 84:21
territorial 122:15	145:13 169:2,5	thing 42:12 45:16,21	121:9 122:24	187:15 189:5	tracing 80:23,25,25
123:6 144:14 149:7	195:25,25 196:1,9	64:12 81:20 87:23	159:21,22 182:4,21	190:16 195:5	track 13:8
157:12 160:15	246:14,15 247:7,8	124:8 141:15 142:2	183:7,10 184:1	197:20 204:5 205:5	tracks 8:23 10:16,20
171:22 213:4	247:21,22 248:3,4 their 6:23 7:10 0:15	157:13,16,16	186:15 201:9 235:5	205:8 207:1 234:9	10:21 11:5,6 12:3,4
220:19 221:24 222:2,4,7,23 226:11	their 6:23 7:19 9:15 9:25 10:2,7,9,11,14	172:10 180:6 213:1 218:22 219:24	236:13,13,22 three-quarters 73:24	240:19 241:20 times 13:15 88:7	18:14 tract 173:10
226:23 227:4,10	11:13,15,19,25 12:1	220:11,12,12,13	through 1:25 5:22	227:21	tracts 174:23
230:2,3,21 247:4	12:2 14:7,7,13,20	227:23 234:21	12:21 13:7,9 14:1	timescale 134:24	trade 14:14
territories 49:9	15:3 21:11 22:21,25	238:19	19:2 22:5 28:16	tiny 103:23	traders 189:3
135:16 141:19	24:16 26:3 29:12	things 2:9 15:20 16:15	29:22 43:17 46:6	tiresome 66:4	trading 189:2
148:24,25 153:16	31:13 35:12 36:22	30:13 35:20 59:9,13	49:16 54:13 55:17	Titherington 194:4	tradition 152:21
228:24 233:23	36:22,24 37:7 38:24	60:22 64:15 80:4,13	60:22 61:1,2 66:3,4	title 169:21	traditional 9:25 42:2
territory 15:17 21:9	39:2,12 41:12 42:7	88:3 89:1 115:15	68:12 80:1 82:23	titled 32:10 40:25	42:8 43:3 46:1
21:23 26:8,23 27:1	42:25 43:2,7 44:5	141:18 148:10	85:9 103:16,21	Todac 62:14	47:17 48:3,7 138:12
27:2,11,14 28:1,2	44:21 45:7,13 46:1	172:25 173:1 186:16 211:23	106:17 112:17,25	today 4:6 59:17 72:20	141:19 143:4 205:25
39:22 50:5 51:6 66:15 70:4 71:15	46:12,13,14,18,19 46:23 47:17,23	186:16 211:23 think 3:22 5:7,13,23	115:22 116:6 118:22 126:2	99:8 114:1 131:7 138:4 152:1,4 199:7	traditionally 65:15
76:25 77:17 78:11	53:12 55:3,3,22	6:15 9:2 11:17	129:24 138:1,17	213:13	traditions 67:14 68:18
89:2 99:16 104:3	60:13 62:4,4,5 66:6	13:22 15:17 22:15	191:4 229:19 237:3	today's 5:11	train 82:25
105:14,15 121:10	66:15,17 67:10,21	36:13,24 44:24	239:12,15 240:13	together 32:3 45:9,20	trained 80:15
134:13 135:8	67:21,22,23,25	49:19 53:6,12 55:6	240:18	48:12 66:8 73:13	trainee 84:11 85:6

	ı	I	I	I	
trainees 81:14 82:11	199:22 200:2,20,22	188:24 201:18	Tuesday 196:14	176:19,20	undue 10:18
83:21 85:5 88:7	204:13,23 205:7,8	212:12 226:18	tukuls 49:11	typical 50:9 105:18	unduly 215:5
89:13	207:2 213:2,17	247:21	Turda 1:25 29:23,24	typically 5:2	unexplored 103:25
training 77:12 79:22	214:11 215:7,8	tribes 58:15 70:6	30:20 61:15	** **	127:8 163:21 164:1
79:23 80:2 84:9,10	218:25 222:15	98:25 175:19	Turkiyya 104:20,24		unfair 138:7 142:24
90:24 91:20	223:6 224:11,21	211:24 217:4,13	109:24 110:20	Ugandan 115:18	143:3,5
transcript 2:12 147:4	225:4,13,16 229:4	221:6 228:3	111:20 235:23	ultimately 166:9	unfamiliarity 75:8
147:17,18,19	230:1 232:11	tribesmen 46:10	Turko-Egyptian	Um 2:12,16,21 3:10	unfathomable 145:1
157:10 234:6 247:9	247:13,17	tribunal 1:1 25:12	104:20 110:17	182:6 183:6 184:2	unfavourable 177:12
transcripts 204:5	transferring 153:15	30:4 56:9,19,22,25	111:14	Umm 35:4 39:16 40:4	Unfortunately 73:21
transfer 99:13 103:24	156:17 157:13	57:4,7,13,17 58:4	Turko-Egyptians	52:23	124:25
105:10,12 106:11	217:7 222:14	58:16 59:21 74:4	105:1	unable 49:14 177:22	unhistorical 106:21
108:10 109:2,7	226:20	78:8,10 101:18	turn 26:16 51:7 53:20	uncertain 71:17 102:8	unilaterally 76:24
119:21 124:20,24	transfers 226:9	117:24 118:24	71:20 115:24	122:19 133:2	124:15
127:13 131:5 141:9	transit 38:2	134:2,12 136:2	116:22 156:12	233:14 235:20	uninhabited 6:5,9 7:5
141:11 144:14	translation 113:24	137:9 142:5 143:15	159:10 176:13	uncertainty 123:8,23	7:7 8:2 10:24 14:23
148:18 149:10,23	176:16	144:25 145:14	182:2 196:10	124:22 125:12,18	15:4 21:9 113:16
150:7,9,21 153:1,5	transmitting 105:16	149:16,19 151:4,14	197:15 199:4 219:2	125:20 126:1	unit 77:16 83:4 84:22
153:7,12,20,21	transparent 84:24	151:23 156:5 162:7	243:1	127:17,18,18,24	93:6 161:4
155:10,14,22 156:9	87:24 93:5	167:1 169:3,10	turned 2:1 186:10	145:22 148:6	United 82:19
156:10,12,19	transparently 244:24	172:2 177:17 188:3	turning 137:11 244:2	236:10	units 76:7 77:8 83:2
158:19,24 159:18	Trappers 76:9	188:9 195:25 196:2	turns 151:25	unchallenged 200:14	University 2:3 120:11
159:21,23 161:12	travaux 143:23 209:5	198:11,15 199:1	Twic 19:11,12,15,16	unclear 229:16	unjust 47:11,12
161:12 162:13,14	209:8 210:13,15	207:21 209:25	19:16,19,22 20:4	unconscious 93:2,3	unknown 126:8
162:20,23,25 163:2	231:8	234:22 246:19	24:20,22 109:3	uncontroverted 140:1	179:17 240:23
163:7,10,16 165:20	travel 177:24 178:2	248:2 249:16,17,18	148:25 155:2,18	200:14	unless 95:9 172:1
165:24,25 166:23	179:18	249:22	170:4 194:2,6	undecided 241:21	unlike 150:6 178:17
167:4,8,9,17 168:2	travelled 1:24 2:11	Tribunal's 22:17	211:10,18 213:3	undefined 127:25	unmistakably 212:10
168:8,10,12 180:4	49:13 104:15	30:22 72:3 154:14	215:1,10,20 216:4	undeniably 53:8	unqualified 190:2
181:25 189:15	106:19	tributaries 115:20	216:23 217:3,7,9,17	under 27:18 33:5	unreasonable 106:22
190:16 195:6	traveller 123:9	123:21 236:7	217:23 225:12,15	71:24 99:23 105:13	unreliable 66:13
196:21,22 199:11	travelling 49:9 89:6	tributary 187:8,21	226:15 227:15,19	106:4 108:9 109:24	unspecific 66:13
200:3 207:9,15	179:10 191:23	tried 14:4 169:17	227:25 228:3,5,24	111:19 130:16,22	unspecified 228:23
208:24 209:11	travels 49:15	185:18	229:24	130:22 132:22	unsuitable 140:18
210:4 212:11,11,12	treated 221:16 222:25	tries 55:23 68:21	twice 69:18 70:2	134:3,12 149:3	unsupported 11:7
212:12,13 213:1,1	225:13,18,19	147:12 227:5	Twic's 225:18	153:23 159:23	untenable 236:15
213:20,23,25,25	228:18	238:24	twisting 170:24	162:14 163:9,17	until 13:5 65:24 99:21
214:1,14 215:15,19	treating 140:20 241:2	trip 2:3 5:3 84:15	two 1:4 8:21 13:20,21	164:20 167:13	99:23 100:1 101:12
215:22,24 216:3,15	treatment 126:12	108:19 187:2	14:3,5 26:22 27:11	181:18 182:8	137:1,4 139:18
216:23,25 217:3,16	171:16	trips 83:25 88:21 95:2	32:22 36:20 38:8	192:23 201:18	166:17 174:24
217:17,23 218:1,16	trek 1:11,24 4:16,17	trivial 193:14	43:1 48:3 49:11	204:8 208:20	196:3 220:20 230:5
218:18 219:6,13,21	4:25 5:4 10:9 11:11	tropics 81:22	50:22 52:1 54:23	211:19,24 212:23	234:13 239:3,8
220:4,6,10,18,21,21	17:11 20:7,9 28:18	trotted 188:13	68:4 71:4 78:10,13	213:7,10 214:24	241:14 248:6
220:23 221:5,22,23	30:2,6 32:5 68:17	truck 53:17 61:1	79:24 81:17 85:22	218:19,21 234:7	untrained 116:15
221:25 222:3,7,8,24	106:22	true 16:17 35:19	88:17 97:7 101:22	underlying 156:10	unusual 102:19
224:14 225:19,20	trekked 17:16 29:22	44:25 45:12,14	104:14 108:25	underneath 142:16	unwillingness 170:1
226:6,10,18,21	106:17	71:12 102:25 103:1	109:3 118:23	217:10,18	upper 20:8 40:1 87:13
227:3,7,11,15 228:2	trekker 3:8	108:16 112:22	125:20 129:3	underscore 5:15 54:5	225:25 226:8
228:2,4,5,8,22,25	treks 1:7 103:20 104:5	115:1 163:19 175:2	131:10,13 141:18	underscores 54:18	urge 68:14
229:1,1 230:3,20,20	104:8 107:1,4	183:14 188:16	145:20 146:2	understand 9:13	urges 205:17
230:21 232:5,5	191:22	194:10 214:2	150:11 152:15	16:24 61:24 72:15	usage 3:24
235:6,9,16 239:20	tremendous 81:4	trust 105:7	153:17 155:24	99:8 108:21 135:24	use 18:7 32:1 44:21
241:20 246:21,22	85:13	truth 55:25 56:1 71:5	157:16 161:16	144:13 172:3	60:11 65:2 79:4
246:25 247:6,15,20	Trevor 2:12	134:9 145:2 236:9	162:8,24 163:7,12	understandable 16:11	81:5,5,18 107:22
transferred 131:8,9	triangle 142:9,12	244:21	164:3,22 167:10	238:15	116:11 119:18
136:15 137:19,23	tribal 54:2 67:4	try 5:21 6:15 41:20	168:17 173:20	understanding 93:14	135:3 188:1 227:20
142:8,11 145:17,24	103:11 145:19	53:6 70:16 72:12,15	177:7 179:9,24	110:2 156:16	used 27:22 28:14
146:16 148:4 149:2	147:6,10,16,22	111:6 135:3 144:8	183:4 188:10	215:13 231:23	35:14 37:18 42:17
150:3 151:11	153:17 166:19,22	182:7 229:3,5,12	194:12 195:11	understandings	50:17 55:17 59:10
152:13,15,22	169:11 171:7,21	231:3,23 232:20	197:22 211:5,22	236:25	60:1,2,23 83:4,6
153:13,19,24 154:2	193:8,19,23 208:24	233:9 234:16	213:18 214:5,11,12	understands 178:21	88:7,8,23 96:2
154:15 155:19,21	216:15 220:5,18	243:24 trying 72:6 118:0	214:20,20 215:9	understatement	106:25 135:4
156:1 157:9,17	222:7,8,24 223:18	trying 72:6 118:9	217:21 235:1,15	224:24	136:12 140:20
159:6,16 162:21	225:20 230:3 235:6	120:16 129:23	236:13 239:20,23	understood 13:18	142:24 152:24 153:17 154:21
164:24 166:2,4	tribally 225:15 tribe 37:8 41:1 66:24	149:6 156:2 159:8	243:1 244:11 245:16	96:1 247:10,11	153:17 154:21
167:5,19 168:6,16 168:23 172:8	142:23 186:23	199:15 233:16 234:14 247:9	type 91:15 162:16	undisputed 202:22	155:11 171:11 194:15 21 202:6
100.45 174.0	142.23 100.23	234.14 241.7	cype 31.13 102.10	225:17	194:15,21 202:6
L	l			I .	

	I				
218:3 227:9 238:20	126:12,13 128:9,13	virtual 157:21	Wau 20:8 102:5	181:23 209:8	227:9 229:20
239:25	131:24 133:10,13	virtually 7:22 36:1	115:20	214:18,20 221:15	231:15,17 232:23
useful 21:21 44:14	134:3,10 135:21,23	152:2 156:13 172:1	way 7:14 14:15,16	237:2	233:17,18,18
48:18 54:7 82:22	136:25 139:8	193:21 194:1	16:16 17:2 28:6	were 1:25 5:24 6:1,23	235:17,16,16
86:11 222:19	142:21 143:12	230:14	34:9 37:13 43:7	6:24 7:9 8:15 9:3,8	238:4,17 239:23
uses 31:24 78:17	144:15 145:6,20	virtue 197:9			
	,		46:8,9 49:5 50:10	10:13 11:1,19,20,20	242:8,24 244:7
117:14 165:22	150:17 151:4	visibility 86:19,21	60:20 67:5,8,10	11:21,22,24 12:2,4	245:25
using 77:16	154:22 157:15	visit 4:1 44:23 85:23	68:16 70:2 72:9	12:17 14:9 16:19	weren't 16:17 18:10
usual 105:22	160:4 169:2 171:19	104:12	73:19 74:17 77:19	17:1,2,3,5,7 18:6,17	30:13 48:22 85:25
utilised 181:12	171:23 178:20	visited 104:2,2 150:18	81:4 83:5,5,21,22	21:14 26:1,12,17,22	131:13 152:25
utterly 156:9	182:1 187:5 188:16	visiting 75:18 85:18	88:2 89:15 92:24	28:21 30:24 35:9	153:3 187:17 214:9
	192:10 193:6 196:1	visits 85:22	93:7 95:21 102:12	36:17 41:15,23,23	224:25 231:4
$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	200:9 201:23 202:2	voice 112:5,6	103:9 105:22	44:3 50:7,14 51:22	west 2:2,5,11,23 3:9
v 160:11 164:12	212:1 223:15 224:5	volume 182:17,19	115:21 116:4,10	54:24 55:3 56:22,24	3:10,17 20:16 22:1
	229:18 234:20	volumes 116:6	119:20 121:20	56:25 58:14 59:6,6	22:4 32:11 49:5
vague 64:10 69:3	235:20 238:22	vote 203:1,18	129:7 137:17	59:9,14 61:3 62:7	105:3 113:8,10
102:7 123:21	246:15 247:7,8,22	Vote 203.1,10	148:16 154:17	62:12 65:9 66:9	128:6 138:19 164:5
vaguely 123:19 236:5	247:24 248:3	w	170:7 172:24 179:6		
vain 156:6				67:17 71:11,21 76:7	165:15 191:15
valiant 185:19	vested 157:22	W 1:13	179:14 186:24,25	76:12 77:15 78:12	195:4
valiantly 185:18	via 13:10	Wadi 37:25	189:20 192:9	78:16,18 80:1,4	western 128:5 170:10
valuable 194:21	vice 178:4	waiting 112:5 181:11	197:17 225:19	81:10 82:16,25 83:6	181:18
value 70:4 71:13,21	vicinity 51:4	walk 60:22	226:4 227:12	84:19 85:1,3,14,17	wet 1:20 21:5,13,14,15
191:11 192:7	victims 211:17	walked 240:13	228:24 229:5,15	85:19,24 86:4,5,6	36:7,14,17 43:11
VANESSA 2:6	Victor 120:24	walking 186:6	235:21	86:11,19,22 88:5,18	50:12 71:7 120:9
varied 79:9	victory 109:23	walks 183:1 191:19	ways 75:9 120:17	88:19 89:6,14,18,21	181:23
variegated 174:18	video 245:15,18	Walsh 15:12,23	123:8 134:6	92:5 93:5,8,9,24,25	wetter 51:8
181:5	view 5:19,19 21:2	waish 15:12,23 126:24 159:2 165:2	weaker 72:13	94:14,15,18,20 97:4	wet-season 21:4 71:9
	117:20 129:17		Wednesday 1:7 1:1	97:21 99:3,15,15,24	we'll 111:2,16 123:3
various 3:15 6:13	131:1 136:22	wandered 14:24 17:1	weeks 77:12 79:25	100:4,23 101:8,9,16	125:15 182:25
13:22 19:1 32:20		113:17	90:25		
54:12 63:10,14 69:1	138:10,11 143:3	want 24:24 38:20		101:24,25 102:1,7,8	196:3
74:11 85:7 119:19	144:10,13,13,15	46:20 47:24 54:25	week's 107:6	102:18,23 103:8,20	we're 6:25 14:12 25:4
126:23,25 144:7	162:1 171:22,25	56:16 77:4,5 91:7	weight 159:7 228:19	104:9,24,25 107:1	26:15 28:7 50:22
176:8 183:17 218:7	178:18,20,24 190:5	133:21 134:6 137:8	welcome 74:23	110:7 111:19 113:9	51:17 76:24 96:3
240:25	191:5 219:4,25	143:13 182:3 193:9	well 2:3,5 4:20,21 5:16	122:19 123:15	114:15 143:6
vary 160:25	247:5	201:12 207:12	7:25 10:3 13:1,20	124:12,18 126:2	158:11 230:23
vast 99:18 100:17	viewed 148:17 150:3	216:20 246:24	15:22 23:24 25:22	127:12,14 131:7	we've 4:9 6:16 14:10
102:23 104:3	153:19 154:18	wanted 16:12,18	27:6,12,13 31:18	132:25 133:25	14:25 17:11 24:14
172:14 181:17	159:19	136:17 201:11,14	37:11 50:14 52:4,9	134:2,11,12 136:15	28:11 29:1 31:21
vegetation 153:2	views 44:7 54:3,9	203:1	59:3 60:5 65:20	138:13,20,21,22	34:7 54:4 59:16
	144:6 146:15		75:17 76:11 77:4,5	141:9,11 146:16,18	62:11 63:17 64:13
vehicle 89:3	150:19 221:5,5	wants 193:18	77:10 78:2,24 83:1	146:23 148:3 149:1	65:20 67:12 69:7
vehicles 89:3	vigorous 92:5	war 125:16 233:15	84:4 86:1,9 88:9	149:6,13 152:3,6,20	80:5 86:15 87:17
Venezuela 77:3 78:3	village 1:19 2:13,14,16	washed 8:11	89:10 90:12 91:21	152:23 153:14,24	96:12 123:25
Venezuelan 76:22		wasn't 11:12 13:19			
veracity 70:13	2:19,22 3:17,18	42:23,24 50:11	93:21 96:19 107:22	154:20 155:12,13	134:10 139:2,21
versatile 108:21	12:20 13:3,3,8,10	76:22 86:15 93:13	114:15 117:14	155:17 156:2,7,9,16	143:6,19 145:20
verse 148:16	26:8 57:9,11 58:5	93:21 94:2 95:2	120:20 128:13,24	156:17 161:5	152:1 190:8 196:19
version 194:10 225:21	63:7 65:12 86:8	97:15,25 109:9,15	133:20 136:23	163:15,20,25	197:25 199:20
versions 194:12	135:10 183:11	135:10 139:9	137:25 141:20	164:24 165:2 166:4	201:16 217:20
versus 80:24	184:6,16,18 186:8	157:16 190:7 214:5	142:25 144:21	166:24 172:22	218:6 223:7,11
very 3:17 4:19 5:2	186:11,19 187:5	214:12,15,15,18,23	148:20 150:9	175:4 177:5 179:15	224:16 225:1 230:7
7:23 11:4 15:22	191:21,23 210:22	216:19 233:1 234:7	157:14 158:22,25	181:18,23,24 183:4	230:24 232:5,8
18:11 19:3,6,6,6,8	villagers 6:11,20,24	234:10,13 237:9	173:2,9 176:7 178:1	183:6,23 184:13,23	233:6 237:1,16
24:1 27:10 28:20	villages 6:20 12:1 13:9	239:16,17 241:14	181:21 184:7 185:8	186:13,16 188:15	241:23
	14:8 18:21,23 19:1		189:5 193:20 201:5	188:19 189:5	whatsoever 152:2
30:16,22 33:6 36:23	19:4,6,9 20:3 21:10	242:7,21 246:9	205:12 222:20	190:20 191:14	whichever 94:23
44:7 56:12 58:21	25:16 29:8,13 30:10	water 12:6 61:20 80:6	234:20 240:16	192:20 193:17,21	102:10
59:17 60:5 69:9	30:11 33:17 34:12	123:20 183:20,21	241:14 245:16	194:9,24 197:4	while 19:19 20:5
72:17 76:11,15 78:5		183:24			
78:18 79:13 83:6	34:20 41:15 49:10	watercourse 49:13	well-established 232:2	198:25 200:2,2	88:25 99:9 103:16
86:11,11 87:21 88:5	50:9 51:25 52:4,9	186:17	WENDY 2:5	201:16 204:7,12,13	111:7 127:22
88:8,23 89:10,16	52:18 58:10 62:10	watercourses 35:3	went 1:20 2:5 3:10	204:23 205:2,7	148:14 183:17
90:18 92:5 98:8	63:10,17 69:4,8	38:7 52:22 238:16	20:8 21:5 36:8,14	206:14 207:1,10,14	207:24
99:5,14 102:21,21	72:1,18 74:3 97:4	watered 23:24 236:7	42:12 49:5 50:10	211:18 213:9	white 32:11 77:5,9
103:19 104:11	97:11,21 176:5	watering 30:7 32:20	51:15 59:13 76:23	214:11,24 215:7,8	115:18 174:19
106:15 108:1 112:7	182:5 183:4,5,6	waterless 176:6	83:8,15,21,21 84:10	216:2 218:25	243:9
114:12 116:11	184:1,7,8 186:12	watershed 166:17	85:9,21 88:14	220:19 222:3 223:2	Whittingham 29:17
117:24 119:3 121:5	192:20 244:7,15	waterways 39:22	108:15 129:6	224:3,23 225:8,9,13	29:22 30:19 42:9
123:21,25 126:3,3	245:25	126:9,23,25 241:1	142:21 155:6	225:13,16 226:2,15	Whittingham's 29:20
145.41,45 140.5,5		140.7,43,43 441.1		,,	
	1				1

30:2,6,10,12 52:6	withheld 177:10	worst 148:14 243:24		11,000 172:17 176:25	210:22 238:8
243:3	witness 15:10 36:22	worth 15:18 104:4	Zakaria 136:6 137:12	180:4	1904 4:16 13:12
whole 18:8,23 76:12	38:24 42:5,7 43:7,9	115:11 199:21	141:17 144:9	11.16 74:21	102:13 113:2 115:2
77:23 80:17 82:17	44:17 45:13 48:12	200:15	197:13	11.42 90:1	115:6 125:2,15,20
87:23 88:9 94:24	55:1,18 56:4,10	wouldn't 8:7 34:21	797:13 Zakaria's 144:2	11.54 98:9	158:6 163:24
144:1 149:20	59:24 60:16 62:9,21	36:16 55:7,24 91:12		11.55 98:16	189:12 241:7,14
156:10 163:22	63:14,16,20,25 64:7	93:3 116:17 233:5	Zarga 20:20 35:13,16	114 146:24	1905 1:15 4:18 13:16
166:8 167:2 174:18	64:11 66:10,18 68:1	238:17,17	39:9,15,18 40:4	118 249:12,13	20:8 22:15,19 24:6
179:3 183:18	68:8,12,14,22,24	writes 115:1 175:14	43:21 53:1 117:13	12 77:13 83:1 84:13	24:23 26:6 81:16
187:11 206:22	69:1 71:22 73:20	188:21	117:19 124:1 125:9	92:12 248:1	94:13 95:6 97:6,12
246:5,11,12	74:12,14,25 75:4	writing 181:25	139:3 141:21 155:5	12.11 108:3	97:22 98:24 99:13
wholly 170:4	92:21 98:10,18,22	writings 48:12	157:5 172:15	12.25 118:3	100:5 101:12,20
wide 40:2	107:9,12,16,19	written 9:23 37:2 54:4	176:16 177:1,2	12.26 118:14	102:15 103:5,15,21
widely 14:9 26:18	118:1,4,18,22	67:6,13 73:5 120:23	183:5 185:14 187:7	12.41 128:11	103:24 105:10,17
221:23	129:13 136:6	133:8 158:9 215:17	187:12,14,20,21	12.49 133:14	106:18 107:14,15
widening 99:6	137:12,18 138:15	wrong 1:22,23 16:10	188:6 193:3 239:10	12.52 136:1	107:24 109:2
wider 58:5	138:16 139:9	29:5 36:12 44:25	241:11,13	12.55 137:3	112:11 114:8 116:1
widespread 238:2,3	141:17,18 142:4	47:6 48:11 53:5	Zarga/Ngol 237:21	12.33 137.3 127 217:11	117:5 122:4,20
width 121:15	144:4,7 176:14	59:13 110:2,8 190:7	239:6	127 217.11 128 208:22,24 209:15	125:1,12 126:1,5
width 121.13 wife 178:1	•		Zerga 138:23		
	177:11 178:15,19	199:2,3 205:10	zonal 123:22	209:22 210:5,10	127:11,14,16 128:19 129:7 131:4
wild 44:21	178:23,25 197:13	208:5 215:8 219:12	zone 122:17	213:20 216:7,11	
wildlife 239:21	201:19 213:22	221:14 232:23	zones 37:15	217:19 219:15	132:22 136:13,14
Wilkinson 5:19 6:10	243:2 244:3 245:16	234:17		220:25 221:7 227:8	136:16 137:21
13:13 22:7 27:22	245:19	wrote 7:8,16 34:24	0	230:9 231:14	145:17,24 147:5,9
62:12 67:9 117:14	witnesses 36:19,25	37:6 39:11 46:22	0)6 2:13	249:14	147:15,21 148:1,18
117:17 124:4	45:3 55:7,12,25	75:21 114:25 151:9	-, - =-=	13th 211:6	149:5,15,23 151:11
154:19 167:24	62:19 63:2,25 66:5	Wul 29:25	1	130 20:11	151:13 152:5,6
171:16 181:22,24	66:15 71:23 92:16	Wun 57:10,10,11,14	1 29:22 84:13,15 170:3	133 249:15	154:7,13,17 155:3
182:19,22 186:17	177:20 178:17	57:14 61:7 64:25		135 114:15,18	155:12,23 156:18
187:1,16 237:3,6,8	205:21	Wunrog 69:23	193:22 249:3	136 249:16	157:2 158:12,16,25
237:18 238:1	witness's 139:4		1,000 76:20 211:2	137 249:17	159:3,22 161:15
239:16 240:3	women 60:17	Y	1.1.2 143:7 196:20	14 142:16	162:22 163:20
Wilkinson's 1:7 25:9	wonderful 119:6	Yamoi 13:6,7	197:16,24 198:3,5	14-mile 21:24	164:16 165:7,17
116:22 117:6,11,20	183:9	year 5:20 9:3 10:11,12	198:18 199:2,16,25	140,000 170:10	167:4,18,20 168:23
182:4 185:5 186:5	wonders 43:22	13:13,14 36:12 41:3	200:17,19 201:2,8	143 249:18	169:15 171:6 172:8
WILLIAMS 2:6	wooded 8:13	44:2 45:9 71:19	201:24 202:1 203:4	145 249:19	172:9,12 174:9,10
willing 177:19	word 99:8 165:22	73:24 75:18 76:8,15	203:25 206:5,13,16	15,000 190:11	174:11 175:4 177:5
Willis 181:22,24	188:1 195:24	76:19 77:23 79:11	206:19,21,22,24	150 74:6	180:15,19,20
Wilmer 2:5	203:12	87:6,6 90:22,22	210:12 212:6 218:4	151 182:19	187:12 189:15
winding 38:7	words 3:24 107:14	91:2,15 100:5	227:6,9 230:23	1579 151:12	191:21 192:22
Wingate 106:9,15	117:11 122:24	112:13 148:4 158:7	232:15,17 242:14	16th 205:1	193:8 196:19,21
115:3 125:18	125:10 139:3,4	159:1	242:15,19	166 234:6	199:23 200:3
126:14,20 127:6	147:12,24 148:7	years 13:16 23:10	1.1.3 45:24 47:16 48:6	169 249:20	204:14 207:2,9,15
133:4 152:12,14	154:15 202:1,1,2,3	27:23 36:21 43:1,7	1:250,000 82:18	17 233:15	209:11,15 211:9
157:15,18 158:2,24	202:6 236:23,25	50:22 52:1 57:3	10 75:6 126:4,5 248:2	178-page 105:21	213:1,2 215:19,24
158:24 162:12	wore 108:15,18,21	75:15 78:1,9,13	10.13 56:5	18th 204:20	218:16 220:21,24
164:16,20 167:19	work 3:3,5 5:22 9:1	80:15 119:5 122:15	10.27 60:7	1820s 109:24 110:13	223:4,7,11,17,25
168:13 205:23	10:4,5,5,18 32:12	123:12 127:3	10.54 60:9	1821-1881 111:10	224:12,23 225:16
229:3,17,23 238:7	55:3 76:20 91:15	150:17 158:18,22	100 54:22,23 79:13	183 147:3	228:25 229:12
240:14 241:5,22,24	93:4 102:22 115:3	179:9 205:4 223:1	205:4,21	1844 123:10	231:4 232:2,4 233:1
Wingate's 105:23	138:1 151:2 173:9	224:8,14 233:15	100th 76:17	1877 236:2	233:12 234:5,23
152:11 155:23	187:22 236:21	235:5,8,21	100,000 82:16	1884 236:4	235:15 236:18
157:8 161:17,18,18	237:16	Yeats 148:7	104 1:12 2:4	1898 23:10 99:21	237:11,13 239:1,5
161:19 163:13	worked 78:1,2 80:16	yesterday 1:6 3:23	108 249:11	103:4 123:18	239:20,23 240:1
165:23 168:13	83:13 87:21 94:19	5:14 14:22 55:9	10°20 34:5 52:14	19 62:2 158:1	241:20 242:9,21
199:10 208:14	working 75:23 78:6	63:1 90:3 92:23	10°22'30 149:25	19th 54:8,10 104:21	244:9,16 246:2
228:12 229:14,19	85:7 90:11 102:12	118:7,12 120:10,11	10°3 96:23	110:15,21 213:22	1906 15:12 64:20
230:6,12,14 231:10	133:18	126:12,17 128:17	10°35 98:1 244:14,20	1900 100:19 109:19	126:2,21 239:5
240:11	works 39:5	147:1,2 151:16,20	245:1	116:20	240:6,9
wisdom 54:18	world 63:24 73:10	162:2 170:6 173:4	10°30 174:25	1900s 123:23	1907 26:20 99:23
wish 88:1 131:23	74:19 102:9 123:14	175:5 180:8 186:19	10°35 97:5,10,12,22	1900/1901 100:22	175:6 234:13 238:8
136:5	148:11	191:4 193:5 196:23	135:8 149:25 176:5	1902 26:6 99:21 117:7	239:4 241:15
wished 131:20	world's 72:21,23	199:8 207:5 229:8	192:21 244:9,16	117:12 182:20	1908 239:8
wishes 140:11	211:25 218:11	Ye'kuana 76:21 77:13	246:2	185:9,12 235:5	1909 29:18 127:7
wisp 180:21	243:24	91:2	10°7 95:15,20,21 96:6	1902/1903 130:10	1910 52:8
withdrew 59:24 98:10	worrying 240:19	young 83:1,1	11 13:1,4 74:8 126:4	1903 1:8,24 108:12	1911 166:11 229:12
118:4	worse 50:19	Joung 65.1,1	126:11,19 165:1	111:23 166:20	230:5
**					
	1	1			

Day 5

	T	T	T	T	1
1912 32:8 52:10	28th 69:20	9			
224:14 225:5	20th 09.20				
		9 83:20 178:22 247:25			
1913 33:24 52:15	3	9.00 248:6			
1914 64:17 235:8	3 29:24 84:14 114:5	9.2.02 183:21			
1915 64:18	137:1 180:6 234:6	90 60:1,2 157:10 249:8	l	l	
1920 103:5	3.00 137:4,5	90s 75:12			
1920s 100:1	3.11 145:11				
1921 52:17		98 2:13 249:9,10			
	3.50 169:7	98% 197:5,7			
1923 177:23	30 60:12 83:10 211:2				
1928 121:7	214:16				
1929 225:15 226:16	30,000 76:20				
1930 103:5	31 113:4				
1930s 194:13					
	33 2:13 136:8 137:11				
1933 69:14,20	138:8				
1935 69:23	34 2:13				
1940 65:14	35 74:7				
1940s 65:23	39 69:19				
1945 64:20 121:8	37 07.17				
1950s 180:2					
	4				
1951 34:23,24 52:20	4 172:15		l		
1953 39:11	4,000 87:7	l	l	l	
1955/56 116:6	4.31 196:4	l	l	l	
1956 166:9		l	l	l	
1959 111:10	4.59 196:6	l	l	l	
196 249:21	40 6:18 61:2 69:21	l	l	l	
	74:6 86:25 95:12,12	l	l	l	
1962 40:25	95:21,23,24 96:6	l	l	l	
1965 35:9 52:24	155:6				l l
138:18	44 2:13				
1966 35:9 41:6 52:24				l	l l
1970 50:25	45 74:8 142:3				l l
1970s 181:2	46 142:3	l	l	l	l l
	48 245:20				
1980 75:14	49 116:25				
1980s 75:23					
1990s 78:14	5				
1997 28:24					
	5 1:1 142:4 196:3				
2	245:5				
	5,000-10,000 190:9				
2 29:23 75:7 84:13,15	50 125:3				
128:18 182:17,19	50,000 115:25 190:6				
2(c) 134:3,12 198:20	· ·				
2,000 88:10,12	50/50 176:11				
2.5 185:23	500 101:1 180:14,22				
	51 97:2,19 192:17				
20 43:7 83:9 87:9	56 74:7 249:4,5				
147:17		l	l	l	l l
20th 122:16 177:18	6	l	l	l	l l
213:22		l	l	l	l l
2001 78:5	6 176:14	l	l	l	l l
2005 197:9 199:18	6.14 246:18	l	l	l	
202 7 202 12	6.16 248:5	l	l	l	
202:5 203:13	60,000 12:23 211:3	l	l	l	
204:20 230:7 231:2	65 166:8	l	l	l	
231:5	66/4/35 69:20	l	l	l	
2009 1:7 1:1 177:18	00/4/33 07.20	l	l	l	
2011 202:19		l	l		
21 94:4,8	7	l	l	l	
22nd 1:7 1:1	7 91:13 220:15				l l
23 138:16 139:11	7th 69:23	l	l	l	
	74 74:7 249:6	l	l	l	
23,000 180:23					l l
24 142:3	75 57:3 248:3 249:7	l	l	l	
246 249:22		l	l	l	
25 52:4 60:6 85:1 94:5	8	l			
94:9 139:6,15	8 202:15	l	l	l	l l
224:17		l	l	l	l l
	8.59 1:2				
26 2:13 60:16 71:23	80 145:9	l	l	l	
74:14 139:6 140:10	80% 80:16				l l
245:20	86 177:23 245:17	l	l	l	
27 62:3	88 181:7	l	l	l	
28 141:2	88% 197:4,6	l	l	l	
	00/01//,0	l	l	l	l l
		•		•	