Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And

I thank you for holding this hearing on the continuing humanitarian

and security challenges in Sudan.

I welcome the distinguished witnesses, appreciate their willingness

to testify, and the willingness of the United Nations to brief

members of the committee on the status of international peacekeeping

deployment in Darfur.

The Darfur crisis is now in its fifth year, and the prospects for

peace in the region appear to be little better than they were 3 or

4 years ago, when the international community first responded

with a massive humanitarian intervention. In the face of direct obstruction

and willful delays by Khartoum, these humanitarian efforts

probably saved hundreds of thousands of lives, but those lives

continue to be under extreme threat. Regional and global conditions

have worked against a solution to the human suffering in

Darfur. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement between North and

South Sudan, which many consider essential for peace in Darfur,

is faltering. To the west, Chad and Sudan continue to sustain rebel

forces intent upon destabilizing or overthrowing each other’s government.

These rebels are preying on the hundreds of thousands

of displaced persons in eastern Chad, the Central African Republic,

and in Darfur, as well as targeting the humanitarian workers in

the region.

As the wet season descends on Darfur, and the roads are increasingly

impassable, the World Food Programme is facing a global

food crisis that has forced the subsistence rations for millions in

Sudan to be reduced. During the last several years, the United

States Government and private American citizens have responded

to the crisis by providing billions in humanitarian assistance. This

national response continues today, and it has been the predominant

portion of the international efforts for Darfur.

The United Nations also has played an important role in response

to this catastrophic situation through the U.N. Security

Council and the individual agencies, such as the World Food Programme,

the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, and UNICEF.

In addition, the African Union, the European Union, NATO, and

numerous countries have made bilateral contributions. Despite

such efforts, the crisis remains, and security is deteriorating.

Last July, hopes were raised by the United Nations Security

Council’s approval of an enlargement of the peacekeeping force in

Darfur to 26,000 troops. Unfortunately, that hope has been fading,

due to Khartoum’s continued obstruction and delay, and rebel factionalism,

and international ambivalence expressed through limited

contributions to the peacekeeping force. Thus far, only 2,000 additional

peacekeepers have been deployed. And the force continues to

lack helicopters and other types of equipment that are essential to

achieve mobility and to deliver humanitarian supplies.

We’re faced with the sobering reality that, after almost 9 months,

only a small fraction of the troops approved in the Security Council

resolution have been deployed to mitigate what many consider to

be the world’s most dire and visible humanitarian crisis. Improving

security will not automatically resolve the underlying causes of the

conflict, but it will provide physical and psychological relief that

would create opportunities for leaders in the communities to assert

themselves and explore the compromises necessary to make peace

sustainable.

The United States must lead in finding ways to address these political

and logistical shortcomings. We must also understand that

even the successful deployment of a full peacekeeping contingent

will not guarantee a political resolution to the crisis. Consequently,

we must simultaneously work with like-minded nations to reinvigorate

a viable and coherent peace process.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses how these efforts

are progressing and what more we can do.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Lute, as has been mentioned in opening

statements and your testimony, one of the compelling reasons why

world attention is focused on Sudan and on Darfur is because there

has been testimony here in the United States by Secretary Powell

and, the chairman mentioned, by the President, that genocide is

being committed.

Now, let me just ask you, as a very close observer of the situation,

who is committing genocide? That is, what group of persons?

And who are the victims of genocide? So that at least the public

can get clear in its own mind precisely where that charge lies.

Well, now——

Yes. What are the deep roots? In other words,

what group or racial/ethnic characteristic are the Janjaweed, and

what are the ethnic characteristics of the victims, these persons in

the huts?

I think that’s important, and I don’t mean to

dwell on this, but clearly one aspect of the Sudan situation that

has elevated attention, in the religious community and persons in

humanitarian causes all over the world, has been because the word

‘‘genocide’’ is applied to this. You know, it’s a very tragic circumstance

that, throughout Africa, there are many groups currently

fighting each other and trying to undermine each other,

undermining governments and so forth. Sudan has had at least

some relative success with negotiations between North and South

Sudan.

Now, experts will point out how that has come unraveled. And

yet, at the same time, there has been at least some negotiating

process moving toward a peace settlement. You’re involved, admittedly,

in peacekeeping, but you’re not divorced from trying to negotiate

peace, but, nevertheless, this is a part of the process. There

have to be persons, even around a table, a campfire, or somewhere,

who are prepared to compromise, who see at least some—and,

therefore, you can come in, along with the international community,

and hopefully retain that agreement.

So, I suppose my second line of inquiry is: Where in this process

are, in fact, the negotiations of any sort? Are they occurring in any

part of Sudan, quite apart from parts of Darfur? In other words,

is there some promising negotiation that might establish even

a modicum of peace that somebody could, as a peacekeeper, help

enforce?

Are these groups who would prefer fighting, are

their objectives racial or ethnic domination, or are they trying to

just simply carve out spheres of land, more food, water? In other

words——

Yes. So, I’m trying to—not to separate the problems

of the genocide and the ethnic conflict and so forth from the

fact that people are warring in many parts of the world over food

and water. But, I think, at some point, in discussing this, we really

have to begin to sort out what at least the world perceives as the

various motivating factors, as well as the players, to have some

sense—otherwise, we have one hearing after another in which we

come, understanding we’re going to hear that things are once again

amiss, sort of almost beyond reconciliation, and we’re not doing

enough. And I’m, sort of, one who, at this point, would like to have

much more of a business plan of who is who and what are the equities

and how could any type of agreement come about that then

armed forces or peacekeepers might be helpful?

Well, that is my dilemma, Mr. Chairman. I’ll leave it at that and

pass it along.