Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Lute, you are the officer responsible for the deployment of

UNAMID, are you not?

So, you would, in essence, be responsible for

its deployment?

Now, on July 31 of last year, the U.N. Security

Council adopted Resolution 1769, and its goal, as I understand

it, was to fully deploy 26,000 peacekeeping troops to Darfur by mid-

2008. Is that correct?

So, here we are today, April 23, 2008, we

have only about 300 new personnel on the ground—150

Bangladeshi police officers, and 140 Chinese engineers. And, at this

pace, we will have the 26,000 peacekeepers on the ground by June

2026. At this pace. Eighteen years after the goal set by the United

Nations. I don’t understand—I’ve heard your answers, and I understand

you’re not solely responsible, so it is not all aimed at you.

But, I think we need to be more explicit about what Member States

are not giving you the support.

You know, the U.S. Government has done some things. We talk

about the helicopter, and certainly we should be able to do something

in that regard. Of course, our engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan

leave us, in large degree, unable to respond in a way

that we should. But, the fact of the matter is, I know that we have

come up with over $450 million to construct bases. Maybe that’s

not enough. But, at the rate that we’re going, the United States

Government’s ability to work with the United Nations, we should

forget about the next administration and the next administration

after that and the next administration after and the next administration

after that, before we finally get to the deployment of what

we are looking for.

I hope you can give this committee some sense—what do you expect

to have, boots on the ground, at the end of this year?

Eighty percent?

Eighty percent of the 26,000?

If we have achieved only 300 new personnel

during this period of time, can you give us the projection of how

you’re going to get to that 80 percent?

I’m listening.

So, you are telling the committee that, by

the end of 2008, you will have a little over 20,000 troops there?

So far, the government has created its own

set of obstacles. What leads us to believe that, in fact, it won’t continue

to provide those obstacles, moving forward?

Well, I must say that I hope that your testimony

ends up being fact, because if you are sitting, as a Darfurian,

in the camps in the Sudan, if you are being attacked by the

janjaweed, if your life is a living hell, you would really have a

doubt about the value of the United Nations. You would wonder

about the world and its response to genocide.

And, just because it takes place within the confines of a country,

if that is going to be our view of genocide, then we should stop saying

‘‘never again,’’ because ‘‘never again’’ can continue to be a hollow

promise if all we are allowed to do is see the genocide take

place and talk about impediments. I cannot believe the world cannot

come up with 26 helicopters. I cannot believe that the world

cannot generate enough pressure on the Sudan to make sure that

all of the roadblocks are removed, as well as the redtape and all

of the bureaucracy.

And let me just close with this, we’re going to hear from Ambassador

Williamson. In part of his testimony, he says, ‘‘In the face of

these obstacles’’—he talks about what’s going on today—‘‘the

United Nations has demonstrated far too little creativity or flexibility

in addressing the slow pace of UNAMID’s deployment.’’

Would you disagree with this.

You would.

You’ve had a lot of creativity, and you’ve had

a lot of flexibility.

My time is up, but let me say, Dr. Lute, if

I was sitting in one of those camps, the counsels of patience and

delay would not be something that I want to hear.

And I hope that, Mr. Chairman, this committee looks, as we look

at the supplemental, at opportunities to further show U.S. leadership

in this regard; otherwise, these words about ‘‘never again’’ are

hollow promises, and I don’t believe in that.

I appreciate that answer, because I am concerned

that we send the wrong message to Bashir, and we send the

wrong message to other countries in the world, as well, that the

way to get a relationship with the United States, and the way to

get off the list of state sponsors of terrorism is to go ahead and

have a conflict, and then promise that you’ll do something, and

then do absolutely nothing, at the end of the day.

I listened to Ms. Almquist’s statement, and there’s plenty of

things, right now, that the Sudanese should easily be doing in assisting

those convoys, at a minimum. At a minimum.

So, I have a real problem, if it was different. I appreciate your

answer, and we’ll have some opportunities, perhaps, to pursue

some other classified opportunity, as well.

But, I would be vehemently opposed and do everything I could

to intercede in any way that was available to an individual Senator,

or to, hopefully, a group of Senators, if that was our course

at this point in time, because there are those who have suggested

that, in our counterterrorism cooperation with Khartoum. We are,

of course, interested in anyone cooperating with us on counterterrorism,

but, at the same time, these are the same people who are

responsible, in part—a very significant part—in creating the genocide

in Darfur. And I am not one—as much as I want to have efforts

on counterterrorism, to be engaged—to be willing to look the

other way in response for information and assistance on counterterrorism

while genocide takes place, and I hope that’s the administration’s

view, as well.

Thank you, Senator Feingold.

Thank you both.

Ms. Almquist, let me say, I was glad to see you again, since we

presided over your nomination hearing. And our thoughts and

prayers are with the families of the two AID workers who lost their

lives. I sent letters to both of their families, and they committed

the ultimate sacrifice in support of our soft-power initiatives in the

world. This just shows how dangerous some of the work that our

people do, and I just wanted to acknowledge that.

Ambassador Williamson, I sent you a letter, on Monday of this

week. Maybe you assuaged some of my concerns, based upon your

response to Senator Feingold. In it, I said that, based upon press

reports, that the negotiating strategy outlined in those reports that

suggested placating Khartoum by normalizing relationships with

the Sudan and removing the regime from the list of state sponsors

of terrorism was definitely the wrong strategy—in my view—and

sends the wrong message.

I appreciated your answer to Senator Feingold, but am I to understand

from your answer, that we are not looking to normalize

relationships, at least at this point in time, with Khartoum, and

not looking to take them off the list of state sponsored terrorism?

Let me ask you this. I appreciate your comments

about how deeply President Bush feels about this. So, how

many helicopters can we come up with?

Can we come——

Up with eight?

Can we come up with six?

Can we come up with four?

Well, the greatest country on the face of the

Earth, with the greatest military prowess on in the world, and we

can’t come up, so far, with anything to begin to urge others to act

in common cause but lead by example. Really hard to believe the

depth of commitment, then, if we can’t do that.

Let me ask you this: With reference to our Chinese friends, who

supplies the majority of the small arms to the Sudan?

Yes, the Chinese. As a matter of fact, 90 percent

of all of Khartoum’s small arms are—between 2004 and 2006,

totaling about $55 million, including assault rifles—the most common

weapon used in Darfur, come from the Chinese.

We have a U.N. embargo, right? Originally posed in 2004, expanded

in 2005?

To Darfur. And it prohibits all Member

States from selling or transferring arms to Darfur, is that not true?

And the fact that the Chinese arms have

been well documented in Darfur, and that the Government of

China has either disavowed their existence, minimized the scope of

China’s arms trade with the Sudan, or denied that its weapons

makes a difference in the conflict, shouldn’t that give us cause for

concern? Isn’t China clearly, by virtue of continuing to provide the

arms that makes its way to Darfur, and, for that fact, the Sudanese

Government, violating the embargo?

Well, I think the whole world knows, Ambassador,

that these Chinese arms, sold to the Sudanese Government,

are making its way to Darfur. The whole world knows that.

I don’t need to go to an intelligence briefing to find that out. But,

the bottom line is, something is clearly wrong, the very Sudanese

Government that we’re talking to in this respect.

Now, with the Chinese, they have the Olympics coming up. ‘‘One

world and one dream,’’ that’s their motto, ‘‘one world and one

dream.’’ You know, it just seems to me, whether it is Tibet, whether

it is the genocide in Darfur, that we are allowing the Chinese

to get away with, incredibly, so much. It may be because they own

so much of our debt, that we are timid in our responses to them.

I hope this administration—you know, commitment—I think the

President—and I often disagree with the President—I’d like to believe

the President honestly, honestly feels some degree of passion

on this issue, but our actions, and notwithstanding the humanitarian

part, which is a part to be complimented—but our actions

in getting to the heart—the humanitarian part is only keeping people

alive so maybe they can survive another day, and maybe they

won’t get raped, and maybe they won’t get killed, but it doesn’t go

to the heart of the matter of the genocide that is taking place. For

that, there must be a much more significant commitment by the

United States to lead the rest of the world to act. And, in the absence

of doing that, with all due respect, Ambassador, you will be

here again and again and again with a report very similar to the

one you are giving us today. So, I hope you take that back to the

administration.

I look forward to trying to challenge the administration, through

the appropriations process, through the supplementals maybe, to

see if they’re willing to stand with us and provide the resources

necessary to change the dynamics so that ‘‘never again’’ really

means something. Otherwise, it will be a stain on America for continuing

to allow a genocide to take place.

And I wonder—and I’ll just close—I wonder whether, if this was

happening in Europe, that we’d be acting with much more urgency—

wondering if this was happening in some other part of the

world that isn’t Africa, whether we would be acting with a different

sense of urgency.