

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health  
Prospects for Peace in Guinea  
March 22, 2007

**Statement by Congressman Christopher H. Smith**

I would like to thank the Chairman for calling this timely hearing, and our witnesses for joining us.

With so many important and often vexing challenges competing for our attention throughout the world, it seems that the tendency in Congress is to focus our attention on a crisis only after it has evolved into an unmitigated disaster. Fortunately, that is not the case today.

This hearing presents us with an opportunity to discuss not only our strategic, humanitarian, human rights, and economic interests in Guinea – particularly as speculation about President Lansana Conté’s political future and the potential for even greater conflict mounts – but also to consider how the United States Government has positioned itself to respond to threats and mitigate crises *before* they have spun out of control.

The stakes are high. Western Africa historically has been beset by political instability and violence, where conflict in one country spills across borders and threatens the region as a whole. This has led to massive displacements, refugee flows, the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, and the perpetration of some of the most heinous human rights atrocities known to man. If we fail to capitalize on the opportunity to address transformative, stabilization and reconstruction needs in support of a democratic transition in Guinea today, I fear that we may be headed for a much wider regional crisis down the road.

Experts have been warning for years that the “ground was quaking” in Guinea. Widespread dissatisfaction with the autocratic rule of an aged and ailing Conté, coupled with economic decline, high inflation, political cronyism and corruption, has led to periodic episodes of unrest in Conakry. However, the union-led strikes of December 2006 through February 2007 took on a new dimension. For the first time since the country obtained independence in 1958, Guineans across the nation have taken to the streets *en mass*, demanding change and refusing to accept half measures.

Through solidarity, the unions, opposition parties and civil society gained strength, and in the end, they succeeded in exacting critical concessions from the government. But while this symbolizes a significant victory, the hardest part is yet to come.

While the naming of the new consensus prime minister, Lansana Kouyaté on February 27<sup>th</sup> is a significant step forward, the office of the Prime Minister is not constitutionally protected and Conté has a record of breaking agreements. In addition, substantial resources are urgently needed for economic and social programs that will address the root causes of social unrest and shore-up popular support for the Prime Minister. History has shown that Conté is unlikely to share power in a meaningful way, and the longer he keeps his hand on the tiller in his authoritarian style, the more likely a renewed and destructive political crisis will emerge.

That said, it is widely speculated that – one way or another – Conté will not finish his term in office. His health is extremely poor and his power appears to be waning. Even the African Union and the Economic Community of West African States, which typically shy away from criticizing one of their own in public, have condemned Conté's violent response to protests and have suggested that this may be the appropriate time for him to step down. Experts are no longer talking about IF Conté will leave office, but WHEN and under what conditions he will leave.

Still, Conté has not designated a successor and, in fact, has sidelined a number of individuals who appeared poised to succeed him. The President of the National Assembly, who would be the successor to the President under the terms of the Constitution, is widely unpopular. It has been widely suggested that a military takeover may be the only option for a “soft landing” should Conté die in office or retire to his farm.

However, I would strongly contend that a military takeover in Guinea, no matter how “temporary” it is intended to be, should NOT be considered an appealing option. The military is divided along generational and ethnic lines. Neither Guineans nor the international community should assume that the military is a cohesive group capable or willing to deliver a smooth transition to a democratic, civilian-led government.

While the responsibility for fostering an environment of peace and security in Guinea rests with Guineans, the United States is in a unique position to help facilitate a non-violent, democratic resolution to this crisis. Guineans remember the fact that it was the United States who came to their aid when Guinea was attacked by the Revolutionary United Front rebels from Sierra Leone, with the support of former Liberian President Charles Taylor. We also have invested heavily in peace in Liberia, and have credibility in the region. Guinea is a predominantly Muslim country which is favorably disposed to the United States. The time to help is now ... *before* the crisis spirals out of control.

I look forward to a lively discussion on these matters.