Chairman Casey, Ranking Member Risch,

distinguished members of the committee, Senator Lugar, thank you

for inviting us to appear before you today to discuss our goals with

regard to Syria and the strategy that we are implementing to

achieve them.

Bashar al-Assad is destroying Syria and destabilizing the region.

As Secretary Clinton said 2 days ago, the greatest source of instability

in the region is not people’s legitimate demands for change.

It is the refusal to change. An orderly democratic transition that

removes Assad from power and restores stability is clearly in the

United States interest, as it is in the interest of the Syrian people.

It will support our goals of promoting democracy and human

rights, contribute to greater stability in the region, and undermine

Iran’s influence.

Our message to President Assad can be summed up briefly. Step

aside and allow your people to begin a transition to democracy.

Though we would like to see this transition proceed as quickly

as possible, we should be prepared for the process, unfortunately,

to be long and difficult. Much has already changed since the unrest

began 8 months ago. Internally a large and growing number of Syrians

have concluded that Assad must go. Protests that started in

the remote village of Daraa now take place in nearly every city and

major town in the country. For the regime to retain power, the

Syrian Army has had to occupy its own country, but the regime’s

overwhelming use of force has not been able to suppress Syria’s

courageous street protesters demanding their universal rights.

And internationally, Syria is increasingly isolated as the international

community loses patience with Assad’s brutality and

broken promises. Nearly all of Syria’s neighbors now recognize that

Assad is dangerously fomenting instability, and that is why we see

this unusual Arab League leadership on a country that is considered

to be very important politically and strategically in the Arab

world. The Arabs want Assad to stop destroying Syria.

The Gulf Cooperation Council described the regime as, ‘‘a killing

machine.’’ After several years of strengthening ties with Syria,

Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan said, ‘‘those who repress their

own people in Syria will not survive.’’ Totalitarian regimes are disappearing.

The rule of the people is coming.

The coverage of the regime’s brutality in pan-Arab media has

also destroyed Assad’s standing in the Arab street. He has become

a pariah in the Arab world. Almost all the Arab leaders, the Foreign

Ministers who I talk to, say the same thing. Assad’s rule is

coming to an end. It is inevitable. Some of these Arabs have even

begun to offer Assad safe haven to encourage him to leave quickly.

We welcome the efforts of the Arab League to stop the violence,

but the regime must be judged by its actions not by its words. The

killing, as you said, Mr. Chairman, has continued unabated, and

we urge our Arab partners to condemn the regime and assume a

greater role in building international pressure, including at the

United Nations.

Economically tough United States and European Union sanctions

and financial mismanagement by the Syrian regime are changing

the calculus of Syria’s business elite. Oil revenue is now almost

nonexistent. The regime’s assets in the United States and European

banks have been frozen. And Syria is cut off from most of the

international financial system. As cash starts to dry up, the more

Syrians see that the regime is not sustainable.

Complementing our international efforts, Ambassador Ford, as

both of you mentioned, and his team are doing courageous work.

And thank you to this committee for confirming him. He is currently

in the United States on leave and we expect him to return

to post soon.

Overall, we are following a deliberative course that takes into

account Syria’s unique circumstances. We do not want to see the

situation descend into further violence. The best way forward is to

continue support for the nonviolent opposition while working with

international partners to further isolate, to further pressure the regime.

This creates an environment in which the Syrians can take

control of their own future.

You mentioned the Syrian National Council. We welcome the

establishment of the Syrian National Council, a broad coalition of

opposition groups from inside and outside Syria. When you consider

the past 40 years Syrians have been prevented from engaging

in any political activity, what the opposition has already achieved

is truly remarkable. We, the United States, have not endorsed any

particular opposition group. The Syrian people alone will decide

who can legitimately represent them. The opposition must continue

to expand and consolidate its base within Syria by convincing more

Syrians of the legitimacy of its vision and its transition plan which

demonstrates that there is a better alternative to Assad.

While we understand the Syrian people’s need to protect themselves,

violent resistance is counterproductive. It will play into the

regime’s hands. It will divide the opposition. It will undermine

international consensus. To create better protection for civilians in

the near term, we are pressing for access to human rights monitors

and journalists. We will relentlessly pursue our strategy of supporting

the opposition and diplomatically and financially pressuring the

regime until Assad is gone and until the Syrians are able to complete

their democratic transition.

Assad may, through his brutality, be able to delay or impede this

transition, but he cannot stop it.

We look forward to working with the Syrian people as they chart

a new and democratic future.

Chairman, thanks. We welcome your proposal

for a contact group for friends of the Syrian people. In fact,

we are running with this idea. We are talking with others about

it. I have a very senior colleague who is working on coordination

with our European allies pretty much full-time, Fred Hoff. I am in

touch with the Arabs.

What we would like to do is to try to get the Arabs themselves

to play a leadership role in this. One of Assad’s propaganda tools

is, oh, this is just an outside plot, and he needs to see that his

brother Arabs are also participating in such a contact group. So we

are exploring, we are pushing. We take the idea as a very positive

one.

We agree with you, Senator Casey. The

Arab League’s committee that is dealing with the Syria issue

headed by the Qatari Prime Minister Hamad bin Jassin includes

several Arab States. They are meeting on Friday, a day before the

Arab League is meeting on Saturday, to discuss Syria. So the committee

on Friday will be discussing a number of options to present

to the Ministers on Saturday, and we hope that—I mean, we are

encouraging them to look at issues such as the Friends of Libya

contact group. We would very much hope that given Assad’s clear

rejection of their proposal, that they will help us with the Security

Council, things like that. So we agree with you that the Arab

League is playing an important role and now is the time for the

Arab League to actually take some action.

On Turkey, you raise a really important issue. And it is worth

remembering that one of, I think, the Assad family’s foreign policy

successes probably, from their own view, would be the rapprochement

that first the father, then the son, were able to have with

Turkey from 1998 moving forward. You know, if you looked at the

Turkish-Syrian relationship a year ago, they were close friends.

They had developed economic ties, political ties, diplomatic ties. It

was a very positive relationship, I think, from the Syrian perspective.

That is in tatters at this point. When you have statements

from the Prime Minister of Turkey such as the ones that I quoted

and you described, you can see what has happened.

And Turkey has played an important role in a couple of areas.

First, they have provided, basically, safe haven on Turkish soil for

Syrian refugees. Turkey is hosting somewhere between 7,500 and

8,000 refugees, roughly, on Turkish soil now, protecting them from

the brutality of the Assad regime that they fled.

Second, Turkey is providing facilitation space for opposition to

organize, for the opposition to talk to themselves. There is very little

ability for these courageous activists inside Syria to get together

because they clearly have no rights for peaceful protest. Their

rights for speech, freedom of expression are not being at all

respected. And so Turkey is providing some space for the opposition

forces to meet to discuss, to try to lay out a vision. So it is an

extremely important role that Turkey is playing.

And Turkey has, in essence, put on a de facto arms embargo to

make sure that arms are not flowing through Turkey back to the

clique around Bashar al-Assad to use against his own people.

So we think Turkey is playing an extremely positive, important

role here.

In the past, there was a lot of trade between the two countries,

a lot of Turkish merchants going across the border to buy things

in Syria to trade. That has all dried up just because of the instability

in Syria, but we are in close contact with Turkey on all these

issues.

First of all, continue what they are doing

because it is having a real impact. The opposition’s ability to come

together, because of the Turkish facilitation, is a tremendous

accomplishment.

Also, given the fact that the economic trade between the two

countries is dropping, we would like to encourage them to join the

European Union, to join Japan, to join Canada, to join us in formalizing

some economic sanctions between Turkey and Syria.

Well, part of it, Senator, is just my own

humility. I have been NEA Assistant Secretary during this year,

and I have learned not to predict things based on what has happened

in the Arab world this year. So part of it is just based on

my own awareness that predictions about what is going to happen

in the Arab world do not always pan out.

But part of it is this question of the unarmed protests that you

mentioned. It is incredibly courageous what these Syrian opposition

figures—the protesters—are doing every day. They are facing incredible

brutality from a government that is basically a family-led

mafia that has hijacked the state, and yet they come out every day,

day in and day out. There are more demonstrations now than there

were at the beginning of this. They are in every town, every city

across Syria.

But what Bashar al-Assad is trying to do is to turn this peaceful

protest movement into an insurgency. He knows how to deal with

violence. He just uses violence against violence. What confounds

him is this phenomenon of protesters yelling ‘‘peaceful, peaceful,’’

of shopkeepers closing their shops in solidarity with the protesters.

That is what really puts Bashar al-Assad in a bind. And that is

why we have been encouraging the opposition, despite the tremendous

brutality they are facing, to keep to the peaceful principles to

which they have subscribed.

Right now, if the opposition were to turn into a largely armed

movement, we think it would, first of all, frighten the minorities.

It would frighten the minorities in Syria to believe that Bashar

al-Assad’s propaganda about chaos after him would come true. It

would probably divide the international community.

There is no consensus even among the opposition themselves on

the question of arms. None of us question the desire by the Syrians

to exercise in self-defense against the kind of brutality that they

are facing, but we believe that right now their strength is in this

peaceful protest, that they deny Bashar the ability to claim that he

is really facing an armed insurrection because he is not. He is

facing people who are demanding their legitimate rights through

great courage.

I do not know. It goes back to my crystal

ball thing. I do not know.

But it is one of the reasons why I think that the Arab leaders

have started taking such an active role because they do not want

to see him destroy Syria. He is not going to remain. He cannot last.

He cannot survive when you have the sort of isolation that Luke

described, when you see the pariah he has become. But he can certainly

cause a lot more deaths. He can certainly do a lot more damage

before he has finally exited from the scene. The best thing for

him to do right now would be to exit the scene, and that is what

we are trying to find the way to do.

Senator Boxer, thanks for the question. I

am going to have to defer to the Bureau of European Affairs,

Assistant Secretary Phil Gordon, for better insights into Russia’s

motivations because it is out of my area.

But what I can say is talking about Syria, what the Russians say

is, first, that they want a peaceful solution. Fine. We want a peaceful

solution. The Russians say we want the violence to stop. Fine.

We want the violence to stop. The Syrian people want the violence

to stop. So I would say, for the purpose of this argument, let us

try to take the Russians at their word, that they are sincere for the

purpose of this argument. Therefore, they should join us in allowing

monitors, allowing media into the country because if they still

pretend to believe Bashar al-Assad’s lies that what he is doing is

fighting bandits and terrorists, let the monitors in. The monitors

can report that. The monitors can tell the world what is actually

happening. The international media can say that. If there are bandits

and terrorists, the monitors and media will show that.

I do not believe that the Russians will be able to sustain their

opposition to the Syrian people indefinitely.

The information we get, Senator, is

mixed. Because the media is not allowed, because there are restrictions

put on our diplomats, we get a lot of information, but it could

be very detailed in one area and very sketchy in other details. So

it is a very mixed picture, but it does provide enough of a vision

of what is happening in Syria to confirm some of these horrific stories

that you are describing. I do not know the specific examples,

but I am sure that Amnesty was able to get eyewitness reports

because information is getting out despite the Syrian Government’s

best efforts to operate in darkness, to operate in the shadows.

ICRC has had access in Syria. How effective they are able to be

inside medical facilities I do not know because ICRC works very

quietly. That is one of their goals.

But I think that the stories that you are describing explain how

it is that the Syrians can be so courageous that day after day they

are going out and protesting because they know of family, of

friends, of neighbors who have faced this kind of brutality, and

they simply do not want to face it anymore. They are facing a

regime that has hijacked the country with the sole purpose of just

protecting the elite of that regime.

Extremely important points, and you are

right, that these play into all of our thinking on Syria policy all the

time.

I guess there are a couple of basic assumptions we have. What

worries the Lebanese is instability next door and how that might

spill over. What worries the Iraqis is the same thing. What worries

the Israelis is another variation of the same thing. But what is

causing the instability right now that they fear is what Bashar al-

Assad is doing to his own people.

And the President has been clear, as the chairman was earlier

as well, that it is time for Bashar to step aside. Bashar is causing

the instability that worries the neighbors. Bashar has gone past

the tipping point. He is past the point of no return. The neighbors

no longer look at him as the devil you know and so will accept him.

They are recognizing with increasing vehemence that he is the

cause of the instability that most worries them.

That is one of the real challenges because

the opposition in Syria is still divided. We think that more unites

them than divides them because they are talking about the need

for Assad to go, the need for a more democratic, secular future Syrians

have equal rights under the law, but there still are big organizational

divisions between the opposition people. We cannot pick

out which opposition people are the right ones to lead the country.

So one of the things that we are, in our discussions when we

meet with opposition figures, be they within the Syrian National

Council or outside the Syrian National Council, be they inside

Syria or outside Syria, are talking to them about you have to be

able to articulate a credible plan, a credible vision that is practical,

that shows people who maybe do not like Assad, but are worried

about what happens afterward that you have a plan, that it is

practical, that it is implementable, that is positive, that is based

on rule of law where the government governs with the consent of

those governed.

And I think they are starting to do this. There have been some

vision papers put out, certain speeches given, but they still have

a long way to go, to be frank, on this.

You are right to be concerned, Senator.

But right now, the impending chaos is happening because of what

Bashar is doing to his own people. So there needs to be an end to

the violence and an opposition that is inclusive, that is able to

articulate a practical, positive plan going forward.

Senator, it is a very interesting topic

because the short answer is yes. Iran is definitely helping Bashar,

giving him the tools by which he represses his own people, cracks

down on them, et cetera. They are providing expertise, advice, what

we would call technical assistance to do bad things. They are providing

equipment by which he can monitor opposition activities on

the Internet, all that sort of stuff. And it is one of the reasons why,

as my colleague mentioned, the IRGC was sanctioned in one of the

three Executive orders that the President has announced this year.

At the same time, Iran is embarrassed. You start to see Iranian

leaders, even people like Ahmadinejad, who talk about the need to

end violence in Syria. They talk about the need for reform. Now,

it is completely cynical on their part because they do just as bad

of things to their own people, but it suggests to us that the Iranian

leadership recognizes, A, that they have lost credibility across the

Arab world because of their support of this brutal dictator and

that, B, he might not survive. And they have got to start positioning

themselves for the day after Bashar. So I think Iran is

actually in a very interesting bind right now. They are trying to

save him without losing what shreds of credibility they may still

have in the Arab world while also trying to signal to the Syrian

people that we know that he might not survive and we know that

he should not bring those bad things to you.

I will have to plead ignorance, Senator. I

am not really sure. I have not seen polling on that.

But if I could use your question to pull up something else that

is interesting, which is Arab polling. There has been enough Arab

polling over the years to see a remarkable shift. A year or so ago,

there was a big poll done, thousands of people, six different Arab

countries, in which they were asked who is the Arab leader, not

from your own country, outside your own country, who you most

admire. Bashar al-Assad overwhelmingly came out on top. Now the

same countries were polled, the same sort of data, and his numbers,

shall we say, are rock bottom. The highest is something like

in Morocco like 15 percent think he might survive. In Egypt, it is

14 percent. Everywhere else it is single digits. So his own credibility

in the Arab world has suffered tremendously.

And this has, of course, influenced the Arab leadership because

Arab leaders have woken up that they need to be a little attentive

to their popular opinion this year. And I think it helps explain why

the Arab leaders are playing a much stronger role in Syria than

they would have a year ago.

I mentioned this a bit in my opening

statement. Syria is considered to be a very important part of the

Arab world for historic reasons, political reasons. I mean, we do not

always like what Syria has done, but Syria is a heavyweight, shall

we say, in the Arab world. And so I think the Arab leaders are trying

to show that they can deal with a problem in their own back

yard, that they can deal with this rather than have to turn to the

outside world to solve everything. It would be an embarrassment

for them if they are unable to do something to protect the Syrian

people at this point.

So when I am talking to the Arab Foreign Ministers—and the

Secretary and the White House are engaged with the Arabs—there

are a lot of ideas that the Arabs are saying, like we are talking

about perhaps suspending their membership. Perhaps we, as the

Arab League could, ask the United Nations Security Council for action.

So there is recognition that Bashar has basically lied to them.

That is positive. There is recognition quietly, not publicly, that his

days are numbered.

I look at the contrast between, again, a year ago where Qatar

used to lend him a plane to fly around the world on state visits

because we had sanctioned the spare parts—he could not have his

own plane, and now Qatar is heading up the committee that is trying

to find ways to take action in light of Bashar al-Assad’s refusal

to comply with their Arab League initiative.

Now, I do not want to be naive here. The Arab League traditionally

has lots of divisions inside it. So I do not know what they can

actually produce, but they do recognize that in a very important

way their own credibility with their own population is now on the

line.

Senator, thanks for the question.

Syria is, I would say, essential to the extremely negative role

that Iran has been able to play in the region. Take Hezbollah. The

transit routes for the arms to Hezbollah are via Syria. The facilitation

that Iran gives to Hezbollah to undermine the state of Lebanon,

to put Israel at risk, to basically destabilize the region comes

via Syria.

Syria is basically Iran’s only friend. Iran is Syria’s best friend.

In fact, it is one of Syria’s few remaining friends. While we have

talked earlier about how Russia and China vetoed the Security

Council resolution, the Russians and Chinese do care about Arab

attitudes. As I said earlier, I do not think that we have seen the

end of the story on Russia and China. But if you look at Iran’s

friends or Syria’s friends, they tend to be each other and then a few

misguided or purchased Lebanese politicians.

What is happening on the ground in Syria is quite interesting

because as our Embassy—and I thank you all for the comments on

Ambassador Ford which, of course, we certainly all endorse. Our

Embassy reports—it also comes in through other channels—that

these demonstrations across Syria have, among other demands, an

anti-Hezbollah, anti-Iran flavor to them. The Syrian people know

exactly who it is that is providing the assistance to their government

to kill them, arrest them, and torture them. They know it is

from Iran and from Hezbollah, which means that a change in government

that comes about where you have a government in Syria

that is governing by the consent of the people is not going to be

the asset for Iran that Syria is today. It is in our strategic interest

to see that this change takes place quickly.

I will mention Iraq as well. There have been mixed press reports

about what do the Iraqis think about what is happening in Syria

right now, and they are concerned, as Senator Boxer said, about instability

in the region. But Iraq suffered grievously from what this

regime did to them. The Syrian regime facilitated, allowed the use

of Syrian territory, Syrian airport for terrorists to get into Iraq and

blow up thousands of Iraqis, hundreds of our own servicemen. I do

not think the Iraqis have any illusions about Syria. It will also help

Iraq to have a different Syria next door.

Yes. I would—yes, yes. People talk about

there could be another sort of Alawite or not Alawite but Assad in

a palace coup inside, but I think that is very unlikely. So, yes, the

high probability is that a government that comes in with the consent

of the Syrian people will not be an asset of Iran.

You know, it is a concern of everyone, including

the Syrian opposition themselves. The slogan of the Syrian

opposition is ‘‘Syria is one people.’’ They are trying to show and

practice that they recognize that the Syrian national identity is

composed of many, many diverse sects, ethnic groups, et cetera.

And in the various opposition groups, including the Syrian

National Council we have talked about, you do see Alawites, Christians,

Kurds, Druze, that are participating. But the majority of this

is still a Sunni-heavy movement. In part, the country itself is heavily

Sunni.

But it goes back to what we were talking about earlier, that the

opposition has started to articulate and needs to continue to articulate

why it is that Bashar’s predictions of what will happen after

he leaves are wrong, that it will not be chaos, that the minorities,

members of the armed services, members of the judiciary, that all

parts of Syria will have a proper role to play, will have their rights

respected in the future of Syria. The burden is on the Syrian opposition

to be talking to the same people.

I do not think that based on our own conversations with Syrian

minority groups, that there are any illusions about Bashar or any

love for Bashar. They may have once seen him as the force of civility.

They now recognize that he is driving the country to ruin. But

they are worried about what happens afterward and that is what

the opposition needs to work on.

Senator, Ambassador Rice and her team

in New York are extremely active looking at how we can use the

U.N. system in the best way to, first of all, raise attention to what

is actually happening in Syria and then to try to find ways to stop

the violence. We are looking for support with Russia and China to

see that we can get a Security Council resolution on Syria. Right

now, we are also working with European and other partners on

getting a General Assembly resolution on Syria passed through the

third committee that would also call for the types of human rights

monitors that we think would give some protection to the Syrian

people. There have been two special sessions, that we have helped

lead, of the U.N. Human Rights Council. So we are looking at all

the ways that the U.N. system could help us achieve that goal of

stopping violence and moving toward a democratic transition in

Syria.

On the International Criminal Court,

since we are not members, I would look for the lead of others.

But on the Security Council, this is an option that we are pursuing.

We are looking for the right time. We are hoping that something

comes out of the Arab League on Saturday that will help us

with those on the Security Council who did not let the resolution

pass the last time. Definitely this is a matter that the U.N. Security

Council should be dealing with, and we would hope that Russia

and China, in looking at how the Assad clique has just refused all

attempts of mediation from others, would now realize it is time for

the Security Council to act.

There are increasing incidents of the

opposition using arms. Some of this is in self-defense—I think any

of us would understand. For the large part, the opposition movement

is still peaceful. What Bashar wants is for the opposition

movement to turn entirely violent so he can say to the world, look,

it really is an insurgency. He does not know how to deal with

peaceful protesters.

First of all, thank you for seeing the Indian Ambassador. That

is a welcome initiative because we have been talking with the Indians

and others as well.

But what I would say to her is what the U.N. Security Council

is trying to do, what the Arab League is trying to do, what the

U.N. Human Rights Council is trying to do is to get monitors in

the country. If there are terrorists in the country, they will either

stop attacking because they do not want to reveal their action or

they will be revealed by these monitors. We think it would put a

check on the brutality that the Assad regime has inflicted on its

own people. But they can use their own arguments to get themselves

to the point of supporting a Security Council resolution because

if they truly believe what she told you, if she truly believes

that, she should not be frightened to have monitors there.

Reinforcing what Luke said, this is

administered by the Department of Commerce. The Department of

Commerce is looking into this very specific case because there was

no license issued to send this stuff to Syria. Since the export controls

were put in place in 2004, any such item like this that would

be exported to Syria requires a case-by-case examination and an

export license. There were no export licenses issued for this, and

the Department of Commerce is investigating it. I would defer to

them on the state of the investigation.

Yes, just quickly. It is worth noting the

contrast between today and not too far in the distant past, which

is that only recently Europe was looking at an association agreement

with Syria. Europe was in an advanced state of negotiations

with Syria about having an association agreement with trade and

all sorts of other benefits that would have accrued to the Syrians.

Today they have sanctioned Syria. They have sanctioned two of the

primary Syrian banks. They have cut off the oil revenues, which

we have talked about, but that is over $4 billion a year in loss, and

the Syrians have not been able to find any other customers. So it

is as if, with the other subjects we have talked about—it is worth

remembering where we were not very long ago and where we are

today, which helps gives us the sense of inevitability that basically

Bashar is finished.

I do not know. All of us have been in discussions

with the Turkish officials, as have, of course, our bosses

at the Cabinet level and the White House, with the Turks because

the Turks have played an important role. The Turks have played

the essential role in terms of providing space for the opposition.

The effective arms embargo that they have put in place has had

an impact on the regime’s ability. And in practice, much of the economic

ties between the two countries has already dried up, just as

a matter of course.

But as I said earlier, we would like to see them take the additional

step of actually putting some legal sanctions in place that

parallel the sanctions that the EU, the United States, Japan, and

Canada have done.

Senator, in terms of sanctions, of course,

even in our case, food and medicine are exempted from sanctions.

That is really the only examples of exemption from sanctions. And

we do not have reports of sanctions themselves having an impact

directly on the food supply. In fact, the only reports we have had

of shortages of food in Syria so far are places that are sort of under

siege, places where it has been hard to get food in because the

army and the security services are occupying the outskirts. But we

have not had reports of widespread malnutrition, widespread food

shortages in Syria.

But you touch on a very important point, which is the subsidy

question. Even before this all started, Syria’s economy was heavily

subsidized, mismanaged one would say. They have suddenly had a

drop of revenue from the oil, from the tourism revenues, from trade

with Turkey at the same time that Bashar and his clique are trying

to maintain some semblance of control and some semblance of

loyalty through the subsidy program.

You see signs—I mean, I will defer to the experts at Treasury—

of a little bit of a panic among the upper echelons of this elite system.

For example, they put a ban on the import of luxury goods

into Syria in order to try to save hard currency probably to help

buy the foodstuffs and help the subsidy program going for the general

population. But they had to reverse because there was such

popular outcry against this. So you are seeing cracks in the system

that suggest that they really are concerned about their ability to

keep the current subsidy program going.

Senator LUGAR. I just raise the question because many feel that

the problems for President Mubarak really came down to this.

There were the young people in Tahrir Square. There were people

demanding their rights. But Egypt is a country of 80 million people,

and the millions that were usually getting the subsidies from

the Mubarak government were not getting the subsidies. And so as

a result, there was a whole pattern there in terms of countrywide

revolt which was maybe a major factor in finally changing the

government.