Mr. Chairman, thank you for having the hearing.

And, General and Mr. Gast, thank you for what you do. I am

very appreciative that we’ve heightened our efforts. Senator

Isakson, I know, as has been mentioned, were in Khartoum, and

also in the Darfur region not long ago, and I—I want to get to

Darfur in just one second—but, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement

seems to be the most crucial issue that exists there now, because

if we, in fact, are not successful—all of us, Sudan and all

those who care about that region—it seems to me that all the

gains, the minor gains, that have taken place in Darfur, are out the

window, because the CPA reaching a not good end is something

that, I think, causes the entire region, possibly, to implode. So, I

appreciate you putting effort there, I appreciate the efforts of our

chairman and others.

There’s been discussion about the humanitarian efforts, already,

so I won’t go into that, and the 13 NGOs that have been expelled.

One of the things, though, that I think is most striking in the

IDP camps there in Darfur is the lack of security for women. Here,

they exist in a home that none of us would call a home, a little

area on sand, and yet they’re confined to those areas because of the

gender-based violence that’s taking place. And we’re talking about

an area smaller than the area between you and I right now, where

sometimes cattle is kept; they themselves are there. They cannot

wander outside of that area, especially if they’re a young woman,

without being concerned about gender-based violence. And I wonder

if there are security measures that we might change inside

these camps, which are already unbelievably undesirable places to

be. Is there something there that we might do that is more tangible

than what is occurring today?

The UNAMID forces were able to accompany us

inside these camps. And yet, when we went out to actually meet

with them at their headquarters, to talk about their mandate,

which I know their efforts are really more out in the region, trying

to control the rebel groups—I know their mandate is being

reviewed right now. And in listening to them regarding their mandate,

one would have to say that it is an incredibly weak mandate.

The things that they have to do to counter the rebel activity out

there—you know, by the time they get through going through all

their protocols, the rebels are gone. OK? It just seemed like a no brainer

that that mandate would be changed to allow them to be

far more productive, to do the things you just mentioned.

And I want to ask one more question. If you could briefly respond

to that, I’d appreciate it.

Unless the mandate is changed.

Even—getting back, though, just to the protocol. When they

encounter a rebel group out in the desert, by the time they go

through the things they have to do—which basically are waving at

them, almost—the rebel groups are gone. And again, it seems to

me that that’s something, regardless of the other things you’re

talking about, that everyone would acknowledge is a problem and

could be changed. Otherwise, getting back to these camps, they’re

going to become permanent cities, because no one’s going to go

out—back to their homeland, as long as the type of security that

we’re not providing continues to exist.

And I know you know that. But, I just hope that you will work

stringently with the United Nations to get that changed, and I

hope all of us will, too.

The final point. We met with a central banker while we were

there, and they talked about the various issues our sanctions are

creating for them. And again, I’m going back to the CPA, because,

again, if we end up having the train wreck that, on the present

course, will occur, OK, Darfur, as terrible as it is, is going to get

far worse, and it’s going to spread to other areas.

So, we met with our intelligence agencies there, and I know

many folks here have done that here. The fact is, there’s no evidence

today—in spite of the atrocities that we all are aware of—

there’s no evidence that Sudan is involved as a state sponsor of terror.

None.

So, the unintended consequences of that defined term existing, I

think, may be hurting us, as it relates to these other efforts. And

I just wonder, since there’s no evidence of that, and since we

understand the importance of this comprehensive peace agreement

achieving its desired end in 2011—I’m wondering if we’re, again,

on one of those paths on unintended consequences, and would like

for you to respond to that.

So, we’re cutting our nose off to spite our face,

today.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this timely

hearing.