Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador Burns, good to see you again. Thank you for your

testimony today. And I know with your past portfolio and the

issues that you are engaged in, how one person is able to juggle

what you are able to do is in itself incredibly admirable, so I thank

you again for your participation today.

I guess in terms of just, you know, an observation, and this is

not—don’t take this in the wrong way, because I think what you

are doing in terms of the Six-Party Talks is incredibly admirable

and the overall goal here in terms of suppressing the development

of nuclear weapons within North Korea and beyond, but in terms

of the Six-Party Talks as they move forward now, what exactly are

your goals? What are the expectations, if you can talk about that

or elaborate on that?

Clearly, I think one who would make an observation would look

at what took place in North Korea now that they have detonated

a nuclear device, albeit a small one in relation to others and other

nations that have done so. What are the expectations as you move

forward? What are we trying to do now? Is the genie not out of the

bottle? And if it is, is it rational to think that we can ever put it

back in the bottle?

I think other nations are looking very closely, in particular Iran,

as to how we are reacting to this. Has there been any discussion

or thought of a change in direction in terms of dealing with North

Korea, moving from not solely a six-party engagement, which I

know took an incredible amount of time to bring about?

I was in Hong Kong 4 years ago, met with Ambassador Kelly

when we were trying to engage the Chinese in this and in convincing

them it was in their regional interest to be engaged here.

It took so long to get to that point.

One could make the argument while that was going on that it

gave the North Koreans the ability to cover—yeah, we are moving

toward Six-Party Talks—but, at the same time, develop, obviously,

what they have done now. Any further discussion about further bilateral

discussions? I know you mentioned a lower level. Any in

terms of a higher level, allowing for either yourself or someone

close to you to actually engage directly with Pyongyang?

I mean, it is arguable they have violated every

one of those commitments, have they not?

Every single one of those commitments they have

violated, right?

Mr. Chairman, could I ask one last question? One

very quick question.

It is pointed, but in your estimate, do you think

this is a diplomatic failure?