And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this

hearing. And thank you, to both of our witnesses.

I think it’s a testament to bipartisan concern about this issue

that eight Senators have spent most of the hearing listening to the

testimony and have taken a considerable amount of our time today

to stick around.

I’m sure you’re aware, General Gration, that there is a concern

that the administration is not speaking with one voice on the issue

of Sudan. As you know, during the campaign last year, Senator

Obama vehemently denounced the Sudanese Government as practicing

genocide. Ambassador Susan Rice stated, on June 15, that

genocide is ongoing. However, you’ve stated that the situation in

Darfur was, at worst, the remnants of genocide. I’d be interested

in you commenting about ‘‘at worst.’’ That seems to indicate that

you’re doubtful that there was ever a genocide. So, it does seem

that, in that respect, our U.N. Ambassador and Presidential candidate

Obama were taking one position, and you’re taking the

other.

Also, Ambassador Rice praised the International Criminal

Court’s issuance of an arrest warrant for President Bashir, and

that is a statement that seems at odds with the administration’s

engagement strategy that you’ve outlined today. So, I’d like for you

to comment about that.

Indicating that it’s ongoing.

But, don’t you think it’s important for us to

know, to the best of our ability, whether there is a continuing genocide,

ongoing, as Ambassador Rice stated?

Have you and the Ambassador had a conversation

about this seeming difference?

Well, no one is suggesting that. But, it’s fair to

say——

I’m heartened that people in the

administration are fond of each other.

In your opinion, are we dealing now only with

the remnants of a genocide that is over?

Well, let me move, then, to another line of

questioning.

Senator Feingold asked you specifically what tangible evidence

we had that Khartoum is acting in good faith. I’d like for you to

elaborate on that. As you know, a number of Senators have

expressed their concern about this policy of national engagement.

And I guess we could talk about carrots and sticks, as opposed to

a comprehensive approach, but it seems to me that any comprehensive

approach is going to have a combination of carrots and sticks.

Senators have advocated a plan of asking for concrete progress

on a number of fronts, and they’ve called for benchmarks, a timetable

to hold the government accountable, and they’ve asked the

administration not to rule out further punitive actions and more

muscular steps in our approach to the national government.

So, what is your response to that, sir?

I’d appreciate it——

If you would respond on the record

about those specifics which you just alluded to.

Yes.

No, for the record.

Clearly, the chairman’s comments are well

taken. However, if Ambassador Rice is correct, and if there is an

ongoing genocide, then clearly the Congress’s—and the United

States—approach to dealing with the government should be different.

I wanted to ask one question about the secession vote. I would

be surprised, General, if the South did not vote to secede, under

any circumstances. Do you expect the Khartoum Government to

honor this vote? And what are the implications of that?

And Khartoum will allow the seceding South to

go quietly and peacefully and orderly.