Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would simply say that I agree with a lot of what you have said.

The one component that I would disagree with, and would just be

curious to hear your thoughts on, would be the idea of lifting economic

but leaving in place military sanctions. It seems to me, as

an advocate of our armed forces, right now we have something that

is providing a lot of wear and tear on our military forces, something

that is providing a lot of expense to the American taxpayer.

That is this enforcement of the no-fly zones, which were originally

put in place to uphold U.N. Security Council Resolution 688.

This was basically to help in easing the repression of Iraqi forces.

It has not done that. As a result, I think American pilots go around

blowing holes in the sky. Every morning, they will leave Turkey at

4 a.m., F–16 pilots out of Turkey, be up at first sunlight there over

the northern watch, and roll in to provide enforcement of that,

quote, ‘‘no -fly zone.’’ It is, in essence, a patchwork that has proved

to be, I think, ineffectual in really making that difference that is

called for in U.N. Security Council Resolution 688. So I would just

be curious as to why the one, but not the other?

I would echo Mr. Smith’s sentiments

in thanking you for your very generous use of time. I will basically

have four quick questions.

First of all, in your testimony you had described

containment as a factor. Even before I say that, I would make a

strong division between economic and military sanctions. I would,

for the most part, agree with your thoughts on economic sanctions.

I strongly disagree with, in essence, your and Ms. Romanowski’s

thoughts on the military sanctions and their efficacy.

Toward that end, you said in your testimony that containment

was effective, but it did not meet the standards necessary to bring

about its end. In other words, Saddam would not do the things in

his regime to bring about its end over the course of his life.

Now, I find that really unsettling, because I come from South

Carolina. We have got a guy named Strom Thurmond, who is two

years away from hitting 100, which is to say that if Saddam had

anywhere near the same kind of life expectancy, you could be looking

at, let us say, another 40 years of him being around, which is

to say if we add up the $1.2 billion that it is now costing the military

to impose these, in essence, military sanctions, and we leave

off OPTEMPO, which I think wears out troops, we leave off depreciation

of assets, that would be about $48 billion in direct cost to

continue to maintain these military sanctions. Do you think this

approximately $50 billion expenditure is worthwhile?

Probably higher, because of OPTEMPO, again, depreciation

of assets, et cetera. But ballpark, we would say in this

hypothetical it could be $50 billion worth of expense.

No, no. That is the first one. I have four. But we

can come back. Do you have a thought? Go ahead.

Those were your words.

Right.

I agree with the distinction.

I am not disagreeing with you. Again, because of

what you have said about effectiveness, in other words, I would not

dispute at all that this is an area of vital strategic interest. But in

terms of effectiveness, in other words, there I think I would have

to disagree, because the question you have to ask when spending

the hypothetical $50 billion is, are we effectively making a difference

on what the air cover is supposed to be doing, which according

to U.N. Security Council Resolution 688, is to cease repression

of Iraqi civilian populations. To suggest that this is the case,

that somehow people in Iraq are unrepressed, I think is just at

total odds with the facts on the ground.

Sure.

Absolutely.

Right.

I do not know that you could draw that. I do not

know that, that is a validate hypothesis. In other words, it may

have been that the economic sanctions were partly attributable to

him not lashing out over the last ten years. It may have been the

fact that he has been rebuilding infrastructure over the last ten

years that has kept him from lashing out.

So I want to specifically focus, in my remarks, really on the nofly

zone. That is what I am really getting at here. I do not know

how you would say that the no-fly zone is effective, because we can

through satellite imagery and otherwise come up with detection as

to whether or not he is massing troops, et cetera.

In fact, I would go on to my second point. Your comment in your

testimony, then, that we have contained the Iraqi military, which

I guess is what you are stressing now. He has not lashed out in

the last ten years. But if you look at 1999 numbers, there were 600

breaches of the no-fly zone in 1999.

In essence, to round it, basically two times a day, he is breaching

the no-fly zone. I go back again to effective containment. How is

that an effective containment of his air forces? Or turned another

way, do you see any place within Iraq where an insurrection has

been made possible because of the no-fly zone?

If I were to go back with what you just said, that

there was outright repression of the Iraqi people, they would say

to me, in other words—it was explained a long time ago—that one

of the possible outcomes of having a no-fly zone would be that Saddam

would not be able to get his troops to places where Iraqi National

Congress or others would gather folks to storm up in arms

against him. That did not happen.

You say that is not one of the goals of the current no-fly zone.

In fact, it is to make sure there is not repression. So instead they

shoot you with a gun, a pistol, as opposed to a gun out of a helicopter.

But that is not to say that they are not repressed.

Better, but still repressed.

Right.

Third question: The military have a term called

center of gravity, wherein if you hit your enemy, for instance, in

the war in Vietnam, we never really impacted North Vietnam’s

center of gravity. As a result, every night they had on the news

nightly body counts, but we were not impacting their center of

gravity. As a result, we lost. Could you show me where this air

war, if you will, is impacting Saddam’s center of gravity?

Right.

Last question: Scott Ritter, who himself has been

on the ground, as have you, has basically said that the no-fly zone

is pretty much a waste of time. Is he incompetent, misinformed; or

if wrong, why?

I am not disagreeing with you on that part.

Sure.

I sure appreciate your time. Nobody else is here,

so the hearing is adjourned.